

SENATE—Thursday, July 30, 1998

The Senate met at 9 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

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

Gracious Lord, You have loved, forgiven, and cared for us. In Your holy presence, any self-sufficiency fades like a candlelight before the rising sun. Awaken us again to the wonder of Your unqualified grace. May the radiance of Your Spirit invade our hearts, vanishing all the gloom and darkness of worry and fear and anxiety.

Father, set us free to do our work today with joy and gladness. The people in our lives desperately need Your love. Liberate us with the sure knowledge of Your unfailing love so that we will be able to be free to love unselfishly. Speak to us now so that we may be energized with new life and new power. We claim this in the assurance of Your love divine, all loves excelling! Through our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I will lay out the plan for today.

This morning, the Senate will be in a period for morning business until 9:30 a.m. Following morning business, under a previous order, the Senate will begin consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations bill. All Members are encouraged to come to the floor early during today's session to offer and debate any amendments to the defense bill. The first votes of today's session will occur in a stacked series beginning at approximately 2 p.m. These votes will include any remaining amendments to the Treasury appropriations bill and possibly several amendments to the defense bill. Members should expect votes late into the evening during today's session, as the Senate attempts to complete action on the defense bill.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY and Mr. HAGEL pertaining to the introduction of S. 2371 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CRAIG and Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2371 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the defense appropriations bill, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2132) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have given the clerk a list of staff members. I ask unanimous consent that these staff members associated with our presentation of the bill be allowed the privilege of the floor during consideration of the defense bill.

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

The list is as follows:

Sid Ashworth, Tom Hawkins, Susan Hogan, Mary Marshall, Gary Reese, John Young, James Hayes, Justin Weddle, Carolyn Willis, Jennifer Stiefel, Frank Barca, and Kristin Iagulli.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senate begins consideration today of the 1999 Defense appropriations bill, to fund the military activities of the Department of Defense for the upcoming fiscal year.

This bill provides \$250.5 billion in new budget authority for 1999, an increase of \$2.8 billion over the amount appropriated in 1998.

The committee reported this bill on June 4th. Unforeseen circumstances delayed the consideration of the bill, but I believe it is vital that we pass the Defense funding bill prior to the recess.

The military must know how much money it will have to meet critical operational and modernization requirements at the beginning of the fiscal year, October 1.

Fiscal year 1999 represents the first budget cycle under the 5 year bipartisan budget agreement—the amount requested by the President corresponds to the cap agreed to for Defense.

That results in a fundamentally different dynamic for balancing this bill compared to fiscal years 1996, 1997 and 1998.

For the previous three fiscal years, Congress and the White House were at odds over the total level of funding for Defense. The budget submitted by the Pentagon failed to fully accommodate the readiness and modernization priorities of the Joint Chiefs.

For 1999, the committee received a budget proposal consistent with the bipartisan budget agreement—not enough for Defense, but at the level agreed to last summer at the summit.

The content of that budget reflected the priorities and strategy of the Quadrennial Defense Review, submitted by Secretary Cohen and Gen. Joe Ralston last spring. The FY 1999 budget kept faith with the concepts and priorities advocated in the QDR.

I want to begin by commending Secretary Cohen and Deputy Secretary John Hamre for their efforts to present a budget that did not require a major overhaul by Congress.

We do not agree on every item, and fact of life events resulted in adjustments on many programs, but essentially, this budget request meets the minimum needs of the Armed Forces.

The recommendations from the committee focus on three goals: ensure an adequate quality of life for the men and women of the Armed Forces; sustain readiness; and modernize to assure future battlefield dominance by our Armed Forces, if needed.

To achieve needed quality of life for our troops, and their families, this bill fully funds the 3.1 percent authorized military pay raise.

During consideration of the DOD authorization bill in June, I joined the managers of that bill in co-sponsoring an amendment to increase the pay raise to 3.6 percent for 1999.

The first amendment that Senator INOUE and I will jointly offer to this bill will provide the additional appropriation for the 3.6 percent raise.

Additionally, the Treasury-General Government bill that we will pass later today provides a comparable pay raise for civilian Pentagon workers. Those amounts are funded from within the general operation and maintenance appropriations.

The pay raise solves only a part of the compensation crisis facing the Department of Defense.

My discussions with the service chiefs, the service secretaries, field commanders and the men and women of the Armed Forces, serving in my State of Alaska and around the world, lead me to conclude that an equally pressing challenge is retirement pay.

The changes adopted by Congress in 1986 reflected the cold war priority of attracting men and women to serve a full 30 year career in the Armed Forces.

Our victory in the cold war led to a wrenching realignment of the force, and radical new personnel priorities.

There is great pressure today for individuals to spend only 20 years in active service. The revised retirement plan puts them at an unfair, and unacceptable disadvantage, as compared to serving a full 30 years.

It is my intention to work with the leaders here in Congress, and with the Secretary of Defense, to put us on a track to fix the retirement system—in my mind, there is no higher defense funding priority, for it has led to a series of decisions by men and women in the services, not to continue because of their feeling about the unfairness of the retirement policies.

The considerable operational demands on our Armed Forces dictate that we also ensure the welfare and quality of life for those on active duty now.

Based on the committee's recent trip to Bosnia and Southwest Asia, a new \$50 million MWR and retention initiative is included in this bill.

These funds will provide added resources and flexibility to address the tough living conditions and family separation challenges of deployments to Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

More than \$100 million is added for quality of life enhancements in the service O&M accounts, to upgrade barracks, dormitories, and other personnel support facilities.

Our second focus, maintaining readiness, has been stressed by overseas deployments during the past three years.

For 1998, this committee succeeded in providing needed contingency funds as an emergency, without disrupting other Defense programs.

For 1999, the recommendation adds funds for flying hours, depot maintenance, training, and base operations.

We recommend savings resulting from changed economic factors, such as fuel costs, foreign currency, and inflation—but restore all those amounts to the O&M appropriations.

There is no option to trade near term readiness for future modernization. As long as our Armed Forces face the range of missions overseas underway today, we must sustain the O&M accounts at least at the levels provided in this bill, and the House bill.

No sector of Defense has suffered more the past few years than acquisition. We must invest more to protect the technological superiority that our smaller military force counts on.

These recommendations fully fund the combat priorities advocated by the Joint Chiefs: F-22, the Crusader, F-18, new attack submarine, the JASSM missile, V-22, and national missile defense.

In many instances, the recommendations add funds for technology development programs, to look even further down the road, past the systems we will deploy over the next ten years—out for the next thirty years.

Achieving these three priorities was especially challenging given our fixed budget caps.

Every dollar shifted among programs came from a reduction to an item in the budget request—there were no additional dollars to spend this year for Defense.

Senator INOUE and I sought to allocate the resources available to the subcommittee as equitably as possible, and consistent with the military needs identified by the Chiefs.

In most cases, we could not provide large increases in existing procurement programs, or to restore programs already terminated.

No member of this committee, or the Senate, secured every priority which he or she advocated to the committee. On the other hand, we reviewed all of them, and have done our best.

I believe the recommendations are fair and achieve a balance between the budget and the priorities of Congress. It is my intention to do everything we can to work with all of our colleagues to meet the needs they have brought to the Committee.

Finally, there is one notable change from the bill reported last year by this Committee—in the area of medical research.

In the bill we reported last year, we provided \$176 million for medical research. Coming out of conference, that total grew to \$344 million, almost twice the level of the Senate.

In the context of adding \$6 billion to the budget, that total was manageable.

Let me explain that again. Last year, we had an additional \$6 billion by the time we came out of the conference,

and it was possible to increase that amount. This year, we have no top line margin to allocate. Whatever is added to this bill will come out of either readiness, or future acquisition, or the quality of life concepts that I have discussed.

For 1999, Senator INOUE and I recommended a new appropriations of \$250 million in the defense health program for medical research grants.

This increase over last year's appropriation provides adequate resources to sustain growth in the breast cancer and prostate cancer programs, while enabling the Department of review other research programs and opportunities. The report lists all the programs seeking funding this year.

The bill establishes a floor for breast cancer and prostate cancer research at the minimum; at least they must be provided at the level that we finally agreed to in conference in 1998.

The bill also seeks to address the funding priorities of the National Guard. In testimony before the subcommittee, the Army Guard identified as shortfall for 1999 \$634 million for their operational requirements—not for future involvement for just their operational requirements.

The bill reported by the committee provides an additional \$20 million for the Guard counterdrug operation, \$225 million for the Army Guard O&M account, and \$95 million for Army Guard personnel account.

A total of \$475 million will be added to the National Guard and Reserve equipment. That is a cut, however, of 25 percent from the level appropriated in 1998.

Finally, the bill reported by the committee did not include the \$1.9 billion requested by the President as emergency spending for Bosnia.

The Senate considered several amendments during debate on the defense authorization bill concerning our future force levels and operations in Bosnia.

Later this morning, I know Senator HUTCHISON, Senator BYRD, and others will raise at least one amendment related to our presence in Bosnia.

At the time we considered this bill in the Appropriations Committee, it was premature for this committee to consider funding for that mission for 1999.

Based on our visit to Bosnia in May, and to NATO headquarters after that, it is clear that a long-term presence in Bosnia is envisioned by NATO and the administration.

That long-term role cannot in the future be funded on an annual emergency basis. The Congress must be part of the decision on the size of the force, the duration of the mission, and the cost of the operations.

Mr. President, we bring this bill to the Senate with the hope of commencing the August recess tomorrow.

Securing passage of this bill at a reasonable hour will require the cooperation, consideration, and assistance of every Senator.

It is my hope that we will obtain early today an agreement to have all amendments filed at the desk so we can most efficiently dispose of those amendments—accepting some, debating some, and encouraging Members not to raise others.

This bill has been available to all Members since June 5. The bill closely approximates the level authorized in the defense bill we passed last June.

That authorization bill is in conference with the House, and we have continued to work closely with Senator THURMOND, Senator LEVIN, and others on that committee to support the priorities passed by the Senate in that bill.

Mr. President, the presentation of this bill to the Senate would not be possible without the leadership and partnership that I have enjoyed with my friend from Hawaii, Senator INOUE.

This is the tenth year that the two of us have come to the Senate jointly to present and recommend the defense appropriations bills. Six of those years Senator INOUE served as chairman, and I have enjoyed that privilege for the past four.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to work with the Senator from Hawaii on defense matters and other matters. I enjoy our personal friendship. And the opportunity to bring this bill to the Senate on a full bipartisan basis is one that I think comes from the tie between us that we enjoy.

Mr. President, I yield to Senator INOUE for his statement.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, may I first thank my dear colleague from Alaska for his very generous remarks. It has been a pleasure to work with him for the past 10 years. We hope that together we have been able to present to the U.S. Senate a bipartisan approach to this very important subject.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in strong support of the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999, S. 2132, as reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

This bill contains funding for the Department of Defense for the upcoming year, excluding amounts for military construction.

The total recommended is \$250.5 billion. This is about \$840 million less than was requested by the administration, but about \$2.8 billion more than funded for fiscal year 1998.

Within these amounts, the committee has recommended full funding to support our men and women in uniform.

This includes a 3.1-percent pay raise as requested by the President. Later

today, the chairman will offer an amendment to increase that to 3.6 percent, the amount authorized by the Senate last month. I strongly support this amendment.

Also at the chairman's initiative, the committee is recommending \$50 million to initiate a new fund for morale, welfare, and recreation.

This new appropriation account will support the personnel support needs of our men and women serving on contingency deployments in Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

Last May, Senator STEVENS led a delegation of members from the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees to Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

It was apparent in our discussions with these units that the deployments for these contingencies were beginning to impair the retention of critically skilled individuals and that morale was starting to suffer.

The delegation unanimously concluded that we needed to do more to support our troops serving in these areas.

The chairman's initiative will help ease the burden of these long overseas deployments and show our men and women in uniform that the Congress has not forgotten them.

Mr. President, this is a very good bill, which meets the national security needs of our Nation, but within the fiscal constraints that have been agreed upon in this balanced budget environment.

I should point out to my colleagues that this bill does not provide any funding for Bosnia.

The President submitted a budget amendment to the Congress requesting an appropriation of \$1.29 billion in emergency funding to maintain our troops in Bosnia.

When the committee marked up this bill, it was unclear what action the Senate would take on Bosnia.

It is my hope that this matter will be resolved in conference or through a supplemental spending measure at a later date.

Let me assure my colleagues that the committee will not shirk from our responsibility to support funding for our forces assigned overseas, no matter where they are located. This matter will be addressed at a later date.

Mr. President, I want to close by commending our chairman and his staff for the fine work that they have done in putting this bill together. As many of you recognize, this is a huge bill. Nearly half of our Government's discretionary resources are contained in this one appropriations bill.

There are an enormous number of programs that must be reviewed and recommended by the chairman and his staff before this measure can be reported to the Senate. That task is made more difficult by the thousands of requests for billions of dollars that are made by the Members of this body.

I want to salute the majority staff which really has done yeoman's work in putting this bill together for the Senate. It is a small staff, many have been with the Appropriations Committee for several years. They transcend the political divisions that sometimes divide this Senate. The staff is led by Steve Cortese who has been by the chairman's side for the past decade and it includes, Sid Ashworth, Tom Hawkins, Susan Hogan, Mary Marshall, Mazie Mattson, Gary Reese, John Young, Justin Weddle, and on assignment as a legislative fellow, Ms. Carolyn Willis.

Mr. President, the Senate owes them a deep debt of gratitude.

Under Chairman STEVENS' leadership, the resulting bill is a well-balanced product, crafted in a completely bipartisan fashion. It meets the needs of the military services and also fully considers the priorities of the Senate and the American taxpayers.

This is a good bill. I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Before ending my presentation, I would like to reflect upon a few things that have just come across my mind in the past few minutes.

Chairman STEVENS and I are what some of us call dinosaurs of the Senate. Admittedly, we are chronologically a bit old. Both of us served in World War II, the ancient war. I would like my colleagues to recall that in that war 16 million men and women served—16 million. Today, we are calling upon less than 1 percent of our Nation's population—one-half of 1 percent—to stand in harm's way for us, to risk their lives for us. Some have suggested that this is too much spending. As far as I am concerned, if any person is willing to stand in harm's way in my behalf, he or she gets the best.

There are many programs that have been carried out at the chairman's initiative that he is too humble to even mention. He has been in the forefront of medical research, and I am proud to say that, working with him, we have been able to come up with a breast cancer program that is being acclaimed worldwide—not just nationally. Scientists from all over the world come to work with the Army Research Center. It may not be evident to many of my colleagues, but some of the best research being done on AIDS is being done by the U.S. Army. The same can be said for prostate cancer and other tropical diseases.

I began my closing remarks by saying there were 16 million American men and women who served with us in World War II. It was at a time when our population was about 100 million. Today, our population is over 250 million, and we are asking 1.3 million to defend all of us.

I concur with my chairman: This is the minimum, this meets the minimum needs of our military. If budgetary constraints were not placed upon us, I am

certain we would come forth with something a bit more generous. After all, Mr. President, you and I want our children and our grandchildren to go to college, we want to be able to have a car in the garage, three meals a day. That is part of the American way of life. I believe that men and women in the service should also aspire to the American way of life, and I am sorry to say that this measure may not provide all that is necessary, but we are striving for the best.

I ask my colleagues to support this measure.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I reciprocate in thanking my good friend for his comments. It is interesting when we reflect back on World War II. We as a nation knew who we were, what we were doing, and we had unanimous support for what we were doing. Today, each of us faces comments from time to time about our commitment to defense and questions of whether we could not cut this budget. If anything, we should have a great deal more money. I shall speak to the Senate later about that during the consideration of this bill.

Let me point out to Members of the Senate that we have knowledge of 46 amendments on this bill. We have reviewed them with our staff and with the staff of those who will present those amendments, and 23 of them we are prepared to accept. Of the balance, 13 of them we have not seen. It would be very helpful if Members will bring their amendments to us so that we can look at them and determine whether or not we can work with the person who wishes to present the amendment and accept it or modify it in a way that it becomes acceptable. I expect we will have some substantial votes today and into the night. But it will be much easier for all of us if we can see these amendments and we can try to find some way to accommodate the needs of the Senate and the demand of our defense spending with the individual desires of Members of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 3391

(Purpose: To provide a 3.6 percent pay raise for military personnel during Fiscal Year 1999)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I mentioned in my statement that we have a 3.1 percent pay raise in this bill. I want to send to the desk, and do send to the desk, an amendment. It is sponsored by myself and my friend from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself and Mr. INOUE, proposes an amendment numbered 3391.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, in between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104(a) On page 34, line 24, strike out all after "\$94,500,000" down to and including "1999" on page 35, line 7.

(b) On page 42, line 1, strike out the amount "\$2,000,000,000", and insert the amount "\$1,775,000,000".

(c) In addition to funds provided under title I of this Act, the following amounts are hereby appropriated: for "Military Personnel Army", \$58,000,000; for "Military Personnel Navy", \$43,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$14,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$44,000,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$5,377,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Navy", \$3,684,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", \$1,103,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", \$1,000,000; for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$9,392,000; and for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$4,112,000".

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount available in this Act for "Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense", real property maintenance is hereby decreased by reducing the total amounts appropriated in the following accounts: "Operation and Maintenance, Army", by \$58,000,000; "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", by \$43,000,000; "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", by \$14,000,000; and "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", by \$44,000,000.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading "National Guard and Reserve Equipment", is hereby reduced by \$24,668,000.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment will raise the military pay to 3.6 percent. This pay raise will add \$185 million to the Active Forces, Guard, and Reserve pay accounts. Over the last year, our committee has heard repeatedly in both hearings with the service chiefs and during field visits to Bosnia, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Alaska, and other places throughout the world that our military members perceive an erosion of existing benefits. This adjustment in pay matches the private sector wage growth at a time when many service members are questioning the value of continued service due to an increasing pace of deployments.

Some economists estimate that the pay gap between the private sector and the military may be as high as 13.5 percent. This amendment will, at a minimum, provide a fairer base for military pay raises in the future.

I ask if my friend has any comments to make in regard to this amendment. He is a cosponsor.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, my only comment is that I wish we could have provided much more than this.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for adoption of the amendment. That is consistent with the authorization bill, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The amendment (No. 3391) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3392

(Purpose: To provide additional funds for U.S. military operations in Bosnia as an emergency requirement)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have tried to be consistent with the authorization bill. As this bill came out of committee, the authorization bill did not meet the contingency operations in Bosnia as requested by the President. I send to the desk an amendment and state to the Senate that, if it is adopted, it will conform the handling of the moneys in this bill for Bosnia with the authorization bill as it has been amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 3392.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. . For an additional amount for "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund," \$1,858,600,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, the defense health program appropriations and working capital funds: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Mr. STEVENS. This does conform, as I indicated, with the decision of the defense authorization committee for the handling of the Bosnia money.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am pleased to concur with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further discussion, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3392) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Nancy Gilmore-Lee, a fellow assigned to my staff, be provided floor privileges during consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that James Bynum, a Capitol Hill fellow serving on Senator McCain's staff, be granted privileges of the floor during debate and any votes concerning this bill, as well as any related amendments.

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

Mr. STEVENS. My previous request and Senator INOUE's request applied to time during votes, Mr. President.

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

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3393

(Purpose: To impose a limitation on deployments of United States forces to Yugoslavia, Albania, or Macedonia)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] proposes an amendment numbered 3393.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be obligated or expended for any deployment of forces of the Armed Forces of the United States to Yugoslavia, Albania, or Macedonia unless and until the President, after consultation with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and the Minority Leader of the Senate, transmits to Congress a report on the deployment that includes the following:

(1) The President's certification that the presence of those forces in each country to which the forces are to be deployed is necessary in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The reasons why the deployment is in the national security interests of the United States.

(3) The number of United States military personnel to be deployed to each country.

(4) The mission and objectives of forces to be deployed.

(5) The expected schedule for accomplishing the objectives of the deployment.

(6) The exit strategy for United States forces engaged in the deployment.

(7) The costs associated with the deployment and the funding sources for paying those costs.

(8) The anticipated effects of the deployment on the morale, retention, and effectiveness of United States forces.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to a deployment of forces—

(1) in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 795; or

(2) under circumstances determined by the President to be an emergency necessitating immediate deployment of the forces.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, the United States and the rest of the Western European countries are on the verge of a very deep and expensive and very dangerous involvement in yet another area of the Balkans, the Serbian province of Kosovo. Unfortunately, and once again, it seems to me the administration has yet to explain to the Congress or to the American people why it is in our vital—again, I emphasize the word "vital"—national interest to get in the middle of this growing conflict.

Let me make it clear I think a case can be made that, under certain circumstances, it is in the U.S. national interest to get involved in the conflict in Kosovo. But in my view, it is the responsibility of the President of the United States and the administration, i.e., the national security team, to explain to the American public and the U.S. Congress why such an involvement is in our vital national interest before our troops are committed.

The reports on CNN are clear that the Yugoslavian leader, Mr. Milosevic, is taking hard and very brutal action against the ethnic Albanians who are living—and, by the way, they comprise, Mr. President, 90 percent of the total population—in Kosovo. Certainly, this should be of no surprise since this is the same kind of activity that he directed in the breakup of Bosnia.

Our diplomatic efforts are active, but they keep changing in purpose and intent. The all too frequent U.S. diplomatic technique has been employed. Several lines in the sand have been drawn, with threats of severe reprisals if the Serbian action against the Albanian population does not cease, but, regrettably, nothing positive to date has come from our diplomatic initiatives or threats. So these lines in the sand are crossed and the fighting has intensified, resulting in increased human suffering.

The Albanian rebels, known as the KLA, are growing in strength and the fighting grows more fierce, with no peaceful solution in sight. The United States and NATO have threatened military action, and they gave a military demonstration consisting of a determined flight involving a considerable amount of aircraft. They called it "Determined Falcon." I am not sure how determined the falcon was. At any rate, neither side has offered to end the conflict. In fact, the KLA is actually buoyed by the apparent Western support for their cause, and therefore they are not interested in backing off now. Mr. Milosevic, having observed our un-

willingness to carry out our threats when he crossed the lines in the sand, and coupled with the strong support of the Serbian people to put an end to the rebel uprising in Kosovo, has no reason to back off either.

We have now started an international monitoring program, Mr. President, in Kosovo. It is "aimed at bringing peace to this strife-torn region." I don't know of any Senator or anybody or any observer who would object to that. But it is not entirely clear what these observers will accomplish other than to report on the obvious, and that is, there is a small war in Kosovo and we have been unable to influence its cessation.

This observer group is comprised of about 40 diplomats and "military experts" attached to the embassies in Belgrade. Our "military experts" are unarmed U.S. military forces from the European Command, and they are specifically trained for this mission.

Here are my concerns: In Kosovo, we are, once again, backing into a military commitment, just as we did in Bosnia—and I hate to use this example but I think it is applicable—and in Vietnam. The term of "unarmed military observers" or "experts" brings back some pretty sad memories of other wars that we have backed into. We are running a great risk that our military experts or diplomats could be in harm's way. As a matter of fact, in terms of hearings yesterday in the Intelligence Committee, we were talking about the priorities in regard to intelligence assets in certain countries, and force protection, obviously, plays a big role in that. So if we have our intelligence assets certainly supporting our troops in that part of the world, it gives real evidence that this is the case.

NATO is conducting contingency planning that could involve thousands of military troops to separate the warring factions or impose peace—it has been estimated anywhere from 7,000 to 25,000 troops, even more.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, at a briefing when the Secretary of State briefed a bipartisan group of Senators on what was happening in regard to India and Pakistan, actually warned the Secretary of State and said we do not have the personnel, we do not have the means, we do not have the materiel to commit those kinds of troops, that kind of involvement with regard to Kosovo, without emergency funding, without certainly stepping up our support, both in terms of funds and in terms of troops.

The costs of involvement in Kosovo, both in dollars and the impact on an already-stressed military, are potentially devastating. The chairman indicated that in his discussion with the national security team and with the administration.

There are many unanswered questions of how this conflict in Kosovo is in our vital national interest. I think a good case can be made for our involvement in Kosovo. I just came back with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee from taking a look at the three new NATO countries, what our intelligence assets are there and what the situation is there. Every official there, every foreign minister, every president indicated that Kosovo was in the interest of NATO and peace in Europe. But there are some very serious unanswered questions, and there are unexplained scenarios of the conflict in Kosovo leading to a larger war in Europe if this war is not ended now.

But my primary concern is that this whole business has yet to be addressed by the administration or, for that matter, to some degree, the Congress in any substantive way. He cannot, nor will Congress let him, commit the men and women of our Armed Forces without defining our national interests, the objectives, and the exit strategy for any involvement in Kosovo.

In the military, Mr. President, there is a term called a warning order, which is sort of a heads-up that some action is coming your way and, as the commander, you should start planning on how you would handle that action.

The amendment I offer today, which is consistent with the amendment that was accepted on a bipartisan basis during the last defense appropriations bill in regard to Bosnia, is a kind of a "warning order." The intent is to let the administration know that before they decide to deploy the military to the region as a result of the conflict in Kosovo, we need to address some salient points before Congress will fund the deployment. It is that simple.

The Congress and, more importantly, the American people need to understand at least the following information, and information required by the amendment. They are as follows:

No. 1, certification that such a deployment is necessary in the national interests of the United States;

No. 2, to explain the reasons why the deployment is in the national security interests of the United States;

No. 3, to define the number of U.S. military forces to be deployed to each country;

No. 4, to explain the mission and the objectives of the forces to be deployed;

No. 5, to discuss the expected schedule for accomplishing the objectives of the deployment;

No. 6, what is the exit strategy for U.S. forces engaged in deployment, if that is possible;

No. 7, what are the expected costs associated with the deployment and the funding source for paying these costs.

I am going to terminate my remarks very quickly, because I know the time schedule here. Let me point out that

when Ambassador Gelbard and General Wesley Clark appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee and reported again on Bosnia and again said that the mission had changed and again said that the objective or the end game could not be defined, I pointed out that it could be in our national interest that we are in Bosnia and that while it was ill-defined, while the mission was changed, my main complaint—and I think one of the complaints shared by the distinguished chairman—is that the administration didn't fund it and the money is coming out of readiness and procurement and modernization, and that has to stop.

What are the expected costs associated with the deployment and the funding source?

What are the anticipated effects of the deployment on the morale, retention, and effectiveness of U.S. forces?

I think, Mr. President, that Bosnia is the perfect example of why such a "warning order" is necessary. We have expended over \$10 billion in Bosnia.

We have yet to answer most of the questions contained in this amendment: Why is it in our national interest to continue to be there? How many troops do we need? How and when do we get out? And how are we going to pay for it?

I am a strong believer, Mr. President, that once the U.S. flag—the U.S. credibility—is "planted," that we must support the U.S. position rather than embarrass or put our troops at risk. My intent is simply to go on record now before we get involved in yet another entanglement in yet another region of the Balkans—before the flag is planted and the troops are deployed.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I commend Senator ROBERTS. He is following the path that he followed last year. The Senate adopted his amendment that he presented last year, which has had a salutary effect on the considerations involved in Bosnia. And we will soon have announced the basic reduction in forces in Bosnia, brought about in many ways because of the study that Senator ROBERTS' amendment last year mandated.

I have reviewed this with my friend from Hawaii. And I note that he has put in even another provision this year that recognizes that there might be an emergency that would be such where the President would not have time to prepare the report that is listed. I think that is very wise to offer that flexibility to the administration.

I am prepared to accept this amendment. I ask the Senator from Hawaii what his views would be concerning Senator ROBERTS' amendment?

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I join my chairman in commending our dear friend. Once again, he has taken the

initiative and leadership in this important area. Thank you very much.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3393) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. It is my understanding that the Senator from Washington wishes to speak on a subject that is not related to the bill. I am pleased to afford my good southern friend that opportunity. I ask him, how much time does he wish?

Mr. GORTON. Ten minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have 10 minutes for a statement as in morning business.

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Alaska for the use of this time, and I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Texas, who is here with an important amendment, in granting me this time.

THE PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we have heard a large number of words and speeches on this floor, of course, in the last 2 or 3 months on the plight of the American farmer. Many called for a return to the policies of yesteryear. I am here this morning in contrast to talk about 10 impediments or evidences of indifference on the part of this administration to the farmers and the agricultural communities of the State of Washington, the Pacific Northwest, and all of America which can be solved simply by the administration's willingness to care about those Americans who produce our food and fibers.

So in the classic way that we give lists of 10, I will start, Mr. President, with number 10, the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Program. A bloated attempt begun 4 years ago, to have lasted 1 year would cost \$5 million, which is now approaching \$40 million in 4 years, and has antagonized all of the private interests in the Interior Columbia Basin, all of the Members of Congress who represent any part of that basin, but the continuance of which is demanded by the President as the price of signing an appropriations bill for the Department of Interior.

I held a field hearing on this subject in Spokane, WA, with unanimous or near unanimous opposition to the program as it is being conducted at the present time. Both the bill that I am in

charge of managing and the bill that has already passed the House of Representatives dramatically changes and minimizes that program.

At the behest of this administration, however, a Seattle Congressman put up an amendment to restore the program to its present pristine size. Every Member of the House of Representatives representing any part of the Columbia Basin voted against that amendment, and yet the administration continues to demand it, with all of the interference of private agriculture that it entails.

No. 9, the Department of Agriculture budget—welfare over farmers. Two-thirds of the Department of Agriculture's budget is earmarked for food and for welfare programs. The essential research conservation and on-the-ground farmer programs get lost in the shuffle. Only when there is a crisis does the Secretary of Agriculture pay any attention to them.

For 3 consecutive years, the administration's request for farmer programs have decreased while the amount requested for food and nutrition programs has increased. No one disputes the importance of those food and nutrition programs, but we cannot very well feed America without providing the funding and infrastructure necessary to enhance the production of the most healthy, abundant, safe and inexpensive crops in the world.

No. 8, Columbia-Snake River dams. The President's Council on Environmental Policy of the Department of the Interior had made it quite clear that major dam removal is very high on their agenda of courses of action for the Columbia and Snake Rivers. The Columbia Basin in eastern Washington, in eastern Oregon, and in Idaho, was literally a dust bowl until the introduction of irrigation. Without it, those States would not lead the country in apples, hops, asparagus, and potato production.

The Columbia Basin is a cornucopia for the Nation's food supply. Dam drawdown or removal would shut down agriculture in the region. In addition, of course, those rivers provide the avenues of transportation to get those agricultural products to market, a transportation system that would be destroyed by dam removal.

No. 7, China trade policy—Washington wheat farmers seem not worth helping by this administration. For more than 20 years, China has refused to import Pacific Northwest wheat because of unfounded, nonscientific phytosanitary reasons. They call it "TCK smut." TCK smut has never been detected in Washington wheat. It does exist, however, in the fields of our wheat-growing counterparts—Canada, France and Germany; but China imports from all three.

The administration seeks a new set of trade relations with China. The

President went to China. The President, in order to keep peace with China, did not so much as mention these trade barriers, ignoring the plight of our wheat farmers in the Pacific Northwest. His first priority should be to get that barrier lifted.

No. 6, repeated efforts to eliminate agricultural research. For the past 2 years, the administration has recommended zeroing out all of the national regionally based agriculture research programs. These programs conduct research necessary to all food-producing regions of the country. The administration's insistence on nationalizing these programs is ludicrous. Obviously, cotton research cannot and should not be conducted in eastern Washington; and red delicious apple research is not conducted in Mississippi. These regional programs have bolstered our already strained land grant education university programs. They are absolutely essential, and yet the administration would wipe them out.

No. 5, no movement on fast-track trade negotiating authority. Fast track is essential to establishing trade relations with Chile. Currently, the United States exports face an 11-percent tariff in that country, giving our competitors an 11-percent advantage. Yet, because of objections from members of his own party, the President has abandoned the cause of fast-track trade authority.

No. 4, the agricultural labor shortage—not our problem. The administration does not seem to believe that there is an agriculture labor shortage and is opposed to the Guest Worker Program to address this issue that has already passed the Senate of the United States. In the face of that fact, the General Accounting Office estimates that over one-third of our Nation's migrant workforce is illegal. By doing nothing, the Clinton administration is making lawbreakers out of law-abiding agriculture employers and proposes to do nothing about it.

No. 3, sanctions against Pakistan. Sanctions are killing our agriculture industries. With more than 40 percent of the world's population under U.S. sanctions, the American farmer is locked out of many markets. The President instantly imposed sanctions on Pakistan as a result of its nuclear tests, and only as a result of action by Congress have those sanctions or the effect of those sanctions been at least partially removed with respect to Pakistan.

No. 2, the Endangered Species Act and private property rights. The Endangered Species Act impacts eastern Washington farmers and many others more than any other environmental regulation, and yet the administration, rather than assist in reasonable amendments to the Endangered Species Act, insists on ever more rigid enforcement and ever more interference

with the ability of our farmers to grow the food and fiber that the Nation needs.

No. 1, AL GORE. President Clinton has officially tagged the Vice President as the administration's environmental leader. He is the promulgator of most of the policies that I have already discussed and has constructed environmental roadblocks and headaches for farmers from Washington State all across the United States to Florida.

No one knows the land better than America's hard-working farm families. The District of Columbia, the administration, and AL GORE should not be dictating to America's farmers how to till, harvest, irrigate, employ, and manage their farms. AL GORE and his administration need to focus on foreign trade and agricultural research, not on locking up private property and over-regulating the family farm.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ed Fienga from my staff be allowed on the floor during the debate on the defense appropriations bill.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3397

(Purpose: To achieve the near full funding of the Army National Guard operation and maintenance account that the Senate provided for in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 (H. Con. Res. 28), as agreed to by the Senate, and to offset that increase by reducing the amount provided for procurement for the F/A-18E/F aircraft program to the amount provided by the House of Representatives in H.R. 4103, as passed by the House of Representatives)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] proposes an amendment numbered 3397.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 13, line 9, increase the amount by \$219,700,000.

On page 25, line 25, reduce the amount by \$219,700,000.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, my amendment would allow the National Guard to almost fully fund its operation and maintenance, or O&M account, for the coming fiscal year. This year's Defense Department budget request left the National Guard with a \$634 million budget shortfall, including a \$450 million shortfall in the Guard's O&M account. This request fell on the heels of a \$743 million shortfall for the current fiscal year. I think these shortfalls are wrongheaded and unacceptable.

Fortunately, both Houses of Congress have acted more responsibly in funding the National Guard. Even with the improvements from both Houses, though, the Senate appropriations bill we are currently considering leaves the Guard's operation and maintenance account \$225 million short. The House bill leaves an even greater gap of \$317 million. My amendment would add \$220 million to the National Guard's O&M account, leaving just a \$5 million shortfall to that account.

According to the National Guard, shortfalls in the operation and maintenance account compromise the Guard's readiness levels, capabilities, force structure, and end strength. Failing to fully support these vital areas will have a direct as well as indirect effect. The shortfall puts the Guard's personnel, schools, training, full-time support, and retention and recruitment at risk. Perhaps most importantly, however, I know firsthand that it is eroding the morale of our citizen-soldiers, as I have had the opportunity to visit some of the armories in Wisconsin and have heard this concern firsthand.

With that in mind, 26 State adjutants general—a majority of the adjutants general in this country—have contacted my office to voice their support for this amendment. The leaders of the National Guard units in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, and my own home State of Wisconsin support my amendment. I would like to thank them for their dedication and support, and I hope we decide to heed their call for support of the National Guard.

Mr. President, in spite of the National Guard's budget concerns, the administration continues to deliver insuffi-

cient budget requests given the National Guard's duties; yet, the administration increasingly calls on the Guard to handle some very wide-ranging tasks. These shortfalls have an increasingly greater effect given the National Guard's increased operations burden. This is as a result of new missions, increased deployments, and training requirements, including the missions in Bosnia, Iraq, Haiti, and Somalia.

As I am sure my colleagues know by now, the Army National Guard represents a full 34 percent of total Army forces, including 55 percent of combat divisions and brigades, 46 percent of combat support, and 25 percent of combat service support; yet, the Guard only receives 9.5 percent of Army funds.

To offer a comparison with the other Army components, the National Guard receives just 71 percent of requested funding, as opposed to the Active Army's 80 percent and Army Reserve's 81 percent. I think it is time we move toward giving the National Guard adequate and equal funding. This amendment almost achieves funding equity for the National Guard, and the National Guard is the Nation's only constitutionally mandated defense force.

Not only have we failed to invest fully in the National Guard, we have failed to invest fully in the best bargain in the Defense Department. That should not come as a surprise, however. DOD has never been known as a frugal or practical department—from \$436 hammers to \$640 toilet seats to \$2 billion bombers that don't work and the Department doesn't seem to want to use. The Department of Defense has a storied history of wasting our tax dollars. Here is an opportunity to spend defense dollars on something that actually works, that is worthwhile, and enjoys broad support on both sides of the aisle.

In this regard, the National Guard fits the bill. According to a National Guard study, the average cost to train and equip an active duty soldier is \$73,000 per year, while it costs only \$17,000 per year to train and equip a National Guard soldier. The cost of maintaining Army National Guard units is just 23 percent of the cost of maintaining active Army units. It is time for the Pentagon to quit complaining about lack of funding and begin using their money a little more wisely and efficiently.

Finally, my amendment doesn't terminate any program, nor does it create unsupported cuts to existing programs. This amendment merely follows the recommendation of the other Chamber.

Early this year, the House overwhelmingly supported DOD authorization and appropriations bills that provide \$2.6 billion to procure 27 Super Hornet aircraft. I think, and the General Accounting Office thinks, that is actually far too much money for a

plane that provides only marginal benefits over the current, reliable Hornet. But it is better than the \$2.8 billion for 30 Super Hornets that the bill contains. I think we should follow the prudent lead of our colleagues in the other body on this issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the House National Security Committee's report on its fiscal year 1999 DOD authorization bill, which specifically addresses the Super Hornet, be printed in the RECORD.

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

F/A-18E/F

The budget request contained \$2,787.8 million for 30 F/A-18E/F aircraft and \$109.4 million for advanced procurement of 36 aircraft in fiscal year 2000.

Based on the results of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), the committee notes that the Department has reduced the total procurement objective from 1,000 to 548 aircraft and has also reduced procurement in the future years defense program (FYDP) from 248 to 224. The committee notes that the Department plans to request increases of six aircraft per year for each of the next three fiscal years until its maximum production rate of 48 aircraft per year is attained in fiscal year 2002. However, for fiscal year 1999, the requested increase from fiscal year 1998 is 10 aircraft.

The committee is also aware that the Department has increased the number of low rate initial production (LRIP) aircraft in fiscal years 1997, 1998 and 1999 from 42, as approved in 1992 by the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB), to its current plan of 62 aircraft. The Department's Selected Acquisition Reports indicate that both its initial plan of 42 LRIP aircraft and its current plan of 62 LRIP aircraft were predicated on a procurement objective of 1,000 aircraft. The committee notes that were the Department to comply with the 10 percent LRIP guideline contained in section 2400 of title 10, United States Code, 55 LRIP aircraft should be sufficient.

During the past year, the committee has followed the Department's challenges in solving an uncommanded rolling motion problem that occurs at altitudes and angles of attack in that portion of the flight envelope where the F/A-18E/F performs air combat maneuvers. The Department's Director of Operational Test and Evaluation recently testified that the most promising solution to this problem—a porous wing fairing—causes unacceptable airframe buffeting and that the final solution to the problem may include other combinations of aerodynamic alterations to the wing surface. According to the Director, the root cause of the problem and modifications to the porous wing fairing are still being investigated, and the wing fairing configuration flown during developmental testing does not incorporate the production representative wing fold mechanism. Additionally, the Director stated that the Department would not have a complete understanding of the impact of the design fix, including uncertainty over air flow effects around the weapons pylons, until the conclusion of operational testing in 1999. Moreover, the Director also noted other concerns with the aircraft such as deficiencies in the performance of its survivability and radar jamming systems.

In light of the significantly higher increase in production proposed for fiscal year 1999, the apparent excess number of LRIP aircraft, and the development and testing issues yet to be fully resolved, the committee recommends a reduction of \$213.1 million and three aircraft. Of the total \$213.1 million reduction, initial spares is reduced by \$8.4 million. The committee believes that an increase of seven aircraft from the approved fiscal year 1998 level is appropriate and further believes that a total of 59 LRIP aircraft, approximately 11 percent of the total procurement objective, will meet requirements for operational testing and evaluation and will also be sufficient to meet both initial training requirements and the first operational deployment scheduled for fiscal year 2002.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to quote the chairman of the House Military Procurement Subcommittee, DUNCAN HUNTER. Speaking of the National Security Committee's Super Hornet procurement decision, Representative HUNTER said, "We think it's a rational, responsible reduction, a balanced reduction."

Mr. President, it is time we prioritized this Nation's defense needs. The National Guard provides a wide range of services, from combat in foreign lands to support in local weather emergencies, all at a fraction of the cost of the Active Army. The National Guard needs and deserves our full support. And it is for that reason that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I intend to move to table this amendment.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for presenting this amendment. I would have to speak against that.

It is true that the budget request submitted by the administration for the National Guard had a shortfall for O&M activities in the Guard in the amount of about \$770 million. On our chairman's initiative, we placed an amount of \$320 million to make up for part of the shortfall.

In addition to that, the administration had zero dollars for procurement of new equipment based upon the philosophy that if the regular services, the Regular Army, purchases equipment, some of the leftovers may go for the Guard. We did not concur with that. We appropriated \$500 million for the Guard to get new equipment.

Having said that, Mr. President, I believe it should be noted that every service, every component of every service, is faced with shortfalls. There is a shortfall in Navy O&M. They would like to have more steaming time. They want their ships to be out there for maneuvers. We can't do that. The Army Tank Corps would like to have more

petroleum and gasoline so that the men who drive these tanks may get more experience and be ready for combat, if such is necessary. Artillerymen would like to have more ammunition for firing range practice.

Mr. President, we have the sad chore of trying to balance all of the accounts and, at the same time, realizing that if this Nation is to continue being the superpower of this world and thereby deter any nation from any mischievous action, we have to provide funds to modernize. The accounts that may be affected by this amendment would stop the modernization program.

Mr. President, although I agree that the Guard should be receiving much more, I will have to concur with my chairman's action when he moves to table this.

Thank you.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have had a series of visits with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I particularly recall the discussion I had with Secretary of the Navy John Dalton and with Admiral Johnson. There is no question that the Navy representatives have informed our committee that full F/A-18E/F funding is the administration's top appropriations priority for defense and the Navy.

This amendment would take these funds from that priority, the F/A-18E/F, and move it to the National Guard.

We have added, as I stated this morning, \$95 million to augment the Guard and Reserve personnel accounts.

We have added for the Guard and Reserve operation and maintenance funds an additional \$225 million.

Finally, we added \$450 million to the Guard and Reserve procurement account.

I have to tell the Senator we have exceeded the requests in many instances. We added almost \$1 billion in the zero sum budget for the Guard and Reserve priorities.

Furthermore, the F/A-18E/F is just entering production. The Senator's amendment will seriously disrupt the production program, and substantially increase the unit cost, if the Senate approves this amendment. To me it does not make common sense to increase the cost of the F-18, the Navy's top priority planes which we must buy to meet the Navy's previously approved program requirements. We have helped the Guard and Reserve. I do not think we should punish the Navy in order to help them any more.

If the Senator wishes to make any comments, I yield to him for those comments.

I intend to make a motion to table his amendment. But before I do that, I ask unanimous consent that, on any votes that are laid aside in order to join the priority list that is already in

existence under the Guard and Reserve the common procedure of a minute on each side be the procedure for this bill: That there be 2 minutes equally divided on any vote that occurs on this bill on an amendment that is set aside for a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, let me first of all say that the two Senators who have spoken in opposition to this amendment are not only very sincere in their support of the National Guard but they have demonstrated in committee a serious concern about increasing funding. And their efforts have gone a long way to make sure that we have less of a shortfall than was originally occurring. That is encouraging. However, as was admitted by those opposed to this amendment, we still have a \$225 million shortfall in the O&M account at the National Guard. This is a serious shortfall.

I am not suggesting that we remove this funding from vital areas, but this is about priorities within the defense budget. I think it is a pretty easy call. Although I would prefer that we not move forward with the Super Hornet airplane, what I am suggesting here is not a dramatic reduction in those planes. I am simply suggesting we take what has already been passed in the House; that is, instead of having 30 of the Super Hornets, we procure 27—3 fewer. For three fewer of these planes, we could fully fund the National Guard O&M account.

This is not an attempt, as the Senator from Alaska, suggested, to seriously disrupt the production of the Super Hornet. Very candidly, Mr. President, I would prefer to do that, because the General Accounting Office has pointed out that the Super Hornet is not substantially better than the current plane. It is going to cost \$17 billion more than the current plane. That is a huge amount of money.

But that is not what this amendment does. All this amendment does is say let's adopt what the House did, which is have 27 Super Hornets instead of 30, and use the money that is saved to fully fund the National Guard, or virtually fully fund the National Guard O&M account.

Mr. President, these shortfalls for the National Guard are serious. I have had the opportunity to visit armories in Oak Creek, WI, and Appleton, WI, and spend a fair amount of time speaking to the officers and the guardsmen and guardswomen who are trying so hard to do the job that they are expected to do, constituting 34 percent of our entire Army's sources and resources. They are having morale problems. Otherwise, why would 26 adjutant

generals in this country write in support of this amendment? They are very concerned.

Mr. President, my amendment is simply about priorities. It is a modest reduction in the number of these Super Hornets that are going to be procured, and in return for something that is far more vital at this point. And that is fully funding the O&M account for the National Guard.

Mr. President, in light of the fact there will be a motion to table at some point, I strongly urge my colleagues to put these modest resources in the National Guard, which supports our Army and which exists in our communities in every one of our States, rather than three more airplanes that, frankly, have not been proven to be substantially better than the current plane that has done a good job in the Gulf war and other situations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if there is no further debate on this matter, I move to table the Senator's amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I now ask that that amendment be set aside.

Is the standing order that all of the votes we ask for the yeas and nays on prior to 2 o'clock will be automatically set aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3398

(Purpose: To limit the use of funds pending establishment of the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if it is in order, I would like to send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

Mr. KYL. And ask for its immediate consideration.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] proposes an amendment numbered 3398.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the establishment or operation of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency until the Secretary of Defense takes the following actions:

(1) Establishes within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy and designates that official to serve as the Director of the Defense Security Technology Agency with only the following duties:

(A) To develop for the Department of Defense policies and positions regarding the appropriate export control policies and procedures that are necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(B) To supervise activities of the Department of Defense relating to export controls.

(C) As the Director of the Defense Security Technology Agency—

(i) to administer the technology security program of the Department of Defense;

(ii) to review, under that program, international transfers of defense-related technology, goods, services, and munitions in order to determine whether such transfers are consistent with United States foreign policy and national security interests and to ensure that such international transfers comply with Department of Defense technology security policies;

(iii) to ensure (using automation and other computerized techniques to the maximum extent practicable) that the Department of Defense role in the processing of export license applications is carried out as expeditiously as is practicable consistent with the national security interests of the United States; and

(iv) to actively support intelligence and enforcement activities of the Federal Government to restrain the flow of defense-related technology, goods, services, and munitions to potential adversaries.

(2) Submits to Congress a written certification that—

(A) the Defense Security Technology Agency is to remain a Defense Agency independent of all other Defense Agencies of the Department of Defense and the military departments; and

(B) no funds are to be obligated or expended for integrating the Defense Security Technology Agency into another Defense Agency.

(b) The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy may report directly to the Secretary of Defense on the matters that are within the duties of the Deputy Under Secretary.

(c) Not later than 10 days after the Secretary of Defense establishes the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on National Security and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the establishment of the position. The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of any organizational changes that have been made or are to be made within the Department of Defense to satisfy the conditions set forth in subsection (a) and otherwise to implement this section.

(2) A description of the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the export control activities of the Department of Defense after the establishment of the position, together with a discussion of how that role

compares to the Chairman's role in those activities before the establishment of the position.

(d) Unless specifically authorized and appropriated for such purpose, funds may not be obligated to relocate any office or personnel of the Defense Technology Security Administration to any location that is more than five miles from the Pentagon Reservation (as defined in section 2674(f) of title 10, United States Code).

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I ask of the distinguished chairman whether this would be an appropriate time to discuss briefly the amendment or whether we should lay it aside and move to other business? What would be the chairman's pleasure?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I just delivered a copy of the Senator's amendment to the minority and other committees affected. He is at liberty to make such comments he wishes to make, but we will not be able to have final consideration of the matter until we have heard back from Senator INOUE and his people on his side of the aisle. The Governmental Affairs Committee is also considering this issue.

Mr. KYL. What I might do then, Mr. President, since we want to handle this in a way agreeable to the chairman, if there is no one else to present an amendment right now, rather than defer business, I will go ahead and describe the amendment but do it briefly and then, when the chairman is ready to proceed with other business, lay it aside and handle it in that fashion, if that is agreeable with the chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. Fine.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, in that event, let me first ask unanimous consent that two fellows from my office, John Rood and David Stephens, be granted floor privileges for the debate on this matter.

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

Mr. KYL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will describe this amendment briefly.

Frankly, this came out of the revelations concerning the alleged transfer of certain technology to the Chinese Government as a part of the process of launching American satellites on Chinese rockets, the so-called Loral-Hughes matter. But it really goes beyond that. It is a question of whether or not the Defense Department has in process an adequate way of reviewing the requests for export licensure and the conditions attached to those licenses to ensure that national security is not jeopardized.

That role has in the past been played by an agency of the Defense Department called the Defense Technology Security Agency. It goes by the name of DTSA for the people who understand it. The point of this memorandum is to ensure that DTSA will continue to have a prominent role in the evaluation of export licenses and the kinds of

conditions that would be attached to them.

In fact, we ensure as a result of this amendment that the role is prominent by restoring the position of the Deputy Under Secretary for Technology Security Policy within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, and thereby ensure, as I say, a prominent role for this agency. The Deputy Under Secretary would have access to both the Under Secretary of Policy and the Secretary of Defense himself.

This is important, Mr. President, for the following reasons:

No. 1, DTSA is the single agency in the Government reviewing the national security implications of an item for export;

No. 2, DTSA coordinates input from the services, military branches, the Joint Chiefs and the defense agencies;

No. 3, DTSA routinely supports the Department of State in its investigations of these matters;

No. 4, creating a Deputy Secretary of Technology Security will ensure that the Department of Defense is represented at a sufficiently high level at the interagency meetings that occur to discuss these export licenses.

And, finally, providing the Deputy Under Secretary with the authority to interact directly with the Secretary of Defense will enable the Deputy Secretary to bring items of immediate concern directly to the Secretary to discuss with the Secretary of Commerce and the President.

The Department of Defense is the only agency with the expertise, the personnel, and the ability to assess the impact of exports on the national security of the United States, and this ought to be our No. 1 concern. The Persian Gulf war demonstrated the value of the United States maintaining a technical edge on the battlefield. Maintaining that edge in the future is dependent upon keeping sensitive technologies out of the hands of potential adversaries.

Questions regarding the appropriate role of the Department of Defense in considering exports of dual-use items have obviously been of concern for a number of years. But, as I said, the alleged transfer technology to the Chinese Government has really elevated this concern to the point that there are those of us in Congress who want to ensure that the Department of Defense continues to have an important role here.

Early in the 1990s, Congress examined the problems with export control and how it was possible that American companies, with the knowledge of the Department of Commerce, could have contributed to the Iraqi arms buildup, as we know occurred. We learned, for example, that between 1985 and the imposition of the U.N. embargo on Iraq in August of 1990, the Department of Commerce approved for sale to Iraq 771 ex-

port licenses for dual-use goods. Some of these sales involved technologies that very probably helped the Iraqis develop ballistic missile, nuclear, and chemical weapons. In some cases, Commerce approved the sale over strong objections from Defense or without even consulting the Department of Defense at all.

In 1994, the Export Administration Act expired and in 1996 dissolved, leaving no overarching legal forum to guide the export control policies of the United States. Export controls were at that point directed by Executive order. And this resulted in relaxed control over national-security-related equipment and technologies. The GAO has documented potential problems with changes that occurred in 1996 and with the Department of Commerce retaining the primary responsibility for oversight of important national security equipment or technology.

Let me just give a couple of examples here. On September 14, 1994, the Department of Commerce approved an export of machine tools to China. The tools had been used in a plant in Ohio that produced aircraft and missiles for the U.S. military. Some of the more sophisticated machine tools were diverted to a Chinese facility engaged in military production, possibly cruise missile production.

Under current referral practices, the majority of applications for the export of categories related to stealth are not sent to the Department of Defense or the Department of State for review. Without such referrals, it cannot be ensured that export licenses for militarily significant stealth technology are properly reviewed and controlled.

A third example: Commercial jet engine hot section technology was transferred to the Department of Commerce in 1996. Defense officials are concerned about the diffusion of technology and the availability of hot section components that could negatively affect the combat advantage of our aircraft and pose a threat to U.S. national security concerns. So the Defense Department must have an active role and a strong position in advising the President about the national security implications of exporting these and other important dual-use technologies. In order to do this, the Secretary of Defense must have the best advice available. This amendment will ensure that Secretary Cohen and all subsequent Secretaries have that advice.

Mr. President, at the appropriate time I hope we can engage in further discussion of this to ensure that the national security of the United States is not impaired.

At this time, unless there is anyone else who would like to discuss it, I am happy to have the chairman or the ranking member move to other business.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask this amendment be set aside for later

consideration so we may have consultation with other committees and Members involved in this subject. We did not have this on our list and have not distributed it until just now. I ask unanimous consent it be put aside until other Members have a chance to review it.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3397

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we have had a brief debate. The manager of the bill, the chairman of the committee, has moved to table the Feingold amendment. I want to add my comments to the debate on that issue.

This is an amendment which I strongly oppose and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose it. This is part of a continuing campaign of harassment against the Navy's No. 1 program, the No. 1 program of the U.S. Navy. This campaign has had a long, and to date totally unsuccessful, history. We all know the problems in the court systems when individuals flood the courts with frivolous lawsuits. We, in providing procurement funds for the Navy, have had a string of what I consider to be less than good-faith, responsible amendments directed at this program.

The amendment before us purports to cut funds from a Navy procurement program and earmark them for the National Guard operations and maintenance fund. As a long-time and strong supporter of the National Guard, I recognize the limited funding the Guard has, and I have worked with my colleagues, the chairman and the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Committee, and the Senator from Kentucky, my cochairman of the National Guard caucus, to fund adequately the Guard component of the total force. But I do not believe that pitting one service against the other, raiding the Navy's No. 1 procurement program, is the way to fill that funding requirement. No, this amendment is not a step forward for good government. It has been proposed for no other reason than as a reckless assault on a program which has successfully cleared every production hurdle with room to spare.

I have been advised by Major General Edward Philbin, Executive Director of the National Guard Association of the U.S., that NGAUS is not supporting this program because, among other things, it would simply create problems between the National Guard and

the Navy. This, to me, is a very unfortunate step when, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, all services are facing shortfalls. We have to address the inadequacy in funding for the National Guard and all of the other services. But I can tell you that this amendment is totally uncalled for.

The F/A-18E/F is the Navy's No. 1 priority procurement program. If you ask the Secretary of the Navy or any of the fleet carrier strike-fighter aviators what will enable the Navy to be viable in the 21st century and beyond, they will tell you it is the Super Hornet. Yesterday the CNO was in my office with one of the fine young men who fly the F/A-18. They reemphasize this is their No. 1 program. They cannot afford to take cuts in the program such as proposed on the House side, or particularly as proposed in this amendment. I think it is a sad day when some Members, for reasons known to themselves, would wish to pit the National Guard against the Navy. I think it is irresponsible and could lead to services raiding each other's accounts to achieve an individual Senator's political goals.

In January of 1997, the Senator from Wisconsin led an effort to terminate the F/A-18E/F. He failed. Since then, he has continued what appears to be a vendetta against the program, and now his intent is slowly to drain the money from the aircraft by continuing a plan to reduce the number of aircraft and the funding available, to make a full-rate production decision nearly impossible.

When you talk with the people in the Navy who know what their needs are, who know what the future of naval aviation is, they will insist, and they will tell you that this is the airplane that they must have. If we want our men and women in naval aviation to carry out the missions we demand of them, then we have to provide them the modern, up-to-date, efficient aircraft, technologically superior, that the E/F F-18 gives us.

I remember full well several years ago when the distinguished ranking member of this committee, the Senator from Hawaii, said, "We don't ever want to send American fighting men and women into a battle evenly matched. We want to send them in with the technological superiority, the training, and the capability and resources to make sure they win."

Mr. President, that is what the 18E/F gives us. It gives us that technological superiority. It gives us the ability to make sure we have the best chance possible of bringing our naval aviators home safely, having accomplished their mission.

The F/A-18E/F has already been scrutinized in the Quadrennial Defense Review. It has been scrutinized by the National Defense Panel. It has undergone GAO study after GAO study. It has

been tested by pilots at the Patuxent River Naval Air Station and the Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake. It has accumulated 2,749 test flight hours, over 1,800 flights, and numerous aircraft carrier landings. It has never had a catastrophic failure. I wish other tactical air programs could meet these standards. It has test fired just about every weapon the Navy might need it to carry. It is on time, it is on budget, and it needs to get underway.

I ask my colleagues, if they have any question about the value of this plane, ask somebody who flies one. Ask somebody who has had the opportunity to fly it. Ask somebody who we are sending in harm's way, asking them to fly a fighter and attack aircraft off a carrier, ask them how important they think the F/A-18E/F is to their ability to carry out their mission and to come home safely. If you will ask the naval aviators, whose lives are on the line, I have no question what their response is going to be. I have heard it myself. Any of my colleagues who wish to contact somebody they know in naval aviation or in the Navy itself, I believe they will tell you it is the No. 1 priority.

Mr. President, this is simply a bad amendment, and I sincerely hope that my colleagues will vote overwhelmingly with the chairman of the committee and the ranking member to table this unwise amendment. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri states that my amendment is a "reckless assault" on the Navy's Super Hornet program. This could not be further from the truth.

My amendment to increase funding for the National Guard is simply that; an amendment to correct most of a dangerous shortfall in funding for the National Guard's operations and maintenance account. To raise as little controversy as possible in finding an offset to the funding increase, I chose a provision already agreed to by the other chamber. Not only did the House agree to funding procurement of 27 Super Hornets in FY99, the body authorized funding for the identical amount.

In speaking to the reduction, Chairman of the House Military Procurement subcommittee, DUNCAN HUNTER said, "We think it's a rational, responsible reduction, a balanced reduction." Does this mean Chairman HUNTER is recklessly assaulting the Super Hornet program? Is Chairman HUNTER diminishing the value of the Navy's aviation fleet? Is Chairman HUNTER questioning the value of the Super Hornet? I don't think Chairman HUNTER was, or ever will be, accused of any of those things. That's why, Mr. President, it boggles my mind why I now stand accused of all those things. It's a plain mischaracterization of my amendment.

This amendment is not about gutting the Super Hornet program. This

amendment is not about pitting one service against another. This amendment is not about diminishing the Navy's aviation fleet. This amendment does not question the value of the Super Hornet.

Mr. President, this amendment is about an adequate level of funding for the National Guard and priorities in our armed forces. This amendment is about giving priority to the National Guard's readiness levels, capabilities, force structure, and end strength. This amendment is about bringing the Guard's personnel, schools, training, full-time support, and retention and recruitment to adequate levels. This amendment, is about ending a slide in the morale of our citizen-soldiers.

Finally, my friend from Missouri states that the National Guard Association of the United States does not support this amendment. I'm sure he made his case very forcefully to them. I counter by saying that the association does not oppose this amendment either. In fact, a majority of State Adjutants General, 26 of them so far, have contacted my office to add their names in support for my amendment. I hope my colleagues will draw their own conclusions from that figure. Indeed, I urge my colleagues to contact their State Adjutant General and ask them for their opinion of my amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the National Guard, as I do. I urge my colleagues to vote against tabling my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3124

(Purpose: Relating to human rights in the People's Republic of China)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3124 which I filed previously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] proposes an amendment numbered 3124.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

TITLE IX HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

Subtitle A—Forced Abortions in China

SEC. 9001. This subtitle may be cited as the "Forced Abortion Condemnation Act".

SEC. 9002. Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Forced abortion was rightly denounced as a crime against humanity by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal.

(2) For over 15 years there have been frequent and credible reports of forced abortion and forced sterilization in connection with the population control policies of the People's Republic of China. These reports indicate the following:

(A) Although it is the stated position of the politburo of the Chinese Communist Party that forced abortion and forced sterilization have no role in the population control program, in fact the Communist Chinese Government encourages both forced abortion and forced sterilization through a combination of strictly enforced birth quotas and immunity for local population control officials who engage in coercion. Officials acknowledge that there have been instances of forced abortions and sterilization, and no evidence has been made available to suggest that the perpetrators have been punished.

(B) People's Republic of China population control officials, in cooperation with employers and works unit officials, routinely monitor women's menstrual cycles and subject women who conceive without government authorization to extreme psychological pressure, to harsh economic sanctions, including unpayable fines and loss of employment, and often to physical force.

(C) Official sanctions for giving birth to unauthorized children include fines in amounts several times larger than the per capita annual incomes of residents of the People's Republic of China. In Fujian, for example, the average fine is estimated to be twice a family's gross annual income. Families which cannot pay the fine may be subject to confiscation and destruction of their homes and personal property.

(D) Especially harsh punishments have been inflicted on those whose resistance is motivated by religion. For example, according to a 1995 Amnesty International report, the Catholic inhabitants of 2 villages in Hebei Province were subjected to population control under the slogan "better to have more graves than one more child". Enforcement measures included torture, sexual abuse, and the detention of resisters' relatives as hostages.

(E) Forced abortions in Communist China often have taken place in the very late stages of pregnancy.

(F) Since 1994 forced abortion and sterilization have been used in Communist China not only to regulate the number of children, but also to eliminate those who are regarded as defective in accordance with the official eugenic policy known as the "Natal and Health Care Law".

SEC. 9003. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 to issue any visa to any national of the People's Republic of China, including any official of the Communist Party or the Government of the People's Republic of China and its regional, local, and village authorities (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers) who the Secretary finds, based on credible information, has been involved in the establishment or enforcement of population control policies resulting in a woman being forced to undergo an abortion against her free choice, or resulting in a man or woman being forced to undergo sterilization against his or her free choice.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1999 to admit to the United States any national covered by subsection (a).

(c) The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) with respect to a national of the People's Republic of China if the President—

(1) determines that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to Congress containing a justification for the waiver.

Subtitle B—Freedom on Religion in China

SEC. 9011. (a) It is the sense of Congress that the President should make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of United States foreign policy with respect to China.

(b) As part of this policy, the Department of State should raise in every relevant bilateral and multilateral forum the issue of individuals imprisoned, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government on religious grounds.

(c) In its communications with the Chinese Government, the Department of State should provide specific names of individuals of concern and request a complete and timely response from the Chinese Government regarding the individuals' whereabouts and condition, the charges against them, and sentence imposed.

(d) The goal of these official communications should be the expeditious release of all religious prisoners in China and Tibet and the end of the Chinese Government's policy and practice of harassing and repressing religious believers.

SEC. 9012. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 for the United States Information Agency or the United States Agency for International Development may be used for the purpose of providing travel expenses and per diem for the participation in conferences, exchanges, programs, and activities of the following nationals of the People's Republic of China:

(1) The head or political secretary of any of the following Chinese Government-created or approved organizations:

(A) The Chinese Buddhist Association.

(B) The Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association.

(C) The National Congress of Catholic Representatives.

(D) The Chinese Catholic Bishops' Conference.

(E) The Chinese Protestant "Three Self" Patriotic Movement.

(F) The China Christian Council.

(G) The Chinese Taoist Association.

(H) The Chinese Islamic Association.

(2) Any military or civilian official or employee of the Government of the People's Republic of China who carried out or directed the carrying out of any of the following policies or practices:

(A) Formulating, drafting, or implementing repressive religious policies.

(B) Imprisoning, detaining, or harassing individuals on religious grounds.

(C) Promoting or participating in policies or practices which hinder religious activities or the free expression of religious beliefs.

(b)(1) Each Federal agency subject to the prohibition in subsection (a) shall certify in writing to the appropriate congressional committees, on a quarterly basis during fiscal year 1999, that it did not pay, either directly or through a contractor or grantee, for travel expenses or per diem of any national of the People's Republic of China described in subsection (a).

(2) Each certification under paragraph (1) shall be supported by the following information:

(A) The name of each employee of any agency of the Government of the People's Republic of China whose travel expenses or per diem were paid by funds of the reporting agency of the United States Government.

(B) The procedures employed by the reporting agency of the United States Government to ascertain whether each individual under subparagraph (A) did or did not participate in activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(C) The reporting agency's basis for concluding that each individual under subparagraph (A) did not participate in such activities.

SEC. 9013. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 to issue a visa to any national of the People's Republic of China described in section 9012(a)(2) (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers).

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1999 to admit to the United States any national covered by subsection (a).

(c) The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) with respect to an individual described in such subsection if the President—

(1) determines that it is vital to the national interest to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to the appropriate congressional committees containing a justification for the waiver.

SEC. 9014. In this subtitle, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I turn, I believe, to an issue of great, great importance to this body and to the Nation. In defending his policy before he left for China, President Clinton said:

We do not ignore the value of symbols, but in the end, if the choice is between making a symbolic point and making a real difference, I choose to make a difference.

I say to my colleagues, today we have a chance to make a difference. The President went on and said:

When it comes to advancing human rights and religious freedom, dealing directly, speaking honestly with the Chinese is clearly the best way to make a difference.

While in China, President Clinton was allowed to make some tempered remarks on human rights abuses in China, though, unfortunately, he was quick to equate them with problems in America. He came back from China hailing his trip as a success and praising President Jiang and saying—I quote again—"feeling the breeze of freedom."

Only a week after President Clinton's return from China, China demonstrated the impact of this rhetoric on their attitude and their policies by arresting 10 democracy advocates. There their crime was not rape. It was not theft. It was not burglary. It was not grand larceny. It was not fraud. Their crime was that they dared to start a democratic opposition party.

The Washington Post reported—it is obvious in the headline—on Sunday, July 12, on the front page, "Chinese Resume Arrests, 10 Detained a Week after Clinton Visit."

Fortunately, five of these activists were subsequently released. But when the supporters of democracy protested these arrests in an open letter to the Communist Government, it was no surprise the Chinese Government kindly responded by arresting yet another dissident, Xu Wenli.

According to the Associated Press, on July 24, 1998, the Chinese Government detained four more dissidents, bringing the known number of detained dissidents since the President returned from China to 21. Twenty-one dissidents have been detained since July 10, and three remain in custody at this moment.

On July 29, the Associated Press reported that the Chinese Government detained the democracy activist Wang Youcai for the second time this month. I will simply say, this is not the "breeze of freedom," but it is rather the draft of repression.

Some would like to argue that President Clinton's televised comments in China were a historic breakthrough in emboldening democracy activists throughout China. Unfortunately, the President's remarks were broadcast in the middle of the day when few Chinese were watching television. His remarks were not repeated on the evening news and were completely omitted from the next day's state-controlled newspapers. I remind my colleagues also that Chinese activists already had their momentum, and that momentum was of their own creation from the 1989 demonstrations at Tiananmen Square.

We see that President Clinton spoke directly to the Chinese people, at least some of them. We see the symbolic point that he made, but what we do not see is that there was any difference made in the policy of the Chinese Government. In fact, their response was one of impudence, one of, if you will, a reinforcement of their policy of repression, and I believe the arrests that the Washington Post and all the major media in our country spoke of within a week of the President's return is testimony to the failure of our policy of appeasement.

As this chart is on the floor of the Senate with that headline, "Chinese Resume Arrests," it stands as, I think, irrefutable evidence that the current policies failed to bring about the desired changes, the changes that we all desire in China.

They resumed arrests. A policy of appeasement has never worked, and it is not working today. Today, we, as a body, have the opportunity to move beyond rhetoric into real action with the amendment that I have offered.

The amendment is composed of two parts: one dealing with forced abortions and one dealing with religious persecution in China. This will have brought most of the House-passed measures last year—the Chinese freedom policy measures sponsored by my

good friend and colleague, CHRIS COX—this will have brought most of those now to a vote in the Senate. I am glad to say that my friend, SPENCE ABRAHAM, the Senator from Michigan, intends to offer the human rights monitors amendment later on this bill.

I am also glad that an amendment that I had filed dealing with satellite technology transfers and moving the authority for that waiver process back to the State Department and away from the Commerce Department is, as I speak, being worked out in the State Department authorization conference committee, and I trust and hope that it will be in that conference report when it is presented to the Senate later.

I want to provide my colleagues with some background on this amendment. As many of my colleagues will recall, in November of last year, a number of China-related bills were overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives. This is that package of bills sponsored by Congressman COX, a "policy for freedom," it was called. Since that time, most of these measures have languished in Senate committees without hearings, without movement and without consideration.

On the defense authorization bill, we adopted several of these House provisions that I offered at that time. However, the remainder of those were not passed because my efforts to offer them were thwarted by those who did not desire to have that debate on these China provisions before or during the President's trip to China. I simply say the President has returned. This is our opportunity now.

My amendment, which I am glad to say is bipartisan and that Senator WELLSTONE from Minnesota, who is on the floor—and I welcome his remarks in support of this—is cosponsoring this amendment, mirrors the language that passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives last November.

The provision on forced abortions—by the way, the Nuremberg Tribunal on War Crimes condemned forced abortions, rightfully, as being a crime against humanity. This is not a pro-life, pro-choice issue. Pro-choicers overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives voted for this provision because this is, in fact, a crime against humanity.

To compel and to force—to use coercion—take a woman in the seventh, eighth, ninth month of pregnancy and compel her, against her wishes, to have an abortion, that is a crime against humanity. That is why that provision in the House of Representatives passed by a vote of 415-1-415-1.

The second provision, the "free the clergy" portion, of the amendment passed the House of Representatives last November by a vote of 366-54.

Now, what does the amendment do? It condemns religious persecution and forced abortion in China. The amend-

ment would prohibit the use of American funds, appropriated to the Department of State, the USIA or AID, to pay for the travel of Communist officials involved in repressing worship or religious persecution.

So where there is credible evidence that these officials are engaged in these horrendous practices, they would be denied visa approval, they would be denied travel expenses, per diem by the American Government, by the American taxpayer. It would deny visas to officials engaged in religious persecution and forced abortion.

The amendment would force the Department of State to raise, in every bilateral and multilateral forum, the issues of individuals in prison, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government on religious grounds. It simply means that we are going to require our diplomats, when engaging in bilateral and multilateral discussions, to raise these important issues of religious persecution and forced abortions so that that discussion and our concern—the concern of the American people—is reflected by our diplomatic corps.

This amendment would make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of the United States foreign policy with respect to China.

And lastly, concerning religious persecution, this amendment would demand that Chinese Government officials provide the United States State Department with the specific names of individuals, the individuals' whereabouts, the condition of those individuals, the charges against them, and the sentence that it imposed against them.

So individuals who have been arrested and incarcerated because of their faith, because of their religious practice, we would demand that the Chinese Government provide information about the condition, the whereabouts of those individuals and how long the sentence was. The same would be applied to those engaged in forced abortions.

Mr. President, since the founding of the People's Republic of China almost 50 years ago, the Government has savaged and persecuted religious believers and subjected religious groups in China to comprehensive control by the state and the Chinese Communist Party.

The head of the state's Religious Affairs Bureau said in 1996—and I quote the head of the Religious Affairs Bureau in China—"Our aim is not registration for its own sake, but control." Let me say that again. He said, "Our aim is not just registration, but control over places for religious activities as well as over all religious activities themselves."

When people say there is religious freedom in China, that they only require registration, please realize, the

purpose of that registration is to control religious activities in China, an effort that they have been quite successful at. So religious organizations today in China are required to promote socialism and "patriotism" while the massive state party propaganda apparatus vigorously attempts to promote atheism and combat what they call "superstition."

Mr. President, the Chinese Government, the Communist Party, have in recent years intensified efforts to expel religious believers from the Government, the military, and the party, ordering a nationwide purge of believers in January of 1995.

I am very concerned about the mounting campaign of religious persecution being waged by the rulers of China. I believe this amendment is the least that we can do. Many of my colleagues have said that using trade policy is the wrong instrument in dealing with the repressive practices of the Chinese Government. I understand. In fact, I am sympathetic to that argument.

I never thought that most-favored-nation status was the best tool that we had, and yet when we come with a proposal like this, one that I have visited with Senator WELLSTONE about, and many of my colleagues about, when we come with one that denies visas and denies travel and per diem for those involved in these terrible practices, then I hear people saying that is the wrong tool to use, we should not use visas. This is the very least that we can do. If we are not willing to deal with the \$60 billion trade deficit that we give China—trade imbalance that we have with that country—then the least we can do is come back on this issue of visas, travel expenses, and raising the issue in our diplomacy and diplomatic efforts with the Chinese Government and make this something more than mere rhetoric.

I believe that these amendments are modest, that they are temperate, that they are well thought out. They have been repeatedly debated, not only in the House of Representatives but on the floor of the Senate as well.

I will ask my colleagues to support the amendments and to oppose any effort to table these amendments. I believe that there is clear evidence not only of religious persecution among Evangelical believers, among Roman Catholic believers, but most obviously among Buddhist believers and the followers of the Dalai Lama. The repression ranges from ransacking homes in Tibet in search of banned pictures of the Dalai Lama to the closing and destroying of over 18,000 Buddhist shrines last spring. So the repression is real. And religious faith of all persuasions is in revival in China, but it is in revival in the face of intense persecution by the Chinese Government.

I will only briefly speak of the practice of forced abortions that are going

on in China today. I believe that this is a practice that is indefensible by any civilized human being. In their effort and attempt to reach a 1 percent annual population growth, the Chinese authorities, in 1979, issued regulations that provided monetary bonuses and other benefits, as incentives, and economic penalties for those who would have in excess of one child.

They subject families in China to rigorous pressure to end pregnancies and to undergo sterilizations. And while the Communist Chinese Government today says that coercion is not an approved policy, they admit that it goes on. They have not provided our State Department any evidence that they are punishing the perpetrators of that terrible practice of coerced abortions and forced sterilizations in China today.

Even more tragic is their effort to eliminate those they regard as "defective." China's eugenics policy, the so-called natal and health care law, requires couples at risk of transmitting disabling congenital defects to their children to undergo sterilization.

So the practices continue in China; the abuses continue in China. This amendment is the very least that we can do in clear conscience. I have faith that my colleagues are going to support this amendment. I think it is something that is so essential that we do. This practice of coerced abortions—and, may I add, the practice of persecuting believers, religious believers—is morally reprehensible and indefensible.

It is clear, as well, that the desired changes that the policy of so-called constructive engagement has sought has failed.

I once again point to this headline in the Washington Post, which was, in various forms, the front page story all across this country this month: "Chinese Resume Arrests"—that in the wake of our President's visit to China.

So please look at the temperate tone of these amendments. Realize that the substance is simply denying visas, travel expenses, if you will, American-taxpayer-subsidized travel, in recognition of those who the State Department, the Secretary of State, has credible evidence indicating that they are involved in these inhumane practices.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment when we vote this afternoon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I am very proud to join with my colleague, Senator HUTCHINSON from Arkansas, in offering this amendment. Let me say, second of all, that while we do not agree on all issues—that may be the understatement of the year—we do

have a common bond in our very strongly held views and, I think, passion when it comes to human freedom in our country and other countries and respect for human rights.

At the beginning, I would like to just start out by doing two other things before speaking right to the amendment.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Linn Schulte-Sasse, who is an intern with our office, be allowed to be on the floor during the debate on this appropriations bill.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I think my colleague from Arkansas will agree with me, it would be important, given this topic, given this debate, given this discussion, to mention Aung San Suu Kyi from Burma, a woman who just wanted to go to a meeting. That repressive junta Government would not let her do so. She spent 5 days in her car, refusing to leave, before she could go to this meeting. She never could get to the meeting. Now she is back safely at home. It reminds us, again, of the repression of this regime.

I hope that these junta leaders understand that all of us in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, abhor their actions. From my point of view, we can't do enough as a country to isolate that repressive Government.

The core value that brings my colleague from Arkansas and the Senator from Minnesota together here today is freedom in human rights. I think that there is no better way to speak to this than to examine our relationship with the Government and 1.2 billion people in China.

I am concerned that the administration's "carrots only" policy has not worked well enough when it comes to accomplishing this goal of promoting freedom in human rights. I believe that the limited steps that the Chinese Government has taken to lessen political persecution or religious persecution has been when there has been American pressure. These included the prospect of a human rights resolution on China at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva and the debate over annual MFN renewal. All of this has been important in communicating a strong statement to this Government that they are under our watchful eye, and that we speak out against persecution against people because of the practice of their religion or of their basic political viewpoint.

I had reservations, I have reservations about the June summit between the President and President Jiang Zemin. I had hoped that there would be concrete results. I always believed it would have been better if the President had laid out clear human rights preconditions before visiting China. Having said that, I was still very hopeful that this visit would make a difference.

I applauded the President speaking out while in China. But always the question was, what next? Will China now take realistic but meaningful steps, such as opening up Tibet to human rights monitors and foreign journalists? Will China release political prisoners? Will they put safeguards in place for the right of free association of workers, beginning a process of abolishing the arbitrary system of reduction through labor? Will they lift their official blacklist of prodemocracy activists now abroad who can't return to China?

I fear that what we have seen so far by way of agreements announced in Beijing are merely symbolic in nature. On Tuesday, Secretary Albright reported that Chinese dissidents are continuing to be rounded up. For example, last Wednesday the police arrested Zhang Shanguang, a prominent dissident, who had already spent 7 years in jail. What did he do? What was his crime? He tried to organize laid off workers. Also last week, a Chinese court sentenced another dissident to 3 years in prison for helping a fellow activist to escape from China.

Mr. President, I am all for having good relations with the Government. I am all for making sure that we have economic cooperation. I understand the market that is there. But I join with my colleague, Senator HUTCHINSON, in introducing this amendment, to say that whatever we do by way of our relations with China, we ought not to sacrifice a basic principle that we hold dear as a country, which is a respect for human rights and for human freedom of peoples.

This amendment started out to do three things. One will be taken care of in an amendment by my colleague, Senator ABRAHAM, which will increase the number of U.N. diplomats at the Beijing Embassy assigned to monitor human rights and add at least one human rights monitor to each U.S. consulate in this vast country. That is an important amendment. I hope my colleagues will support it.

The second point I want to make is that our amendment is divided into two parts. First, our amendment will demonstrate our commitment to religious freedom by banning travel to the United States by any Chinese official who has engaged in religious persecution. While membership in religious groups is increasing explosively in China, the Government continues to prosecute, continues to persecute, Muslim Uighurs, Tibetan Buddhists and Christians.

While harsh prison sentences and violence against religious activists still occur, state control increasingly takes the form of a registration process. This is the way the Government monitors the membership in religious organizations.

According to the State Department's reports, Chinese officials have con-

ducted a special campaign against all unauthorized religious activities by Christians. This included police detaining people, beating, and fining members of the underground Catholic Church in Jiangxi Province, and raiding the homes of bishops. That is what is happening in this country.

The Government has also carried out a major purge of local officials in certain heavily Muslim populated areas, and targeted again "underground" Muslim activities. The Government has banned the construction or renovation of 130 mosques, and arrested scores of Muslim dissidents.

In Tibet, human rights conditions remain grim, and have gotten worse this past year. Tibetan religious activists face "disappearance," or incommunicado detention, long prison sentences, and brutal treatment in custody.

Finally, this amendment, second part, demonstrates the abhorrence of the United States over the practice of forced abortion and sterilization. It targets officials involved in forcing Chinese women to undergo abortions and sterilization and bans their travel to the United States of America. Chinese population control officials, working with employers and work unit officials, routinely monitor women's menstrual cycles. They subject women who conceive without Government authorization to extreme psychological pressure, to harsh economic sanctions, including unpayable fines—in one province, twice a family's gross annual income—to loss of employment, and in some cases to the use of physical force.

Some people argue that we cannot influence China, that the country is too large, too proud, and that change takes too long. I disagree. Religious prosecution, religious persecution, forced sterilization, forced abortion, people trying to speak out on behalf of their own human rights, all of these citizens have thanked us for speaking out; all of the human rights advocates have thanked us for helping to keep them alive by focusing attention on their plight and for fighting for reforms.

We cannot give up. We must continue to pressure China on these urgent matters. I urge my colleagues to vote for this very reasonable amendment, and I think Senator HUTCHINSON sends a very compelling and very powerful message, not only to the Government that we will not in any way, shape, or form stand by idly and be silent about this kind of repression, but also to the people in China, the citizens, that we support their efforts on behalf of human rights, on behalf of their right to be able to practice their own religion, on behalf of their right to be free from forced abortion and forced sterilization.

Colleagues, please give this amendment your overwhelming support.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I realize that standing and speaking in opposition would be condemned by some of my colleagues and my constituents. I also realize that my chairman will rise to table this amendment at the appropriate time. But I believe that something has to be said as to why some of us oppose this amendment.

Mr. President, we are blessed to be able to live in a great country. We just celebrated the 222nd anniversary of our birth. We have had a very illustrious and a glorious history. Yet, there are many chapters in our history that we would prefer not to discuss; we would prefer to just pass them over. The countries that we are speaking up against in Southeast Asia and Asia do not have a 222-year history. Yes, they may have been in existence for 4,000 or 5,000 years, but keep in mind that most of these countries have been under the yoke of some European power until just recently. Indonesia, until the end of World War II, was under the control, and therefore a colony of, Holland. China has been controlled by various countries. The Japanese have been there; the British have been there; the French, the Russians—and Americans. North Korea had been under the control of the Japanese up until World War II. The Philippines was our colony until the end of the war.

Our country is blessed with resources—all of the minerals that we need, all of the chemicals we need to make us the No. 1 high-tech country in the world, the most powerful military country in the world. These other countries are still struggling. I don't think we can expect these nations who are going through the evolutionary stage of just 50 years, as compared to our 222 years—we cannot impose and demand that our will be carried out.

We should remind ourselves that we, the people of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States have said that slavery was constitutional. That wasn't too long ago. And there are many fellow Americans who are still showing the effects of slavery to this day. Well, we pride ourselves on human rights, but hardly a day goes by when we don't see statistics that may not be the happiest. For example, I am vice chairman now of the Indian Affairs Committee. The things we are confronted with on a daily basis in this committee are sickening. For example, the unemployment rate in the Nation is less than 5 percent. The unemployment rate in Indian reservations today is over 50 percent. In some reservations, it is as high as 92 percent. Yes, there are reservations that are doing well—doing very, very well. But most of the 550 tribes are not doing well.

When you look at health statistics, they are worse than Third World countries. They are worse in cancer, worse

in respiratory diseases, worse in diabetes. And this happens in these United States. And if some other country should condemn us for this, we would stand up as one and say: It is none of your damn business.

Well, Mr. President, the question before us is, Do we contain and do we isolate China—a nation with a population of over one-fourth of the world's population? They have problems, as much as we have problems. The question is, Do we ignore them, realizing that they may someday acquire all the technology that they need to become a terrible world power? Or do we try to engage them and, hopefully, by practice and by model, convince them that our system is the best?

We seem to have done pretty well in doing this with the Soviet Union. We are told that the cold war is over now, that the power the Soviet Union had once upon a time is no more. Why? Because we had a policy of engagement. We continue to talk to them. We continue to exchange views. Yes, we propagandize them and they propagandize us. But because of our attitude, because of our resources, we have prevailed. I think the same can happen elsewhere.

Yes, we are dealing with countries that have a short contemporary history—Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos. These were European colonies. If one looks at the history of these colonies, the treatment was just as bad as the colonies in Africa. And now to suddenly say, "Now that you have freedom, we expect you to behave like Americans," I think is asking too much, Mr. President.

We speak of human rights. We will conclude this year the final payment of redress to Japanese Americans who were put in camps. Mr. President, I certainly recall that soon after December 7—on February 19, 1942—an Executive order was issued declaring that Japanese Americans were not to be trusted. Therefore, they had to be rounded up, with 48 hours' notice, and placed in 10 camps throughout the United States—no due process. No crimes were committed. Studies were made, investigations done, and there was not a single case of sabotage, not a single case of un-American activity. In fact, men volunteered from these camps to form a regiment, which I was honored to serve in, and we became the most decorated Army unit in the history of the Army. The United States is finally going to close that chapter.

But these things have happened to us. As a personal matter, I resented that when, on March 17, 1942, my Government said I was to be declared 4C.

In case people are not aware of what 4C is about, 1A is the Draft Board's declaration that you are physically fit, mentally alert. Therefore, you are qualified to put on the uniform of the United States; 4F, something is wrong with you, physically or mentally; 4C is

a special designation for enemy alien. That was my designation.

So when one speaks of the history of the United States, there are chapters that we don't wish to look at, because, if we start looking back to these chapters, you will find that we have gone through this painful evolution.

So I am telling my colleagues that this is not a simple amendment. It is an amendment that requires deep thought on our part. I hope that we leave it up to those who we rely upon in our State Department to do the best. We can always watch what is going on. Yes, they have forced abortion. I am against that. I am against religious persecution. We try to convince ourselves that there is no religious persecution in the United States. But I am certain we know that there is.

Mr. President, I will be voting to table this amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I respond to the comments, because I have such utmost respect for the Senator from Hawaii and his distinguished career, and all that he represents.

But I just want to clarify the perspective of the authors of this amendment. The issue is not imposing American values. Frankly, we don't and we can't impose anything on another nation. But what we can say is that the values are important.

I think it is terribly wrong to try to make a moral equivalency argument and say that examples of religious persecution that may exist in the United States can in any stretch of the imagination be compared to the wholesale religious oppression that exists in China today.

We simply don't have headlines in the Washington Post saying that there were "10 detained in Arkansas" because of their religious beliefs. We don't have that in this country, and we shouldn't. If we did there would be an outrage, and if we did we should be condemned by other nations in the world.

So the issue is not imposing American values. The issue is whether or not we as a body and we as a nation want to reflect certain fundamental beliefs and fundamental rights.

I add that these are not American values that we speak of. These are not American values that this amendment is addressing. These are human values. They are basic human rights.

It was not the U.S. Supreme Court that I quoted in condemnation of forced abortion. It was the Nuremberg War Tribunal that said forced abortion is a crime against humanity.

These are human values. We cannot excuse a nation by saying they are new

at this thing of freedom. No. In fact, it is not that the communist rulers of China don't understand freedom. It is that they understand freedom all too well, and they are determined to repress it.

The issue in China is control, and the Chinese Communist Government is determined to use whatever means necessary and whatever means at their disposal to insure that they maintain control, even to the point of persecuting those who might say there is a power above and beyond the power of the Chinese Government.

I say to my distinguished colleague from Hawaii that the issue is not isolation. It is certainly not isolation. There is no way that we could, even if we wished to, isolate the largest, most populist nation in the world.

It is, though, whether we as a country and we as a people are going to stand for something other than profits.

That is what this amendment is about. That is why I believe, I have faith, that my colleagues in the Senate will support an amendment that really reflects the best not only of American values but human values.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will take 2 minutes, because I know my colleague wants to move forward.

Mr. President, the Senator from Hawaii is the best of the best Senators. I don't like to be in disagreement with him. I am certainly not in disagreement with his analysis about our own history. There is nobody who can speak with more eloquence and more integrity about injustices in our country toward minorities and violations of people's human rights than the Senator from Hawaii. There is no question about it.

But I also believe, as my colleague from Arkansas has ably pointed out, that it is also important for other countries, and it would have been an important relation for our country to speak out.

When I think about South Africa, I think about what President Mandela said. One of the things he said over and over again, was when the people in the United States took action, it was when we put the pressure—not just symbolic politics—that things began to break open, and finally we were able to end the awful system of subjugation of people because of the color of their skin.

When I think even about our relations with the former Soviet Union, we were tough on these human rights violations.

I really believe that this amendment is just a very modest beginning which says, look, when you have people who are directly guilty of religious persecution, and when you have people who are directly guilty of forced sterilization, forced abortion—and we even had

waivers for the Presidents. But what we are saying is then let's take this into account. They ought not to be given travel visas to our country.

This is moderate, I say to my colleagues. This is but a step forward. But it sends such a powerful and important message about what our values are all about, what we are about as a nation. And it supports the people in China. This really is an important amendment. I hope that our colleagues will vote for it and will give it overwhelming support.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, before I respond, I again would like to request Senators to come forward, and let us see their amendments.

Earlier today I said of the 46—it is now 47 amendments that we know of—that we had agreed to accept 23 of them.

My staff informs me that the difficulty is we can't accept them because we haven't seen the final version of them. We hope that those will be produced here so we can dispose of the amendments that we are willing to accept expeditiously with very short comments from Members.

We are going to have over 50 amendments. We are going to finish this bill by tomorrow. I advise Members and staff to start bringing in cots for people to rest on tonight unless we get through them very quickly.

Mr. President, I have to confess to my friends, both of them who have spoken in favor of this amendment, that this Senator is at a loss to understand section 9012, which says that no funds can be used to pay the travel expenses and per diem for the participation in conferences, exchanges, programs, et cetera, of any national from the People's Republic of China who is the head or political secretary of any Chinese Government-created or approved organization. And it lists the Chinese Buddhist Association, the Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association, the National Congress of Catholic Representatives, the Chinese Catholic Bishops' Conference, the Chinese Protestant Three-Self Patriotic Movement, the China Christian Council, the Chinese Taoist Association, the Chinese Islamic Association, and then a series of civilian and military officials and employees of Government to carry out the specific policies that are listed, such as promoting or participating in policies or practices which hinder religious activities, or the free expression of religious beliefs.

I am at a loss to understand that section. Perhaps the Senator would explain that to me.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The officials that are listed of the various religious organizations that the Senator listed in the amendment are, in fact, Government employees, and Government agents.

They are those at the head of these associations. These are the registered churches that are used as tools and the agents of the Chinese Communist Government in the repression of those various groups. It does not refer to the pastors, the ministers, the priests of local congregations, but the heads of these associations which, in fact, work for the Communist Chinese Government and are those that are perpetrating the very persecution against those groups.

So while there are millions of Chinese today underground in unregistered churches, mosques, synagogues and temples, there is also the so-called Patriotic Church, the recognized church by the Government which is strictly controlled, names, addresses of worshippers to be turned into the Government. Messages that are proclaimed are closely censored by the Government. That is why those officials would be included if, in fact, the Secretary of State found credible evidence that they were practicing perpetrating religious persecution.

Mr. STEVENS. I am sad to say to my friend I don't understand that section to have that limitation, but, in any event, it is a very controversial subject to be added to the Defense appropriations bill. In conferring with Members yesterday, it was the position that we took at the time that we were going to do our utmost to keep controversial subjects that would lead to extended debate off of this bill. The only way to do that is, once we have had a short explanation of it in courtesy to the presenting Senator, it was going to be my intention to move to table any such amendment, not just this one but any such amendment.

Therefore, on the basis of the policy that we have announced, I move to table the Senator's amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is set aside and the vote will occur after 2 p.m. today.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at the request of Senator THOMAS that a letter signed by himself and Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator BIDEN, Senator KERRY, Senator SMITH of Oregon, Senator HAGEL, Senator GRAMS, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator ROBB, and Senator LIEBERMAN, and an excerpt from Newsweek be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, June 15, 1998.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: When the Senate returns to consideration of the DOD Authorization bill, S. 2057, we expect a series of amendments to be offered concerning the People's Republic of China. These amendments, if ac-

cepted, would do serious damage to our bilateral relationship and halt a decade of U.S. efforts to encourage greater Chinese adherence to international norms in such areas as non-proliferation, human rights, and trade.

In relative terms, in the last year China has shown improvement in several areas which the U.S. has specifically indicated are important to us. Relations with Taiwan have stabilized, several prominent dissents have been released from prison, enforcement of or agreements on intellectual property rights have been stepped up, the revision of Hong Kong has gone smoothly, and China's agreement not to devalue its currency helped stabilize Asia's economic crisis.

Has this been enough change? Clearly not. But the question is: how do we best encourage more change in China? Do we do so by isolating one fourth of the world's population, by denying visas to most members of its government, by denying it access to any international concessional loans, and by backing it into a corner and declaring it a pariah as these amendments would do?

Or, rather, is the better course to engage China, to expand dialogue, to invite China to live up to its aspirations as a world power, to expose the country to the norms of democracy and human rights and thereby draw it further into the family of nations?

We are all for human rights; there's no dispute about that. But the question is, how do we best achieve human rights? We think it's through engagement.

We urge you to look beyond the artfully-crafted titles of these amendments to their actual content and effect. One would require that the United States to oppose the provision of any international concessional loan to China, its citizens, or businesses, even if the loan were to be used in a manner which would promote democracy or human rights. This same amendment would require every U.S. national involved in conducting any significant business in China to register with the Commerce Department and to agree to abide by a set of government-imposed "business principles" mandated in the amendment. On the eve of President Clinton's trip to China, the raft of radical China-related amendments threatens to undermine our relationship just when it is most crucial to advance vital U.S. interests.

Several of the amendments contain provisions which are sufficiently vague so as to effectively bar the grant of any entrance visa to the United States to every member of the Chinese government. Those provisions not only countervene many of our international treaty commitments, but are completely at odds with one of the amendments which would prohibit the United States from funding the participation of a great proportion of Chinese officials in any State Department, USIA, or USAID conference, exchange program, or activity; and with another amendment which urges agencies of the U.S. Government to increase programs between the two countries.

Finally, many of the amendments are drawn from bills which have yet to be considered by the committee of jurisdiction, the Foreign Relations Committee. That committee will review the bills at a June 18 hearing, and they are scheduled to be marked-up in committee on June 23. Legislation such as this that would have such a profound effect on US-China relations warrant careful committee consideration. They should not be subject of an attempt to circumvent the committee process.

In the short twenty years since we first officially engaged China, that country has

opened up to the outside world, rejected Maoism, initiated extensive market reforms, witnessed a growing grass-roots movement towards increased democratization, agreed to be bound by major international non-proliferation and human rights agreements, and is on the verge of dismantling its state-run enterprises. We can continue to nurture that transformation through further engagement, or we can capitulate to the voices of isolation and containment that these amendments represent and negate all the advances made so far.

We hope that you will agree with us and choose engagement. We strongly urge you to vote against these amendments.

Sincerely,

Craig Thomas, Chairman, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations; Frank H. Murkowski, Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; Chuck Hagel, Chairman, Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Committee on Foreign Relations; Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Ranking Member, Committee on Foreign Relations; John F. Kerry, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations; Gordon Smith, Chairman, Subcommittee on European Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations; Rod Grams, Chairman, Subcommittee on International Operations, Committee on Foreign Relations; Charles S. Robb, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Near East/South Asian Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations; Dianne Feinstein, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on International Operations, Committee on Foreign Relations; Joseph L. Lieberman, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology, Committee on Armed Services.

[From Newsweek, July 6, 1998]

HELP "INDEPENDENT SPIRITS"—A GULAG VETERAN APPRAISES CLINTON'S MISSION
(By Wang Dan)

President Clinton is taking a lot of heat for his decision to visit China in spite of the serious human-rights problems there. I spent seven years in prison in China for my activities on Tiananmen Square in 1989, so I certainly share the view that the Chinese government must change its ways. But I also think the American president can accomplish some positive things with his trip.

It's critically important to have a broad range of contacts with China. The West should not try to isolate the communist regime or limit contact to political exchange. Washington needs to maintain dialogue on many fronts at once: economic, cultural, academic, anything that helps build civil society. The key to democracy in China is independence. My country needs independent intellectuals, independent economic actors, independent spirits.

Economic change does influence political change. China's economic development will be good for the West as well as for the Chinese people. China needs Most Favored Nation trade status with the United States, and it should fully enter the world trading system. The terms of that entry must be negotiated, of course, but in any case the rest of the world must not break its contact with China.

President Clinton's visit to Tiananmen Square did not look like a sacrilege to the Chinese people. He didn't stand in the middle

of the square, but along the side, outside the Great Hall of the People. All foreign leaders go there. Clinton was right later to mention the events of June 4, 1989. He must continue to stick up for such political prisoners as Liu Nianchun, imprisoned in 1995 for three years; Li Hai, a former student at Peking University sentenced to nine years in 1995; and Hu Shigen, another former Peking University student who was sentenced to 20 years in 1994. All were convicted on trumped-up criminal charges. These people must never be forgotten. Nor should the routine arrest and harassment of other dissidents, which continued last week.

It's hard to say exactly what Chinese leaders think about Clinton. The scandals in Washington allegedly implicating Chinese officials only make the picture murkier. But one thing is clear: China's leaders always view American presidents as competitors. They believe that the United States doesn't want China to grow, and they are suspicious of its motives. That made Clinton's task in China more difficult still. I wish him well.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I keep asking and requesting that Members come forward with these amendments. I have asked now the leadership to clear a unanimous consent request that all amendments have to be filed by 4. I know it is not cleared yet, but I am again requesting that and letting people know somehow or other we are going to get these amendments. It may be that I will just have to move to go to third reading, we will have a vote to go to third reading and cut them all off.

For those people who want to go home, I will give them an avenue to get home, and that is let's just vote on this bill. But if people won't bring the amendments to us, we are going to have to take some drastic steps here to limit the number of amendments we can consider. I know that it is an extraordinary procedure, but these are extraordinary times. I would like at least to have the amendments we have said we would accept. Twenty-three Members out there with amendments I said we would accept, and they have not brought them over. I plead with the Senate to think about proceeding with this bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Texas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3409

(Purpose: To express the Sense of Congress that the readiness of the United States Armed Forces to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States is eroded from a combination of declining defense budgets and expanded missions, including the ongoing, open-ended commitment of U.S. forces to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] proposes an amendment numbered 3409.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . (a): Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since 1989,

(A) The national defense budget has been cut in half as a percentage of the gross domestic product;

(B) The national defense budget has been cut by over \$120 billion in real terms;

(C) The U.S. military force structure has been reduced by more than 30 percent;

(D) The Department of Defense's operations and maintenance accounts have been reduced by 40 percent;

(E) The Department of Defense's procurement funding has declined by more than 50 percent;

(F) U.S. military operational commitments have increased fourfold;

(G) The Army has reduced its ranks by over 630,000 soldiers and civilians, closed over 700 installations at home and overseas, and cut 10 divisions from its force structure;

(H) The Army has reduced its presence in Europe from 215,000 to 65,000 personnel;

(I) The Army has averaged 14 deployments every four years, increased significantly from the Cold War trend of one deployment every four years;

(J) The Air Force has downsized by nearly 40 percent, while experiencing a four-fold increase in operational commitments.

(2) In 1992, 37 percent of the Navy's fleet was deployed at any given time. Today that number is 57 percent; at its present rate, it will climb to 62 percent by 2005.

(3) The Navy Surface Warfare Officer community will fall short of its needs a 40 percent increase in retention to meet requirements;

(4) The Air Force is 18 percent short of its retention goal for second-term airmen;

(5) The Air Force is more than 800 pilots short, and more than 70 percent eligible for retention bonuses have turned them down in favor of separation;

(6) The Army faces critical personnel shortages in combat units, forcing unit commanders to borrow troops from other units just to participate in training exercises.

(7) An Air Force F-16 squadron commander testified before the House National Security Committee that his unit was forced to borrow three aircraft and use cannibalized parts from four other F-16s in order to deploy to Southwest Asia;

(8) In 1997, the Army averaged 31,000 soldiers deployed away from their home station

in support of military operations in 70 countries with the average deployment lasting 125 days;

(9) Critical shortfalls in meeting recruiting and retention goals is seriously affecting the ability of the Army to train and deploy. The Army reduced its recruiting goals for 1998 by 12,000 personnel;

(10) In fiscal year 1997, the Army fell short of its recruiting goal for critical infantry soldiers by almost 5,000. As of February 15, 1998, Army-wide shortages existed for 28 Army specialties. Many positions in squads and crews are left unfilled or minimally filled because personnel are diverted to work in key positions elsewhere;

(11) The Navy reports it will fall short of enlisted sailor recruitment for 1998 by 10,000

(12) One in ten Air Force front-line units are not combat ready;

(13) Ten Air Force technical specialties, representing thousands of airmen, deployed away from their home station for longer than the Air Force standard 120-day mark in 1997;

(14) The Air Force fell short of its reenlistment rate for mid-career enlisted personnel by an average of six percent, with key war fighting career fields experiencing even larger drops in reenlistments;

(15) In 1997, U.S. Marines in the operating forces have deployed on more than 200 exercises, rotational deployments, or actual contingencies.

(16) U.S. Marine Corps maintenance forces are only able to maintain 92 percent ground equipment and 77 percent aviation equipment readiness rates due to excessive deployments of troops and equipment;

(17) The National Security Strategy of the United States assumes the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces to prevail in two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously.

(18) To execute the National Security of the United States, the U.S. Army's five later-deploying divisions, which constitute almost half of the Army's active combat forces, are critical to the success of specific war plans;

(19) According to commanders in these divisions, the practice of under staffing squads and crews that are responsible for training, and assigning personnel to other units as fillers for exercises and operations, has become common and is degrading unit capability and readiness.

(20) In the aggregate, the Army's later-deploying divisions were assigned 93 percent of their authorized personnel at the beginning of fiscal year 1998. In one specific case, the 1st Armored Division was staffed at 94 percent in the aggregate; however, its combat support and service support specialties were filled at below 85 percent, and captains and majors were filled at 73 percent.

(21) At the 10th Infantry Division, only 138 of 162 infantry squads were fully or minimally filled, and 36 of the filled squads were unqualified. At the 1st Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division, only 56 percent of the authorized infantry soldiers for its Bradley Fighting Vehicles were assigned, and in the 2nd Brigade, 21 of 48 infantry squads had no personnel assigned. At the 3rd Brigade of the 1st Armored Division, only 16 of 116 M1A1 tanks had full crews and were qualified, and in one of the Brigade's two armor battalions, 14 of 58 tanks had no crewmembers assigned because the personnel were deployed to Bosnia.

(23) At the beginning of fiscal year 1998, the five later-deploying divisions critical to the execution of the U.S. National Security Strategy were short nearly 1,900 of the total

25,357 Non-Commissioned Officers authorized, and as of February 15, 1998, this shortage had grown to almost 2,200.

(24) Rotation of units to Bosnia is having a direct and negative impact on the ability of later-deploying divisions to maintain the training and readiness levels needed to execute their mission in a major regional conflict. Indications of this include:

(A) The reassignment by the Commander of the 3rd Brigade Combat Team of 63 soldiers within the brigade to serve in infantry squads of a deploying unit of 800 troops, stripping non-deploying infantry and armor units of maintenance personnel, and reassigning Non-Commissioned Officers and support personnel to the task force from throughout the brigade;

(B) Cancellation of gunnery exercises for at least two armor battalions in later-deploying divisions, causing 43 of 116 tank crews to lose their qualifications on the weapon system;

(C) Hiring of outside contract personnel by 1st Armored and 1st Infantry later-deploying divisions to perform routine maintenance.

(25) National Guard budget shortfalls compromise the Guard's readiness levels, capabilities, force structure, and end strength, putting the Guard's personnel, schools, training, full-time support, retention and recruitment, and morale at risk.

(26) The President's budget requests for the National Guard have been insufficient, notwithstanding the frequent calls on the Guard to handle wide-ranging tasks, including deployments in Bosnia, Iraq, Haiti, and Somalia.

(b) Sense of Congress:

(1) It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) The readiness of U.S. military forces to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States is being eroded from a combination of declining defense budgets and expanded missions;

(B) The ongoing, open-ended commitment of U.S. forces to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia is causing assigned and supporting units to compromise their principle wartime assignments;

(C) Defense appropriations are not keeping pace with the expanding needs of the armed forces.

(c) Report Requirement.

(1) Not later than June 1, 1999, the President shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives, and to the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses, a report on the military readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States. The President shall include in the report a detailed discussion of the competition for resources service-by-service caused by the ongoing commitment to the peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, including in those units that are supporting but not directly deployed to Bosnia. The President shall specifically include in the report the following:

(A) an assessment of current force structure and its sufficiency to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States;

(B) an outline of the service-by-service force structure expected to be committed to a major regional contingency as envisioned in the National Security Strategy of the United States;

(C) a comparison of the force structures outlined in sub-paragraph (c)(1)(B) above with the service-by-service order of battle in Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, as a representative and recent major regional conflict;

(D) the force structure and defense appropriation increases that are necessary to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States assuming current projected ground force levels assigned to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia are unchanged;

(E) a discussion of the U.S. ground force level in Bosnia that can be sustained without impacting the ability of the Armed Forces to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States, assuming no increases in force structure and defense appropriations during the period in which ground forces are assigned to Bosnia.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, this amendment is a sense of Congress regarding the readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces to execute the national security strategy of the United States. So many people are now talking about the hollow military that we seem to be going into, and I think it is time that Congress address the concern that all of us have that we may be driving our military down to the point that we will not be able to respond if something happens where we are needed anywhere in the world.

So, I make the following findings:

That since 1989:

The national defense budget has been cut in half as a percentage of the gross domestic product;

The national defense budget has been cut by over \$120 billion in real terms;

The U.S. military force structure has been reduced by more than 30 percent;

The Department of Defense's operations and maintenance accounts have been reduced by 40 percent;

The Department of Defense's procurement funding has declined by more than 50 percent;

U.S. military operational commitments have increased fourfold.

It is clear the Army has reduced its ranks by over 630,000 soldiers and civilians, closed over 700 installations at home and overseas and cut 10 divisions from its force structure.

The Army has reduced its presence in Europe from 215,000 to 65,000 personnel.

The Army has averaged 14 deployments every four years, increased significantly from the Cold War trend of one deployment every four years.

The Air Force has downsized by nearly 40 percent, while experiencing a fourfold increase in operation commitments.

In 1992, 37 percent of the Navy's fleet was deployed at any given time. Today that number is 57 percent; at its present rate, it will climb to 62 percent by 2005.

The Navy Surface Warfare Officer community will fall short of its needs a 40 percent increase in retention to meet requirements;

The Air Force is 18 percent short of its retention goal for second-term airmen.

We know the Air Force is more than 800 pilots short, and we know that our experienced pilots have not re-upped, even in the face of a \$60,000 bonus.

The Army faces critical personnel shortages in combat units, forcing unit commanders to borrow troops from other units just to participate in training exercises.

In 1997, the Army averaged 31,000 soldiers deployed away from their home station in support of military operations in 70 countries with the average deployment lasting 125 days.

Critical shortfalls in meeting recruiting and retention goals is seriously affecting the ability of the Army to train and deploy. The Army reduced its recruiting goal for 1998 by 12,000 personnel.

The Navy reports it will fall short of enlisted sailor recruitment for 1998 by 10,000.

One in ten Air Force front-line units are not combat ready.

Ten Air Force technical specialties, representing thousands of airmen, deployed away from their home station for longer than the Air Force standard 120-day mark in 1997.

In 1997, U.S. Marines in the operating forces have deployed on more than 200 exercises, rotational deployments, or actual contingencies.

U.S. Marine Corps maintenance forces are only able to maintain 92 percent ground equipment and 77 percent aviation equipment readiness rates due to excessive deployments of troops and equipment;

The National Security Strategy of the United States assumes the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces to prevail in two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously.

Mr. President, all of us, including the distinguished Senator from Kansas who is a former marine, know that "nearly" has been inserted into our national security strategy. Our strategy used to be that we would have the ability to prevail in two major regional conflicts simultaneously. Today, we are saying "nearly simultaneously," yet none of us who have studied these issues believe that we are ready, today, even for this ramped down mission.

To execute the National Security of the United States, the U.S. Army's five later-deploying divisions, which constitute almost half of the Army's active combat forces, are critical if the success of specific war plans can be achieved.

According to commanders in these divisions, the practice of under staffing squads and crews that are responsible for training, and assigning personnel to other units as fillers for exercises and operations, has become common and is degrading unit capability and readiness.

In the aggregate, the Army's later-deploying divisions were assigned 93 percent of their authorized personnel at the beginning of fiscal year 1998. In one specific case, the 1st Armored Division was staffed at 94 percent in the aggregate; however, its combat support

and service support specialties were filled at below 85 percent, and captains and majors were filled at 73 percent.

At the 10th Infantry Division, only 138 of 162 infantry squads were fully or minimally filled, and 36 of the filled squads were unqualified.

At the beginning of fiscal year 1998, the five later-deploying divisions critical to the execution of the U.S. National Security Strategy were short nearly 1,900 of the total 25,357 Non-Commissioned Officers authorized, and as of February 15, 1998, this shortage had grown to almost 2,200.

Rotation of units to Bosnia is having a direct and negative impact on the ability of later-deploying divisions to maintain the training and readiness levels needed to execute their mission in a major regional conflict. Indications of this include;

The reassignment by the Commander of the 3rd Brigade Combat Team of 63 soldiers within the brigade to serve in infantry squads of a deploying unit of 800 troops, stripping non-deploying infantry and armor units of maintenance personnel, and reassigning Non-Commissioned Officers and support personnel to the task force from throughout the brigade;

Cancellation of gunnery exercises for at least two armor battalions in later-deploying divisions, causing 43 of 116 tank crews to lose their qualifications on the weapon system;

Hiring of outside contract personnel by 1st Armored and 1st Infantry later-deploying divisions to perform routine maintenance.

Mr. President, these are the facts. Every one of the facts that I have read is absolutely in print, in the report of the Quadrennial Defense Review, in the DOD budget for fiscal year 1999, and a compilation of statements from the Department of Defense vice chiefs in a hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee, and every other part of what I have just read has been documented. These are from the Defense Department's own statistics.

So I am asking for the sense of Congress, that we declare that:

The readiness of U.S. military forces to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States is being eroded from a combination of declining defense budgets and expanded missions;

The ongoing, open-ended commitment of U.S. forces to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia is causing assigned and supporting units to compromise their principle wartime assignments.

Defense appropriations are not keeping pace with the expanding needs of the Armed Forces.

So I am asking for a report by June 1, 1999 from: the President of the United States to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives, and to the

Committees on Appropriations in both Houses, a report on the military readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The President shall include in the report a detailed discussion of the competition for resources service-by-service caused by the ongoing commitment to the peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, including in those units that are supporting but not directly deployed to Bosnia.

What we are asking, Mr. President, is for an assessment of where we are. We have all talked about the problems we have seen in small instances and different pieces of testimony. What I have done in this sense of the Senate is put it all together. I have taken from the Department of Defense its own authorization, its own budget, its Quadrennial Defense Review, from statements made before one of our two committees that talked about the problems in specific detail.

I think it is time that we in Congress now say we have put it all together and we want a report on the state of our readiness. Let's look at all of the factors and let's determine that we have a problem, that we have to determine what to do about it, and let's go forward and try to work with the administration, with the President, with the Secretary of Defense, and look at the big picture, and the big picture and the goal for all of us is that we would be able to meet the national security strategy of the United States, that we would be able to prevail in two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously.

I prefer simultaneously, but, nevertheless, we are not even up to the goal that we have stated, and we want to do what is our responsibility in the U.S. Congress, and that is, ask for the report, let's study the problem and let's come up with a solution together with the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will support me in this sense of Congress. It is just the beginning of our responsibility to address what we see as the problems in our military and that we would then be able to take the report and take the necessary steps to correct the backward motion that we are making with regard to the military readiness and the security of our country.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Texas for her presentation. It is my hope we will be able to accept that amendment. I have referred it to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and we are hopeful that we can reach that conclusion later.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999—AMENDMENT NO. 3385

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on another subject, time will expire at 2 o'clock on the items to be voted on included in the Treasury and general government operations bill. I offered amendment No. 3385 regarding recomputation of some Federal annuities. I point out that this option is not mandatory. The only way future retired employees can take advantage of this provision is if they make a payment into the Federal retirement system.

Several times in recent years, Congress has denied COLA adjustments for Federal employees. In some years, only Members of Congress were denied COLAs. In other years, other employees were affected.

My amendment provides that Federal employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement System and the Federal Employees Retirement System who did not receive automatic pay adjustments because of an act of Congress may, upon retirement, have their high-three salary recomputed as if they received the COLAs provided to annuitants.

This option cannot be exercised until the covered employee pays into the Civil Service Retirement Fund the amounts required by the amendment; namely, the contributions to the retirement fund the employee would have made if the employee had received the annuitant COLA.

It is really a fairness issue, to me. I am most concerned about survivors. Currently, 26 percent of all those who receive Federal annuities are survivors and the median time for a survivor annuity is just over 12 years. Survivors live on 55 percent of the employee's annuity. But, Mr. President, when an employee does not receive a COLA received by retired annuitants—and I point out that in almost every year, the retired annuitant, the people retired, have received the COLAs—then it simply means that survivors of retired employees receive greater annuities, greater compensation than those received by survivors of employees who continued to serve during the period when Congress denied COLAs to current Members and employees.

I believe the right thing to do is to adopt this concept. It allows the employee or the survivor of the employee who has passed on to ask for recomputation of the high-three concept based upon an assumption that the retiree had received the cost-of-living adjustments that were given to retired annuitants in the period when those were denied to Congress or other Federal employees.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment. I will have a minute to talk about it when the amendment comes up for a vote, as we start voting at 2 o'clock. I wanted this in the RECORD at this point.

I thank the Chair.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from California would like to speak on the Hutchinson amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Not on this amendment, Mr. President, but the Hutchinson amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. The Hutchinson amendment that I made a motion to table, the one pertaining to China.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Although I made a motion to table, I think it is in order until 2 o'clock that they may be able to speak.

AMENDMENT NO. 3409

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am prepared to leave the floor, but I have two things. First, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ABRAHAM be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3409.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Secondly, I ask the manager of the bill if he still wants me to offer the other amendment that I was to offer, or would he prefer to go forward with Senator FEINSTEIN, and I can always do that after the votes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I did request the Senator from Texas offer her Bosnia amendment so it will be the pending amendment after the votes this afternoon. I appreciate that she did that at this time. I urge she save the statement to be made until after the Senator from California, who has been waiting to make comments on the China amendment which I have already moved to table.

AMENDMENT NO. 3391, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a technical correction to amendment No. 3391 previously adopted. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified. It is strictly a technical error in the amendment that was previously adopted.

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

The amendment (No. 3391), as modified, is as follows:

On page 34, line 24, strike out all after "\$94,500,000" down to and including "1999" on page 35, line 7.

On page 42, line 1, strike out the amount "\$2,000,000,000", and insert the amount "\$1,775,000,000".

On page 99, in between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8 . (a) In addition to funds provided under title I of this Act, the following amounts are hereby appropriated: for "Military Personnel, Army", \$58,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Navy", \$43,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$14,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$44,000,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$5,377,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Navy",

\$3,684,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", \$1,103,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", \$1,000,000; for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$9,392,000; and for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$4,112,000".

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount available in this Act for "Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense", real property maintenance is hereby decreased by reducing the total amounts appropriated in the following accounts: "Operation and Maintenance, Army", by \$58,000,000; "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", by \$43,000,000; "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", by \$14,000,000; and "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", by \$44,000,000.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading "National Guard and Reserve Equipment", is hereby reduced by \$24,668,000.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senator from California to speak on the amendment that was offered by Senator HUTCHINSON, following the offering of the Bosnia amendment by the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I think the unanimous consent agreement was to allow me to offer my amendment, and then I will defer to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 3413

(Purpose: To condition the use of appropriated funds for the purpose of an orderly and honorable reduction of U.S. ground forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], for herself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon and Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 3413.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) The Congress finds the following:

(1) United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina have accomplished the military mission assigned to them as a component of the Implementation and Stabilization Forces.

(2) The continuing and open-ended commitment of U.S. ground forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is subject to the oversight authority of the Congress.

(3) Congress may limit the use of appropriated funds to create the conditions for an

orderly and honorable withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(4) On November 27, 1995, the President affirmed that United States participation in the multinational military Implementation Force in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina would terminate in about one year.

(5) The President declared the expiration date of the mandate for the Implementation Force to be December 20, 1996.

(6) The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff expressed confidence that the Implementation Force would complete its mission in about one year.

(7) The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff expressed the critical importance of establishing a firm deadline in the absence of which there is a potential for expansion of the mission of U.S. forces.

(8) On October 3, 1996, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff announced the intention of the United States Administration to delay the removal of United States Armed Forces personnel from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina until March 1997.

(9) In November 1996 the President announced his intention to further extend the deployment of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina until June 1998.

(10) The President did not request authorization by the Congress of a policy that would result in the further deployment of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina until June 1998.

(11) Notwithstanding the passage of two previously established deadlines, the reaffirmation of those deadlines by senior national security officials, and the endorsement by those same national security officials of the importance of having a deadline as a hedge against an expanded mission, the President announced on December 17, 1997 that establishing a deadline had been a mistake and that U.S. ground combat forces were committed to the NATO-led mission in Bosnia for the indefinite future.

(12) NATO military forces have increased their participation in law enforcement, particularly police activities.

(13) U.S. Commanders of NATO have stated on several occasions that, in accordance with the Dayton Peace Accords, the principal responsibility for such law enforcement and police activities lies with the Bosnian parties themselves.

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF FUNDS.

(a) Funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for any fiscal year may not be obligated for the ground elements of the United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina except as conditioned below.

(1) The President shall continue the ongoing withdrawal of American forces from the NATO Stabilization Force in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina such that U.S. ground forces in that force or the planned multi-national successor force shall not exceed:

(A) 6500, by February 2, 1999;

(B) 5000, by October 1, 1999.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) to the extent necessary for U.S. ground forces to protect themselves as the drawdowns outlined in sub-paragraph (a)(1) proceeds;

(2) to the extent necessary to support a limited number of United States military

personnel sufficient only to protect United States diplomatic facilities in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(3) to the extent necessary to support non-combat military personnel sufficient only to advise the commanders of North Atlantic Treaty Organization peacekeeping operations in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and

(4) to U.S. ground forces that may be deployed as part of NATO containment operations in regions surrounding the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(c) CONSTRUCTION OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to restrict the authority of the President under the Constitution to protect the lives of United States citizens.

(d) LIMITATION ON SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES IN BOSNIA.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended after the date of the enactment of this Act for the—

(1) conduct of, or direct support for, law enforcement and police activities in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, except for the training of law enforcement personnel or to prevent imminent loss of life;

(2) conduct of, or support for, any activity in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina that may have the effect of jeopardizing the primary mission of the NATO-led force in preventing armed conflict between the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska ('Bosnian Entities');

(3) transfer of refugees within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina that, in the opinion of the commander of NATO Forces involved in such transfer—

(A) has as one of its purposes the acquisition of control by a Bosnia Entity of territory allocated to the other Bosnian Entity under the Dayton Peace Agreement; or

(B) may expose United States Armed Forces to substantial risk to their personal safety; and

(4) implementation of any decision to change the legal status of any territory within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina unless expressly agreed to by all signatories to the Dayton Peace Agreement.

SEC. 4. PRESIDENTIAL REPORT.

(a) Not later than December 1, 1998, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the progress towards meeting the drawdown limit established in section 2(a).

(b) The report under paragraph (a) shall include an identification of the specific steps taken by the United States Government to transfer the United States portion of the peacekeeping mission in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to European allied nations or organizations.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be laid aside.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. This is the amendment on Bosnia that we will discuss immediately following the stacked votes this afternoon. I am happy to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from California is finally recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 3124

Mr. President, as one who has watched China for some 35 years now,

and been a frequent visitor for the past 20 years, I would like to make a few comments on the Hutchinson amendment, which effectively would set up a protocol whereby officials beneath the rank of Cabinet officials could be refused visas to come to this country.

The amendment, while it promotes a worthy goal, goes about it in a completely, I believe, counterproductive way. I do not think there is any Senator in this body who does not condemn the practice of forced abortion, forced sterilization, or any other coercive population control device or measure. We all condemn it.

I do not think there is any Senator in this body who does not condemn religious persecution that prevents people from freely exercising their own personal religious beliefs. Of course, not. We all condemn that. This amendment takes a stand on a principle but it does nothing to help solve the problem it is designed to address, and there is the rub.

We all agree there are certain practices and policies still in China that we oppose. The question we need to ask ourselves is this: What is the best contribution we can make to producing change, real change, in China? I submit that the answer is, we can engage China at all levels, all levels of government. Academia, business, law, and every other kind of social interaction should be energized. We should welcome every chance to interact with the Chinese people and officials as an opportunity to expose them to our values, to expose them to the rule of law, to Democratic values, to individual liberties.

The path set out by this amendment, I believe, is extraordinarily dangerous and it takes us on the opposite path. It is a path of isolation and containment. It cuts ourselves off from the very people we need to help educate and persuade and expose to Western values. And it would surely spark similar countermeasures by the Chinese Government to deny visas to U.S. officials, further deepening our isolation from one another, and developing the adversarial relationship that many of us believe need never happen. It could go on and on in a vicious cycle.

Do any of my colleagues seriously believe that any Chinese official would be dissuaded from conducting any human rights action because they would be denied a visa to the United States? I think not. I do deeply believe that if Chinese officials are exposed to U.S. society—and this has begun. I know it has been criticized, but I see it working. I come from a Pacific rim State where there is a great deal of interaction with Asia. I see our values go across the Pacific. I see them enter the Chinese mainland. I see the changes that have been made.

Mr. President, when Richard Nixon went to China in 1972, China was still

in the midst of the Cultural Revolution. There has never been a more brutal period in Chinese history than the Cultural Revolution. We have seen those dark days recede. We have seen a new leadership in place.

For the first time, I believe that this new leader now has the face, has consolidated his power, to begin to make certain major reforms. I very deeply believe we are going to see those reforms in the next few years. Already, there is writing here and in China about the order given to the Chinese military to remove themselves from all commercial endeavors.

Surprisingly enough, this, for the first time, has been done with transparency—in other words, a public statement for all to know that the new policy of the Chinese Government is that the Chinese military will not run commercial operations in trade, in business, or in any other pursuit. This is a very healthy, a very positive advance, which I think the entire free world should take hold of.

Additionally, you heard voluntarily the President of China, after many of us have importuned him over a long period of time, I myself beginning in 1991 carrying messages from His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, to the President of China, urging that there be a meeting—for the first time, the President of China has said publicly, with transparency, that if His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, makes a statement that respects the fact that Tibet is a part of China and that independence is not a part of the discussions, that there can be meetings that follow.

This is, true, a breakthrough in rhetoric, but it has never happened before in the 8 years I have been trying to achieve it. That happened while the President was in China. So these changes are being made.

One by one—perhaps not enough—the freeing of political dissidents, the adoption of a 30-day period of administrative leave, the Chinese interests in developing exchanges in the rule of law, to develop a modern commercial code, a modern criminal code, hopefully to press for the independence of the judicial branch of Government which currently is subject to party control—all of these are the breakthroughs that we should begin to press.

We have certain intellectual property, certain intellectual property concerns. How could those ever be brought about if we could not have an exchange of lower level officials to see to it that intellectual property laws are being carried out? It makes no sense to me. I believe it is one step toward containment and isolation. I believe that both of those are unwarranted, highly counterproductive—

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. You were speaking very positively about the changes in China. My question is, How do we reconcile the recent round of arrests that occurred in the 2 weeks—actually, the week subsequent to the President's visit—headlined in all of the newspapers across the country? Those who had attempted to register as an opposition political party and were arrested, some of whom are still incarcerated, as well as the tests of rocket engines that occurred even while the President was in China, how do we reconcile that with this supposed great reform that is taking place in China? And then also, the question I would pose is, The amendment that you are opposing simply says that visas should not be granted to those who are involved in forcing—compelling—abortions on women against their will and those who are involved in persecution of religious believers of various faiths. Do you oppose denying visas to those individuals who are involved in forced abortions and religious persecution?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I would be happy to answer the questions of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Yes, I oppose a measure which would oppose the granting of visas. The normal diplomatic and pragmatic efforts of a government-to-government effort to engage and discuss, to bring to light of day, to continue to persuade and develop a better sense of values would be truncated and cut off.

I believe, I say to the Senator, as one who has watched China for some 35 years now, that this is a country which has been humiliated by the West in the past. This is a country that has 5,000 years of dictatorship by one individual, generally an emperor, an emperor who could cast aside people, who could kill people at will—then revolutionary war heroes, basically people who were uneducated.

This is the first post-revolutionary war leadership that has had some Western education, that has some Western understanding. China closed itself off from the West after the Boxer Rebellion and because of what happened in the opium trade, never wanting any kind of interaction with the West.

Now, for the first time, China is open, I believe, to Western values, to Western ideas. I happen to believe it is to our interest. We didn't settle the enormous intellectual property and piracy problems by saying, if you commit a piracy act, you won't have a visa to the United States. We settled it by sending over delegation after delegation of officials to let the Chinese Government know what this was all about, to identify and help identify those factories that were producing illegal goods, and to follow up and see, in fact, that the Chinese Government was willing to take action to shut them down. It has worked. It will be a bumpy road. But cutting off visas of officials isn't

the way to handle problems, whether they relate to IPR, whether they relate to technology transfer, whether they relate to other military endeavors or trade matters, I believe.

I must say, I believe this is the first time in the last year that the administration has really made up their mind that what they are going to do is engage China fully and completely at the top level. I believe it is having enormous dividends and that we will see in the years to come a much more open country, a country that has taken steps to make greater reforms.

You have to realize that to those of us who sit on the west coast, the Pacific rim is our world of trade. The Pacific rim has by far exceeded the Atlantic Ocean as the major theater of trade. In my State, approximately over a third of the jobs depend on trade with Asia. We want to have positive relations with Asia, positive relations with the Philippines, with Taiwan, with South Korea, with China, with all of the ASEAN countries as well. Increasingly, we have an opportunity, we believe, on the Pacific, to form a Pacific rim community that is peaceful, where trade can take place, where like values can be shared. I must tell you, I buy into that dream. I want to see it happen.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, coerced abortion and religious persecution are two practices that the Chinese Communist Government denies take place in China.

How, then, would denying visas to Chinese officials in which we have credible evidence that, in fact, they are doing—how would that impede the kind of positive relationship that you want to see?

I again reiterate the questions: How do we reconcile the most recent rounds of arrests of those who tried to form a democracy party in China when they were detained and incarcerated? And the test of the rocket engines while the President was in China, how do we reconcile that with this supposed breeze of freedom that we now have blowing through China?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I don't think it is all going to be smooth and all going in one direction. I find the arrest of dissidents in the wake of the President's visit or prior to the President's visit as 100 percent wrong.

Senator, if there is one thing I have learned about the Chinese, they can be ham-handed in how they function. They can be their own worst enemies in how they handle, because they function under a different, I think, value system in this regard. Sometimes, I believe, it is overreaction. I have read things, and I sit back and say, why did this have to happen?

Now, let's talk for a moment about forced abortion. I think it is an abysmal practice, it is a barbaric practice. China says they do not countenance and they do not want to permit it. That is the official government policy. Are there occasions where, in this vast country, forced abortion is committed, do I believe? I believe there are instances where forced abortions are, in fact, committed. I also believe, though, that by pointing this out continually, we will see some changes.

I think it has to be understood that China still has over 100 million people way under the poverty line, some living in caves, some living in the most impoverished circumstances, particularly in western China. It has to be understood that China is a nation of 1.2 billion people, growing rapidly.

When I first went to China in 1979, what I was told was, what we have for one person must be extended to five people. I have seen since that time the quality of life improving for people. I have seen the easing of restrictions. I have seen the improvement in the dialog. I have seen the stress on education. I have seen the opening of the society. I have to think that is healthy for the society. I think if we engage that society, if we talk with people on equal levels, if we treat China without humiliating China but treat China with equality, that we will see major positive changes in the future.

So I appreciate the opportunity to have this dialog. I respect your values. I respect what you are trying to do in this regard. I just happen to believe, based on my knowledge, my understanding, and my experience with China and the Chinese people, I believe it would be highly unproductive.

I just wanted an opportunity to come to the floor and have that opportunity to state my views. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Last evening I had asked the majority leader just for 5 minutes at some time during the period when he was propounding the consent request. I am glad to cooperate with the floor managers on when would be the most appropriate time to do so, but since we are starting off on an amendment, I don't want to interrupt the debate on the amendment, and I am glad to inquire of my friend from Michigan what period of time he intends to take.

Mr. ABRAHAM. If the Senator from Massachusetts would like to speak for up to 5 minutes, the Senator from Michigan would be happy to propose a unanimous consent agreement by which the Senator from Massachusetts is yielded 5 minutes to speak, in morning business or whatever, and then establish that the Senator from Michigan would be recognized to proceed with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan desire to make that request in the form of a unanimous consent request?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts be permitted to speak for 5 minutes at this time, to be followed by the Senator from Michigan to then resume discussion of my amendment.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

As the Senator knows, the Judiciary Committee, of which we are both members, is starting hearings at this time as well. I appreciate his kindness in permitting me to address the Senate at this time.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as we begin the August recess, the American people should understand that the Republican leadership is still bent on blocking meaningful HMO reform. I believe that Senator LOTT owes it to Congress and the American people to schedule a full and fair debate as the Senate's first order of business when we return in September, but he has refused to do so and continues to hide behind the unreasonable restrictions on fair guidelines for the Senate's debate.

The Republican leadership in Congress deserves the failing grades it is getting for fumbling the issue on HMO reform. At least since last January when the press reports began noting that Oscar-winning actress Helen Hunt in "As Good as it Gets," who electrified audiences with her attack on HMOs, it has been clear that a tidal wave of support is building to end the managed care abuses and stop HMOs from profiting in ways that jeopardize patients' health or their very lives.

The GOP's HMO line of defense continues to be to block any strong legislation, refuse to allow fair debate, and to give the HMO industry antireform TV ads a chance to bite. The genie is out of the bottle, and that cynical strategy will fail. If the majority leader has not already done so, I urge him to see the film during the recess. I have a videotape of the film here. I ask a page to deliver it to the majority leader.

I urge the leader to see the film in a theater so he can judge the audience reaction and be more convinced of the genuine public outrage that exists over the abuses of HMOs and managed care. It is long past time for the Congress to end these abuses. Too often, the managed care is mismanaged care. No amount of distortion or smokescreens by insurance companies or GOP campaign ads can change the facts. A real Patients' Bill of Rights can stop these abuses. Let's pass it now before more patients have to suffer.

All we want is a chance, in the time-honored tradition and the regular order of this body, to present a full and complete debate on this issue. We have had 5 days of debate and discussion on agriculture, with 55 amendments. We have had 6 days of debate on the defense authorization, with 105 amendments. We have had 7 days of debate on the budget, with over 100 amendments. We are entitled to an opportunity for a full and fair debate. If there are provisions to be included in the Daschle bill, we would like to hear about them and what the objectives are. We believe that this debate offers the best opportunity to make sure that we are going to have the doctors and patients make decisions and not the insurance companies. That is the central and fundamental issue that we ought to be debating. We are going to continue to press this issue until we have that debate.

The Senate Republican leadership plan is not a bill of rights—it's a bill of wrongs. It cannot withstand a full and fair debate on the floor of the Senate. Its supporters know that—so they are refusing to bring it up for full debate, or at least agree on a fair number of amendments.

The goal of the Republican leadership and their friends in the insurance industry is to prevent legislation this year, or to pass only a minimalist bill so weak that it would be worse than no bill at all. The initial Republican strategy—the stonewall strategy—lasted for more than a year. But it broke down last month in the face of overwhelming public demand for action.

Their minimalist approach pays lip service to reform without the reality of reform. They refuse to let the Senate debate it, because they know their plan is more loophole than law.

The Republican record of delay and denial is clear. Congressman DINGELL and I first introduced patient protection legislation 17 months ago—on February 25, 1997.

Senator DASCHLE introduced the Patients' Bill of Rights four months ago—on March 31, 1998.

We have repeatedly asked for committee action or consideration by the full Senate of this important legislation, but the Republican leadership has repeatedly said "no."

Now, they know they can no longer just say "no." So the Leadership is trying the next best thing. Instead of bringing up the bill for full and fair debate, they have offered up a series of phony consent agreements that they know are unacceptable. They don't want a full debate with an opportunity to amend their Patient Bill of Wrongs, because they believe that the less the American people know about their sham proposals, the better they will be able to protect their friends in the health insurance industry.

In fact, the Republican leadership has gone to extraordinary lengths in

the past six weeks to prevent a full debate on HMO reform.

On June 18, Senator LOTT proposed to bring up the bill, but on terms that made a mockery of legislative process.

That proposal would have allowed the Senate to start debate on HMO reform, but Senator LOTT would have been permitted to pull the bill down at any time, and the Senate would have been barred from considering it further for the rest of the year. So if Senator LOTT did not like the direction the bill was headed, he could withdraw it and tie the Senate's hands on HMO reform for the remainder of the year.

On June 23, 43 Democratic Senators wrote to Senator LOTT to urge him to allow a full debate and votes on the merits of the Patients' Bill of Rights before the August recess.

In response, on June 24, Senator LOTT simply repeated his earlier unacceptable offer.

On June 25, Senator DASCHLE proposed an agreement under which Senator LOTT would bring up a Republican health care bill by July 6, Senator DASCHLE could offer the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights, and other Senators could offer only amendments relevant to the HMO reform issue. We would not allow amendments on any other subject—just those relevant to the Patients' Bill of Rights.

However, Senator LOTT rejected this offer. And on June 26, he offered once again an agreement that allowed Senator LOTT to withdraw the legislation at any time, and bar any further consideration of any health care legislation for the remainder of the year.

On July 15, after a long silence, Senator LOTT made yet another offer. This time he proposed an agreement that allowed for no amendments. He could bring up his bill. We could bring up ours. And that is it. It would be all or nothing. The American people would be denied votes on specific issues.

No vote on whether all Americans should be covered, or just one-third as the Republicans propose.

No vote on whether there should be genuine access to emergency room care.

No vote on whether patients should have access to the specialists they need when they are seriously ill.

No vote on whether doctors should be free to give the medical advice they feel is appropriate, without fear of being fired by the HMO.

No vote on whether patients with cancer or Alzheimer's disease or other illnesses should have access to clinical trials after conventional treatments fail.

No vote on whether patients in the middle of a course of treatment can keep their doctor if their health plan drops the doctor from the network, or the employer changes health plans.

No vote on whether patients should have meaningful independent review of

plan decisions—or whether health plans should continue to be judge and jury.

No vote on whether the special health needs of persons with disabilities, and women, and children should be met.

No vote on whether health plans should be held responsible for decisions that kill or injure patients.

The list goes on and on.

But the Republican Leadership just wants an all-or-nothing vote on their plan and our plan. They don't want a genuine debate on patient protection. They don't want to be held accountable by the American people for defending industry profits instead of patients. They want to gag the Senate, and allow HMOs to continue to gag doctors.

On July 16, Senator DASCHLE proposed that we agree on a limited number of amendments—20 per side, directly related to the legislation, not on extraneous issues.

This offer by Senator DASCHLE reflects the best traditions of the Senate. It is consistent with the conditions under which we have debated many major legislative proposals in the Senate this year.

We had 7 days of debate on the budget resolution, and considered 105 amendments. Two of those were offered by Senator NICKLES.

We had 6 days of debate on the defense authorization bill, and considered 150 amendments. Two of those were offered by Senator LOTT, and he cosponsored 10 others.

We had 8 days of debate on IRS reform, and considered 13 amendments.

We had 17 days of debate on tobacco legislation—a bill we never completed—and considered 18 amendments.

We had 5 days of debate on the Agriculture Appropriations bill and 55 amendments.

Senator LOTT has said to reporters that Democrats might be able to offer 3 or 4 amendments. But that means we would have to decide which issues of concern to the American people are debated, and which are discarded. Do we debate access to emergency rooms, but put aside all concerns about access to specialists? Do we offer an amendment to ensure that all Americans are covered by the legislation, and not just the one-third the Republican plan proposes, but put aside access to clinical trials that could save lives?

This debate should not be an unfair choice. We agree that the number of amendments should be limited. But the number should be large enough to accommodate the large number of legitimate issues that need to be debated as part of this important reform.

If the Republican leaders are serious about fair debate, they know how to do it. We do it every day in the Senate, and we should do it now. If they are serious about passing meaningful patient protection legislation, they should call

up the bill now. All we have asked for is 20 amendments per side. It will take at least 20 amendments to even begin to remedy the major defects in the Republican proposal.

Since the Republican leadership plan was introduced a week ago, we have held meetings and forums with doctors, nurses and patients to explore the critical issues that must be addressed if a Patients' Bill of Rights is to be worthy of its name.

In each case, doctors, nurses and patients have reached the same conclusions. The abuses by HMOs and managed care are pervasive in our health system. Every doctor and patient knows that, too often, managed care is mismanaged care. Every doctor and patient knows that medical decisions that should be made by doctors and patients are being made by insurance company accountants. Every doctor and patient knows that profits, not patient care, have become the priority of too many health insurance companies.

The message in each of these forums from doctors, nurses and patients has been the same. Pass the Patients' Bill of Rights. Reject the Republican leadership plan. It leaves out too many critical protections. It leaves out too many patients. Even the protections it claims to offer have too many loopholes. It is a plan to protect industry profits, not patients.

One of the aspects of their legislation that the Republican leadership likes to tout is its alleged protections for women. As part of their ongoing disinformation campaign about their legislation, they even had a press conference this morning to proclaim the benefits of their legislation for women. But no credible organization representing women endorses their bill—because their so-called protections for women are a sham.

Nowhere is the difference between the bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights and the Republican Bill of Wrongs more evident than on the issue of protecting women's health. The Republican leadership bill leaves out most key patient protections. Even the protections it does include are more cosmetic than real. And even those cosmetic protections are limited to fewer than one-third of the privately insured patients who need help.

We held a forum yesterday afternoon during which leading organizations for women released a letter urging Senators to support the Patients' Bill of Rights and to reject the Republican leadership bill. The letter is signed by more than 30 women's groups, who represent millions of women in communities across the country.

Last Friday, we heard from Diane Bergin of College Park, MD. She has ovarian cancer, and is currently enrolled in a clinical trial. She eloquently described the need for plans to cover such trials and the importance of

having access to specialty care. Diane is a vivid example of the promise of such therapies and the need to see that patients have genuine access to specialists.

Women need to know that they will receive the benefits covered by their plan and recommended by their treating physician—without being overruled by insurance company accountants.

Women need to know that they can choose their gynecologist to be their primary care physician.

Women need to know that they will never have to drive past the nearest emergency room, because a more distant hospital is part of their managed care plan.

Women with mental illness need to know that they will have access to psychiatrists, psychologists and other mental health professionals.

Women with ovarian cancer—like Diane Bergin—or other life-threatening conditions need to know that their health plan will let them participate in clinical trials by covering routine costs of such care.

Women whose plans provide pharmaceutical benefits need to know that they will have access to drugs that are not on the plan's list.

Women need to know that they will have access to a quick and independent appeal if their plan overrules their doctor.

Women need to know that they have a genuine remedy when plan abuses result in injury or death.

The Patients' Bill of Rights guarantees these rights to all women with private health insurance. The Republican plan guarantees none of them.

In fact, the closer you look at the Republican bill, the worse it looks. They claim to provide protections for patients who seek emergency room care. But the American College of Emergency Physicians has denounced their proposal as a sham.

They claim to provide independent third party appeal, but Consumer's Union analyzed their proposal and called it "woefully inadequate and far from independent."

Virtually every protection they claim to have included turns out to fail the truth-in-advertising test—and the protections they have left out are a dishonor roll of insurance industry abuses.

Part of democracy is accountability. We have votes in the Senate to pass or defeat bills. We have votes on amendments to improve bills. We record these votes, because we are elected by the people of our states to represent them. The people have a right to know where we stand on important issues.

I ask the Republican leader why he doesn't want the American people to know where members of the Senate stand on whether protections for patients should apply to all 161 million

privately insured Americans—or leave more than 100 million out.

I ask the Republican leader why he doesn't want the American people to know where members of the Senate stand on allowing a sick child with cancer to have access to a specialist to treat his disease.

I ask the Republican leader why he doesn't want a vote on whether doctors and patients, not accountants, should make medical decisions.

I ask the Republican leader why he doesn't want a vote on whether doctors who stand up for their patients should be protected from retaliation by insurance companies.

I ask the Republican leader why he doesn't want a vote on whether patients should have access to the nearest emergency room when immediate medical treatment means the difference between life and death.

I ask the Republican leader why he doesn't want a vote on whether HMO decisions to deny patients the care they need should be subject to timely and independent review by an impartial third party.

I ask the Republican leader why he doesn't want a vote on whether patients with deadly diseases that no conventional treatment can help should have access to clinical trials that offer them the hope of cure or improvement.

I ask the Republican leader why he doesn't want a vote to insist on accountability for health plans when they kill or injure patients.

Each of those votes will address a critical weakness in the Republican plan. It is obvious why the Republican leader does not want Democrats to offer these amendments. He wants to keep the Republican bill weak, so that it will protect profits instead of patients. He thinks that he can hold Republican Senators for one vote in favor of a bad bill, but he cannot keep them together on vote after vote that will show who stands with patients—and who stands with HMOs.

The President will not sign—and the Senate should not pass—a bill that is a fig leaf over continued HMO abuses.

If the Senate has a full and fair debate in full view of the American people, needed patient protections will pass—and that is what the Republican leadership is trying to avoid.

The House Republican plan is so flawed that President Clinton has already sent a strong veto message. But the Senate Republican plan is even weaker than the House Republican plan—it's "Gingrich Lite." We know we can do better, and we will do better if we have a fair opportunity for full debate.

The Senate Republican plan protects industry profits instead of protecting patients. It is so riddled with loopholes that it's a license for continued abuse. It allows insurance company account-

ants to continue to make medical decisions, not doctors and patients. Patients with cancer, heart disease, or other serious illnesses will not have timely access to specialists and the treatment they need. Managed care plans are immunized from liability for abuses that injure or even kill a patient. No other industry in America has this immunity—and the managed care industry doesn't deserve it either.

Just as managed care plans gag their doctors, the Republican leadership wants to gag the Senate. Just as insurance companies delay and deny care, the Republican leadership is trying to delay and deny meaningful reform. Just as health plans want to avoid being held accountable when they kill or injure a patient, the Republican leadership wants to avoid being held accountable for killing patient protection legislation.

Yesterday, Senator CHAFEE offered a proposal that is a major improvement over the Senate Republican leadership plan, and it provides significant patient protections. But it lacks many of the most important protections in our Patients' Bill of Rights.

Key provisions omitted in the Chafee plan include the lack of needed protection for breast cancer patients from drive-through mastectomies and access to reconstructive surgery—the lack of fair opportunities for patients to join health plans allowing them to go to the physician or specialist of their choice—the lack of protection for health professionals who point out problems in the quality of care provided by health plans or facilities—and the lack of adequate remedies for patients injuries or killed by HMO abuses.

All of these reforms are needed, and all of them are strongly supported by an unprecedented alliance of physicians, nurses, patients, and working families.

Despite these significant gaps, the Chafee plan shows that the wall of opposition by Senate Republicans to genuine reform is continuing to crack, and it shows that at least some Republicans in the Senate are serious about reform. Now is the time for the Republican leadership to respond. As the Chafee plan shows, their industry profit protection plan is becoming less and less tenable with each passing day. The American people demand action, but the Republican leadership still refuses to bring patient protection legislation to the floor for full debate and action.

The Republican Leadership in Congress deserves the failing grades it's getting for fumbling the issue of HMO reform. At least since last January—when press reports began noting that Oscar-winning actress Helen Hunt in the movie "As Good As It Gets" was electrifying audiences with her attack on her HMO—it has been clear that a tidal wave of support is building to end managed care abuses and stop HMOs

from profiteering in ways that jeopardizing patients' health or their very lives.

The GOP-HMO line of defense continues to be to block any legislation, refuse to allow fair debate, and give the HMO industry's anti-reform TV ads a chance to bite. But the genie is out of the bottle, and that cynical strategy will fail.

It's time for Congress to end the abuses of patients and physicians by HMOs and managed care health plans. Too often, managed care is mis-managed care. No amount of distortions or smokescreens by insurance companies can change the facts. A real Patients' Bill of Rights can stop these abuses. Let's pass it now, before more patients have to suffer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles on the film "As Good As It Gets" be printed in the RECORD. The first is a March 29 Boston Globe column by Ellen Goodman. The second is a January 12 article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which to my knowledge is the first report of the extraordinary impact of the film on the HMO debate, and which mentions State Representative Thomas Holbrook of Beltsville, Illinois as the first elected official to recognize this impact.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Boston Globe, March 29, 1998]

(By Ellen Goodman)

THE HMO HORROR SHOW

Too bad they don't have a Oscar for the Single Best Line in a movie. A zeitgeist award for the sentence you want to freeze-frame, the magical moment when Hollywood fantasy meets daily life, with they get it absolutely right.

Helen Hunt and Jack Nicholson picked up a couple of statues last week for Best Actress and Best Actor in "As Good as It Gets." But the Best Line prize belongs to the scribbler who put a string of ungentle words in Hunt's mouth. When the distraught mother gave her opinion about the managed medical attention being given her asthmatic son, she exploded: "F----- HMO B----- Pieces of S---!"

At this outburst—with none of the expletives deleted—audiences all over America spontaneously burst out in applause. It was one of those moments when you know the tide has turned.

HMOs have become the new expletive—undeleted. Managed-care companies are rapidly replacing tobacco companies as corporate demons. Indeed, if you watch "The Rainmaker," the HMOs are taking the place of the Russkies as the bad guys. As Ronald Glasser, a Minneapolis pediatrician, HMO critic, and moviegoer who was downing popcorn when the audience roared at Hunt, exclaims, "I looked around and said, 'My God, the people are way ahead of the politicians on this.'"

A few years ago, the public saw doctors as rich professionals who overcharged on Tuesday and played golf on Wednesday. The weakness in the system was cost control—or cost out of control.

Now doctors and consumers are becoming allies on the same side, fighting the HMOs, hassling the 800 numbers, trapped in a med-

ical system we suspect is being run by accountants. The weakness in the system is trust. Or rather, mistrust.

It is an astonishingly swift transformation. Bob Blendon, who polls health care issues at Harvard's School of Public Health, is about to publish a study of the consumer backlash that confirms Helen Hunt's less professorial opinion. His survey of surveys proves, he says, that "we have changed the whole politics of the health field. Essentially patients and doctors have come together in a new class of exploited people."

On the one hand, polls show that most Americans are satisfied with their own health care plans. On the other hand, they favor some type of government regulation.

These two views seem contradictory, but the backlash is based on the widespread anxiety about what happens if they get sick. "People have come to believe," says Blendon, "that these plans won't do the right thing for them when they are very sick."

There isn't yet much objective research to show how often health care is refused, or how often the hassles and hurdles have lethal consequences. The backlash is driven by horror stories of health care plans that won't pay for emergency care, by anecdotes of cancer referrals denied or delayed, by firsthand stories about a mother, a sister, a neighbor, a friend.

We have gotten the big picture as well. About 15 percent of the population accounts for 80 percent of the medical bills. In the phrase Glasser used in the March issue of Harper's, HMOs are "a Ponzi scheme" in which the premiums have to keep ahead of claims.

But the backlash scenario presents the HMOs with a dilemma. On the one hand, employers and employees may choose a system based on how it treats the very ill. On the other hand, HMOs want to enroll the very healthy.

In general, managed-care companies have shown the public relations skills of Ken Starr. In the past year or so, we've had reports of outpatient breast surgery and drive-through deliveries. All we've seen in return is HMO defensiveness.

Now politicians who read the papers and go to the movies are playing catch-up. There have been about 1,000 bills in state legislatures to protect the consumers from the managers.

In Washington, Congress is still dithering around with various forms of a patients' bill of rights, with Republican leadership trying to stall, duck, and weave. But it is getting pushed closer to a law that would provide for an external appeal to those denied care, access to emergency room, and an ombudsman program.

As for the HMO's those folks who brought us Harry and Louise are now warning us about Frankenstein. The latest ad says, "Washington: Be careful how you play doctor, you might mandate a monster."

A monster? It's the unmandated, unregulated system that has now produced the horror movie running in everybody's head. Any way you look at health care, even in a darkened theater, this is not as good as it gets.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 12, 1998]

HMOs MAY HIGHLIGHT HOT TOPICS IN LEGISLATURE; BILLS WOULD TARGET MYRIAD OF PATIENTS' COMPLAINTS

State Rep. Thomas Holbrook, Beltsville, Illinois got a preview of what may lie ahead in

this year's Illinois legislative session when he saw the new Jack Nicholson movie, "As Good As It Gets."

In one scene, co-star Helen Hunt, playing the mother of a chronically ill boy, spouts vulgarity about a health maintenance organization that is refusing to give her son the treatment he needs.

"She starts railing on this HMO, and people in the theater actually stood up and started applauding," Holbrook recalled last week. "When's the last time you saw that happen in a theater? That's not an undercurrent, it's a tidal wave."

Proposals to make HMOs more user-friendly to consumers are among the major issues likely to face Illinois legislators when the year's legislative session opens Wednesday.

Other potential topics include clamping more restrictions on the campaign and contracting practices of state politicians; continued controversy over hog farm waste; discussions of new transportation projects in the Metro East area; and minor adjustments to the major education funding changes passed into law last year.

Technically, this year is the second half of a two-year legislative session. By legislative rule in Illinois, legislators in the second, even-numbered years are supposed to consider only budgetary matters and emergency issues.

That has historically been among the most ignored rules in state government, especially since even-numbered years are also election years. And, with the Senate and House under opposing parties—and with the House, especially, under a razor-thin Democratic majority—much of the debate this year is likely to be partisan and acrimonious.

Most legislators predict there will be few concrete changes on the books after the dust clears.

"There's no question there will be election-generated bills . . . but it will just be window-dressing," said Rep. Kurt Granberg, D-Carlyle. "Mainly, I think it's going to be a budget year."

AMONG THIS YEAR'S LIKELY TOPICS OF DEBATE IN THE LEGISLATURE: HMOs

The House last year passed several bills that would have regulated how HMOs deal with their patients and member doctors. Most of that legislation has remained stalled in the Senate but could be called up again through the end of this year.

One measure, labeled the "Patient Bill of Rights" by its supporters, would require that insurance companies provide certain information to patients, would set up a formalized grievance process and would make other changes to the HMO industry.

"There seems to be a real ground swell about this," said Holbrook, a co-sponsor of the bill. HMO expenses and alleged lack of responsiveness to patients have "become such a glaring atrocity."

Not everyone agrees with that assessment. But even Republican Senate President James "Pate" Philip of Wood Dale, who has prevented most HMO-related legislation in the past year from coming up for a Senate vote, is likely to open the subject to debate this year.

"We're going to find out what's out there," in the way of legislation, said Patty Schuh, Philip's spokeswoman. "This is an issue that hits everyone."

Proponents of the changes believe public frustration will work in their favor in an election year.

"That truly has a chance at moving forward," said Rep. Jay Hoffman, D-Collinsville. "I see bipartisan support."

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2964

(Purpose: To provide for improved monitoring of human rights violations in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes)

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2964 and ask for its immediate consideration, and I ask unanimous consent Senator HUTCHINSON from Arkansas be added as a cosponsor to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The clerk will report the amendment. The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], for himself and Mr. HUTCHINSON proposes an amendment numbered 2964.

Mr. ABRAHAM. 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:

Add at the end the following new titles:

TITLE —MONITORING OF HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN CHINA

SEC. . SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Political Freedom in China Act of 1998".

SEC. . FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress concurs in the following conclusions of the United States State Department on human rights in the People's Republic of China in 1996:

(A) The People's Republic of China is "an authoritarian state" in which "citizens lack the freedom to peacefully express opposition to the party-led political system and the right to change their national leaders or form of government".

(B) The Government of the People's Republic of China has "continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms, stemming from the authorities' intolerance of dissent, fear of unrest, and the absence or inadequacy of laws protecting basic freedoms".

(C) "[a]buses include torture and mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, and arbitrary and incommunicado detention".

(D) "[p]rison conditions remained harsh [and] [t]he Government continued severe restrictions on freedom of speech, the press, assembly, association, religion, privacy, and worker rights".

(E) "[a]lthough the Government denies that it holds political prisoners, the number of persons detained or serving sentences for 'counterrevolutionary crimes' or 'crimes against the state', or for peaceful political or religious activities are believed to number in the thousands".

(F) "[n]onapproved religious groups, including Protestant and Catholic groups . . . experienced intensified repression".

(G) "[s]erious human rights abuses persist in minority areas, including Tibet, Xinjiang, and Inner Mongolia, and [c]ontrols on religion and on other fundamental freedoms in these areas have also intensified".

(H) "[o]verall in 1996, the authorities stepped up efforts to cut off expressions of protest or criticism. All public dissent against the party and government was effectively silenced by intimidation, exile, the imposition of prison terms, administrative detention, or house arrest. No dissidents were known to be active at year's end."

(2) In addition to the State Department, credible independent human rights organizations have documented an increase in repression in China during 1995, and effective destruction of the dissident movement through the arrest and sentencing of the few remaining pro-democracy and human rights activists not already in prison or exile.

(3) Among those were Li Hai, sentenced to 9 years in prison on December 18, 1996, for gathering information on the victims of the 1989 crackdown, which according to the court's verdict constituted "state secrets"; Liu Nianchun, an independent labor organizer, sentenced to 3 years of "re-education through labor" on July 4, 1996, due to his activities in connection with a petition campaign calling for human rights reforms; and Ngodrup Phuntsog, a Tibetan national, who was arrested in Tibet in 1987 immediately after he returned from a 2-year trip to India, where the Tibetan government in exile is located, and following a secret trial was convicted by the Government of the People's Republic of China of espionage on behalf of the "Ministry of Security of the Dalai clique".

(4) Many political prisoners are suffering from poor conditions and ill-treatment leading to serious medical and health problems, including—

(A) Gao Yu, a journalist sentenced to 6 years in prison in November 1994 and honored by UNESCO in May 1997, has a heart condition; and

(B) Chen Longde, a leading human rights advocate now serving a 3-year reeducation through labor sentence imposed without trial in August 1995, has reportedly been subject to repeated beatings and electric shocks at a labor camp for refusing to confess his guilt.

(5) The People's Republic of China, as a member of the United Nations, is expected to abide by the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(6) The People's Republic of China is a party to numerous international human rights conventions, including the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

SEC. . CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS.

(a) Release of Prisoners: The Secretary of State, in all official meetings with the Government of the People's Republic of China, should request the immediate and unconditional release of Ngodrup Phuntsog and other prisoners of conscience in Tibet, as well as in the People's Republic of China.

(b) Access to Prisons: The Secretary of State should seek access for international humanitarian organizations to Drapchi pris-

on and other prisons in Tibet, as well as in the People's Republic of China, to ensure that prisoners are not being mistreated and are receiving necessary medical treatment.

(c) Dialogue on Future of Tibet: The Secretary of State, in all official meetings with the Government of the People's Republic of China, should call on that country to begin serious discussions with the Dalai Lama or his representatives, without preconditions, on the future of Tibet.

SEC. . AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AT DIPLOMATIC POSTS TO MONITOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

There are authorized to be appropriated to support personnel to monitor political repression in the People's Republic of China in the United States Embassies in Beijing and Kathmandu, as well as the American consulates in Guangzhou, Shanghai, Shenyang, Chengdu, and Hong Kong, \$2,200,000 for fiscal year 1999 and \$2,200,000 for fiscal year 2000.

SEC. . DEMOCRACY BUILDING IN CHINA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NED.—In addition to such sums as are otherwise authorized to be appropriated for the "National Endowment for Democracy" for fiscal years 1999 and 2000, there are authorized for the "National Endowment for Democracy" \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, which shall be available to promote democracy, civil society, and the development of the rule of law in China.

(b) EAST ASIA-PACIFIC REGIONAL DEMOCRACY FUND.—The Secretary of State shall use funds available in the East Asia-Pacific Regional Democracy Fund to provide grants to nongovernmental organizations to promote democracy, civil society, and the development of the rule of law in China.

SEC. . HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA.

(a) REPORTS.—Not later than March 30, 1999, and each subsequent year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the International Relations Committee of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate an annual report on human rights in China, including religious persecution, the development of democratic institutions, and the rule of law. Reports shall provide information on each region in China.

(b) PRISONER INFORMATION REGISTRY.—The Secretary of State shall establish a Prisoner Information Registry for China which shall provide information on all political prisoners, prisoners of conscience, and prisoners of faith in China. Such information shall include the charges, judicial processes, administrative actions, use of forced labor, incidences of torture, length of imprisonment, physical and health conditions, and other matters related to the incarceration of such prisoners in China. The Secretary of State is authorized to make funds available to nongovernmental organizations presently engaged in monitoring activities regarding Chinese political prisoners to assist in the creation and maintenance of the registry.

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN ASIA.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress, the President, and the Secretary of State should work with the governments of other countries to establish a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Asia which would be modeled after the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DEMOCRACY IN HONG KONG.

It is the sense of Congress that the people of Hong Kong should continue to have the right and ability to freely elect their legislative representatives, and that the procedure for the conduct of the elections of the legislature of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region should be determined by the people of Hong Kong through an election law convention, a referendum, or both.

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO ORGAN HARVESTING AND TRANSPLANTING IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of the People's Republic of China should stop the practice of harvesting and transplanting organs for profit from prisoners that it executes;

(2) the Government of the People's Republic of China should be strongly condemned for such organ harvesting and transplanting practice;

(3) the President should bar from entry into the United States any and all officials of the Government of the People's Republic of China known to be directly involved in such organ harvesting and transplanting practice;

(4) individuals determined to be participating in or otherwise facilitating the sale of such organs in the United States should be prosecuted to the fullest possible extent of the law; and

(5) the appropriate officials in the United States should interview individuals, including doctors, who may have knowledge of such organ harvesting and transplanting practice.

Mr. President, let me speak a little bit about this amendment. I don't intend to take up too much of the Senate's time discussing it, because I know other Senators, including Senator HUTCHINSON, are interested in speaking as well to the amendment.

Essentially, this amendment sets forth concrete steps by which the United States would support the improvement of human rights in the People's Republic of China. Its provisions regarding human rights are identical to those included in the legislation that was recently passed by the other Chamber by an overwhelming vote of 394-29.

The amendment I am offering is based on the recognition that the United States can conduct meaningful engagement with China only if we are honest with Chinese leaders, and only if we are willing to stand up for our principles. And chief among the principles on which our nation was founded is an abiding commitment to fundamental human rights.

The current regime in China suppresses fundamental human rights on a daily basis:

Women pregnant with their second or third child are pressured to have abortions and even subjected to forced abortion and sterilization.

Religious exercise is violently suppressed among Christians in China, and among indigenous Buddhists in Tibet.

Proponents of democracy and human rights are imprisoned under inhumane conditions and often denied necessary medical treatment.

I could go on, Mr. President. The list of human rights abuses in China is as long as it is deplorable.

Let no one in this body be mistaken, the current Chinese regime does not respect fundamental human rights.

The question I think we have to ask is, Should that influence how American policy toward China is shaped? Obviously, there are some who say the only way for us to change those policies in China is to have a complete and total engagement with the People's Republic of China. Obviously, that is one point of view. But I subscribe to the view that we can take constructive steps designed to try to change things and to try to make things more consistent with America's views of appropriate human rights behavior.

And the Chinese regime's recent conduct gives us no reason to expect improvement any time soon. Indeed, Mr. President, since President Clinton returned from his trip to China this June, that government has detained 21 prominent human rights activists. At least three remain in custody today.

Through this amendment, Mr. President, we would make clear to the Chinese government our opposition to its oppressive practices and initiate concrete steps by which we can monitor human rights abuses and assist those seeking to promote human dignity and civil society.

Among the provisions in this amendment: First, it contains findings detailing the deplorable human rights record of the Chinese government. Second, the amendment calls for greater efforts on the part of our Secretary of State to improve the behavior of the current Chinese regime:

It calls on the Secretary of State, during official meetings with the Chinese government, to call for the release of political prisoners in China and Tibet.

The amendment also calls on the Secretary of State to seek greater access for international humanitarian organizations to prisons in Tibet and China—access that will ensure that prisoners are not being mistreated and that they are receiving necessary medical treatment.

And the amendment calls on the Secretary of State, during official meetings, to request that China begin serious discussions with the Dalai Lama or his representatives, without preconditions, on the future of Tibet.

Third, the amendment authorizes funding for several programs intended to improve human rights conditions in China. These include: \$2.2 million in 1999 and 2000 for additional personnel at diplomatic posts to monitor human rights in China; \$4 million in 1999 and 2000 for the National Endowment for Democracy to promote democracy, civil society, and the development of the rule of law in China, and permission for funds in the East Asia-Pacific

Regional Democracy Fund to be used to provide grants to nongovernmental organizations to promote democracy, civil society, and the development of the rule of law in China.

Fifth, the amendment contains provisions aimed at improving our monitoring of human rights in China.

These include: A call for preparation of an annual report on human rights, religious persecution, and the development of democratic institutions and the rule of law in China that includes specific information on each region, and establishment within the State Department of a Prisoner Information Registry for China to provide information on all political prisoners, prisoners of conscience, and prisoners of faith in China.

Finally, this amendment includes several sense of Congress resolutions, including: A sense-of-the-Congress resolution concerning the establishment of a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Asia; A resolution concerning democracy in Hong Kong; and a resolution condemning organ harvesting and transplantation for profit from prisoners executed by the Chinese government.

Mr. President, these provisions will make clear our determination to stand up for the fundamental human rights of the Chinese people.

As the world's first free nation, and the continuing leader of the free world, we have a responsibility, in my view, to defend people's basic rights wherever they are endangered or violated.

We cannot, without undermining freedom in our own nation, turn our backs on those who suffer oppression in China, or in any other nation.

Our principles as well as our national interest demand that we pursue meaningful engagement with the current government in China. And that requires, at a minimum, an open discussion of human rights abuses and concrete steps aimed at bringing those abuses to an end.

These amendments will not destroy our current relationship with China. None of the amendment's supporters seek an isolationist policy. I for one support normal trade relations with China because I see them as a necessary element of effective engagement.

But this amendment serves an important function in our effort to achieve and maintain meaningful engagement with China. It signals this Congress' continuing concerns for human rights, democracy, and freedom in China. It signals our determination to speak up and support the fundamental principles of civilized society.

Through this amendment we can stand with oppressed people of conscience in China, for our sake as well as theirs.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. 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. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Abraham amendment 2964 to the Defense appropriations bill. The Abraham amendment would authorize additional human rights monitors at the embassy in Beijing, China, as well as our other consulates around China. I think it is exceptionally warranted. It is very, very much needed.

The Chinese Government has repeatedly flaunted its lack of respect for human rights. We have seen how the Government controls its people through registration, through coercive and repressive practices. We have seen how the Chinese Government punishes those who would dare to worship by the dictates of their conscience. We have seen how the Government punishes those who would speak in the name of democracy, those who would seek to register an opposition political party. They punish those who simply seek to fulfill normal human aspirations, aspirations that we too often take for granted.

We have seen that in the last two, at least the last two annual State Department reports on human rights that China was found to be one of, if not the worst human rights abuser in the world today. I think that fact alone, the fact that our State Department, in monitoring the countries of the world, the nations of the world, issuing reports on human rights conditions in the various nations of the world, found China as the greatest abuser of human rights justifies the Abraham amendment in establishing additional human rights monitors, additional personnel in the embassy to monitor situations like this: "Chinese Resume Arrests," so that we will have the kind of knowledge about what is going on in the area of human rights within China that will allow us to, I think, engage China in the correct way.

Mr. President, we do not expect that China will change overnight, nor do we expect that the amendment that I have offered dealing with forced abortions and religious persecution, or the amendment that Senator ABRAHAM has offered will magically produce the change that we all desire. But it is essential that we shed light on the kind of human rights abuses, the dark practices that have become too evident for too many years. And it is essential

that we engage those abuses with a substantive response.

This is part of that substantive response. The question before us is not whether we contain and isolate China. We cannot do that. We should not do that. We would not want to do that. The question before us is whether or not we will engage them on issues of human rights, as well as trade, as well as national security issues, whether we will actually engage them, and in so doing support the cause of freedom.

Frankly, I am puzzled by those who would excuse themselves and pardon themselves by saying that they, too, are opposed to the human rights abuses in China but then would oppose any effort to have a substantive response to those human rights abuses.

So I believe that this is not only a well-intended but a well-drafted amendment. It is, once again, part of the package that passed in the House of Representatives now almost a year ago with overwhelming bipartisan support, and it is long past time for the Senate to weigh in on that; to support the monitoring of human rights abuses in China, as we seek to do throughout the world; to give the kinds of personnel to our State Department, to our diplomatic people to assure that we have the best intelligence, the best reporting possible.

It is, I think, evident that this is needed in light of this latest round of arrests of political dissidents in China. It is puzzling to me that we can talk about the great improvement in China and the reforms that are taking place, and that this administration could put so much faith in President Jiang and his regime in Beijing when all of the evidence that is forthcoming, whether it is in the media, through our intelligence agencies, or the State Department itself indicates that, in fact, those abuses are as bad as ever, and that the crackdown on religious believers is now only most recently exceeded by the crackdown on political dissidents. I do believe, as the President has expressed, that eventually China will be free. I believe that. I think someday China will be a country in which free expression is tolerated and the freedoms that are not American values, but are fundamental human values, will exist in China. But I think it will not be through the regime that rules with an iron fist in Beijing, China, today. So, let us engage, but let us engage thoroughly and on all fronts.

The package of amendments that is before the Senate today will enable us to do that. So it is essential that we not table the China amendments, that we support them, that we agree to them as part of the appropriations bill. I believe, because the House passed these measures by such an overwhelming vote, they will be preserved in the conference and we will be able to give the President an opportunity to

truly involve this administration in an engagement policy that will reflect the values that are precious to us and help to bring about the change that we desire to see in China and to give support to the freedom fighters, freedom lovers in China today who risk the limited freedom that they have to go about their daily activities by speaking out, by seeking to form an opposition political party, by seeking to worship according to the dictates of their conscience.

I think it is so imperative that we go on record with these amendments, to stand shoulder to shoulder with those who are putting their lives and their limited liberty at stake by taking a far more dangerous stand there, in China, today.

I applaud Senator ABRAHAM for bringing the human rights monitors amendment to the floor of the Senate, and I look forward to casting my vote against tabling and for the amendment. I ask my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Matthew Tourville, who is an intern in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor while we debate and vote on this bill today.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MAN'S LONGING FOR IMMORTALITY SHALL ACHIEVE ITS REALIZATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the July 20, 1998, edition of U.S. News & World Report and an article from the July 20, 1998, edition of Newsweek be printed in the RECORD. The two articles are relevant to the speech that I delivered on Tuesday this week entitled "Man's Longing for Immortality Shall Achieve Its Realization."

I understand the Government Printing Office estimates it will cost approximately \$1,283 to have these articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 20, 1998]

SCIENTISTS AND THEOLOGIANS DISCOVER A COMMON GROUND

Darwin, Freud, relativity, the mechanics of the big bang—rightly or wrongly, all have been taken as supporting the modernistic conception of a change-based world in which forces devoid of meaning account for all outcomes. Some thinkers have maintained that the big-bang theory shows that no god was necessary at the creation. Intellectuals have wrung their hands in angst about how bang-caused cosmic expansion will result in an inescapable running down of the stars, proving existence to be pointless. A depressing inevitable death of the universe figures prominently in the works of post-modern novelist Thomas Pynchon; while in the movie *Annie Hall*, Woody Allen's character is psychologically paralyzed by his dread of the galaxies expanding until they die.

By contrast new developments in big-bang science are almost supernaturally upbeat: The universe wants us, and the stars will shine forever!

This remarkable change in perspectives is helping inspire a warming trend between scientific and spiritual disciplines. A conference last month in Berkeley, Calif., at which cosmologists discussed the theological implications of their work, is representative. Allan Sandage, one of the world's leading astronomers, told the gathering that contemplating the majesty of the big bang helped make him a believer in God, willing to accept that creation could only be explained as a "miracle."

HERESIES

Not that long ago, such a comment from an establishment scientist would have been shocking. The mere existence of the organization that sponsored the Berkeley event, a well-regarded academic group called the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences, might have been snickered at. Today, "intellectuals are beginning to find it respectable" to talk about how physical law seems to favor life, notes Ian Barbour, a professor of both religion and physics at Carleton College, in Northfield, Minn.

In this vein, the recent book *Consilience* by Harvard biologist E.O. Wilson argues that there is no need to wall off scientific from moral thought; rather, people should once again pursue the Enlightenment vision of reconciling the technical and the spiritual. A boomlet of serious books with titles such as *A Case Against Accident and Self-Organization and God: The Evidence* goes further, suggesting the unknowns of the big bang eventually will be seen as divine latency.

If nothing else, the theological idea of creation ex nihilo—out of nothing—is looking better all the time as "inflation" theories (main story) increasingly suggest the universe emerged from no tangible source. The word "design," rejected by most 20th-century scientists as a theological taboo in the context of cosmology or evolution, is even creeping back into the big-bang debate. Physicist Ernest Sternglass, among Einstein's last living acolytes, recently argued that the propitious circumstances of the big bang show that the universe is "apparently designed for the development of life and destined to live forever, neither to fly apart into dying cinders nor collapse."

Parallels between cosmology and spirituality may be coincidence. Some fine it sig-

nificant that the Book of Genesis describes God creating existence out of the "waters," because big-bang science asserts the early universe was mostly hydrogen, the chief component of H₂O. Maybe that tells us something; probably it's just a word choice.

But on more telling issues, the trend line of cosmology unquestionably favors a sense of purpose. Existence may be eternal, prewired somehow for life; consciousness may expand forever, never running out of room or resources; there may be a larger cosmic enterprise waiting for us to join its purpose, if we can just learn wisdom and justice.

Because the cosmos is ancient by our measure, people assume they are latecomers, gazing out into a universe worn down and faltering. But if the firmament will expand for an enormous span of time, or even for an eternity, then our universe glistens with morning dew. Homo sapiens may represent a youth movement, arriving at a time when almost everything is still to come. Dreary projections about ultimate fates may be supplanted by the belief that, like the cosmos itself, the human prospect is, as the physicist Freeman Dyson once wrote, "infinite in all directions."

[From Newsweek, July 20, 1998]

SCIENCE FINDS GOD

(By Sharon Begley)

The more deeply scientists see into the secrets of the universe, you'd expect, the more God would fade away from their hearts and minds. But that's not how it went for Allan Sandage. Now slightly stooped and white-haired at 72, Sandage has spent a professional lifetime coaxing secrets out of the stars, peering through telescopes from Chile to California in the hope of spying nothing less than the origins and destiny of the universe. As much as any other 20th-century astronomer, Sandage actually figured it out: his observations of distance stars showed how fast the universe is expanding and how old it is (15 billion years or so). But through it all Sandage, who says he was "almost a practicing atheist as a boy," was nagged by mysteries whose answers were not to be found in the glittering panoply of supernovas. Among them: why is there something rather than nothing? Sandage began to despair of answering such questions through reason alone, and so, at 50, he willed himself to accept God. "It was my science that drove me to the conclusion that the world is much more complicated than can be explained by science," he says. "It is only through the supernatural that I can understand the mystery of existence."

Something surprising is happening between those two old warhorses science and religion.

Historically, they have alternated between mutual support and bitter enmity. Although religious doctrine midwifed the birth of the experimental method centuries ago (following story), faith and reason soon parted ways. Galileo, Darwin and others whose research challenged church dogma were branded heretics, and the polite way to reconcile science and theology was to simply agree that each would keep to its own realm: science would ask, and answer, empirical questions like "what" and "how"; religion would confront the spiritual, wondering "why." But as science grew in authority and power beginning with the Enlightenment, this détente broke down. Some of its greatest minds dismissed God as an unnecessary hypothesis, one they didn't need to explain how galaxies came to shine or how life grew so complex. Since the birth of the universe

could now be explained by the laws of physics alone, the late astronomer and atheist Carl Sagan concluded, there was "nothing for a Creator to do," and every thinking person was therefore forced to admit "the absence of God." Today the scientific community so scorns faith, says Sandage, that "there is a reluctance to reveal yourself as a believer, the opprobrium is so severe."

Some clergy are no more tolerant of scientists. A fellow researcher and friend of Sandage's was told by a pastor, "Unless you accept and believe that the Earth and universe are only 6,000 years old [as a literal reading of the Bible implies], you cannot be a Christian." It is little wonder that people of faith resent science: by reducing the miracle of life to a series of biochemical reactions, by explaining Creation as a hiccup in space-time, science seems to undermine belief, render existence meaningless and rob the world of spiritual wonder.

But now "theology and science are entering into a new relationship," says physicist turned theologian Robert John Russell, who in 1981 founded the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. Rather than undercutting faith and a sense of the spiritual, scientific discoveries are offering support for them, at least in the minds of people of faith. Big-bang cosmology, for instance, once read as leaving no room for a Creator, now implies to some scientists that there is a design and purpose behind the universe. Evolution, say some scientist-theologians, provides clues to the very nature of God. And chaos theory, which describes such mundane processes as the patterns of weather and the dripping of faucets, is being interpreted as opening a door for God to act in the world.

From Georgetown to Berkeley, theologians who embrace science, and scientists who cannot abide the spiritual emptiness of empiricism, are establishing institutes integrating the two. Books like "Science and Theology: The New Consonance" and "Belief in God in an Age of Science" are streaming off the presses. A June symposium on "Science and the Spiritual Quest," organized by Russell's CTNS, drew more than 320 paying attendees and 33 speakers, and a PBS documentary on science and faith will air this fall.

In 1977 Nobel physicist Steven Weinberg of the University of Texas sounded a famous note of despair: the more the universe has become comprehensible through cosmology, he wrote, the more it seems pointless. But now the very science that "killed" God is, in the eyes of believers, restoring faith. Physicists have stumbled on signs that the cosmos is custom-made for life and consciousness. It turns out that if the constants of nature—unchanging numbers like the strength of gravity, the charge of an electron and the mass of a proton—were the tiniest bit different, then atoms would not hold together, stars would not burn and life would never have made an appearance. "When you realize that the laws of nature must be incredibly finely tuned to produce the universe we see," says John Polkinghorne, who had a distinguished career as a physicist at Cambridge University before becoming an Anglican priest in 1982, "that conspires to plant the idea that the universe did not just happen, but that there must be a purpose behind it." Charles Townes, who shared the 1964 Nobel Prize in Physics for discovering the principles of the laser, goes further: "Many have a feeling that somehow intelligence must have been involved in the law of the universe."

Although the very rationality of science often feels like an enemy of the spiritual,

here, too, a new reading can sustain rather than snuff out belief. Ever since Isaac Newton, science has blared a clear message: the world follows rules, rules that are fundamentally mathematical, rules that humans can figure out. Humans invent abstract mathematics, basically making it up out of their imaginations, yet math magically turns out to describe the world. Greek mathematicians divided the circumference of a circle by its diameter, for example, and got the number π , 3.14159 . . . π turns up in equations that describe subatomic particles, light and other quantities that have no obvious connections to circles. This points, says Polkinghorne, "to a very deep fact about the nature of the universe," namely, that our minds, which invent mathematics, conform to the reality of the cosmos. We are somehow tuned in to its truths. Since pure thought can penetrate the universe's mysteries, "this seems to be telling us that something about human consciousness is harmonious with the mind of God," says Carl Feit, a cancer biologist at Yeshiva University in New York and Talmudic scholar.

To most worshippers, a sense of the divine as an unseen presence behind the visible world is all well and good, but what they really yearn for is a God who acts in the world. Some scientists see an opening for this sort of god at the level of quantum or subatomic events. In this spooky realm, the behavior of particles is unpredictable. In perhaps the most famous example, a radioactive element might have a half-life of, say, one hour. Half-life means that half of the atoms in a sample will decay in that time; half will not, but what if you have only a single atom? Then, in an hour, it has a 50-50 chance of decaying. And what if the experiment is arranged so that if the atom does decay, it releases poison gas? If you have a cat in the lab, will the cat be alive or dead after the hour is up? Physicists have discovered that there is no way to determine, even in principle, what the atom would do. Some theologian-scientists see that decision point—will the atom decay or not? will the cat live or die—as one where God can act. "Quantum mechanics allows us to think of special divine action," says Russell. Even better, since few scientists abide miracles, God can act without violating the law of physics.

An even newer science, chaos theory, describes phenomena like the weather and some chemical reactions whose exact outcomes cannot be predicted. It could be, says Polkinghorne, that God selects which possibility becomes reality. This divine action would not violate physical laws either.

Most scientists still park their faith, if they have it, at the laboratory door. But just as belief can find inspiration in science, so scientists can find inspiration in belief. Physicist Mehdi Golshani of Sharif University of Technology in Tehran, drawing from the Koran, believes that natural phenomena are "God's signs in the universe," and that studying them is almost a religious obligation. The Koran asks humans to "travel in the earth, then see how He initiated the creation." Research, Golshani says, "is a worship act, in that it reveals more of the wonders of God's creation." The same strain runs through Judaism. Carl Feit cites Maimonides, "who said that the only pathway to achieve a love of God is by understanding the works of his hand, which is the natural universe. Knowing how the universe functions is crucial to a religious person because this is the world He created." Feit is hardly alone. According to a study released last year, 40 percent of American scientists

believe in a personal God—not merely an ineffable power and presence in the world, but a deity to whom they can pray.

To Joel Primack, an astrophysicist at the University of California, Santa Cruz, "practicing science [even] has a spiritual goal"—namely, providing inspiration. It turns out, explains Primack, that the largest size imaginable, the entire universe, is 10 with 29 zeros after it (in centimeters). The smallest size describes the subatomic world, and is 10 with 24 zeros (and a decimal) in front of it. Humans are right in the middle. Does this return us to a privileged place? Primack doesn't know, but he describes this as a "soul-satisfying cosmology."

Although skeptical scientists grumble that science has no need of religion, forward-looking theologians think religion needs science. Religion "is incapable of making its moral claims persuasive or its spiritual comfort effective [unless] its cognitive claims" are credible, argues physicist-theologian Russell. Although upwards of 90 percent of Americans believe in a personal God, fewer believe in a God who parts seas, or creates species one by one. To make religions forged millenniums ago relevant in an age of atoms and DNA, some theologians are "incorporat[ing] knowledge gained from natural science into the formation of doctrinal beliefs," says Ted Peters of Pacific Lutheran Seminary. Otherwise, says astronomer and Jesuit priest William Stoeger, religion is in danger of being seen, by people even minimally acquainted with science, "as an anachronism."

Science cannot prove the existence of God, let alone spy him at the end of a telescope. But to some believers, learning about the universe offers clues about what God might be like. As W. Mark Richardson of the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences says, "Science may not serve as an eyewitness of God the Creator, but it can serve as a character witness." One place to get a glimpse of God's character, ironically, is in the workings of evolution. Arthur Peacocke, a biochemist who became a priest in the Church of England in 1971, has no quarrel with evolution. To the contrary: he finds in it signs of God's nature. He infers, from evolution, that God has chosen to limit this omnipotence and omniscience. In other words, it is the appearance of chance mutations, and the Darwinian laws of natural selection acting on this "variation," that bring about the diversity of life on Earth. This process suggests a divine humility, a God who acts selflessly for the good of creation, says theologian John Haught, who founded the Georgetown (University) Center for the Study of Science and Religion. He calls this a "humble retreat on God's part": much as a loving parent lets a child be, and become, freely and without interference, so does God let creation make itself.

It would be an exaggeration to say that such sophisticated theological thinking is remaking religion at the level of the local parish, mosque or synagogue. But some of these ideas do resonate with ordinary worshippers and clergy. For Billy Crockett, president of Walking Angel Records in Dallas, the discoveries of quantum mechanics that he reads about in the paper reinforces his faith that "there is a lot of mystery in the nature of things." For other believers, an appreciation of science deepens faith. "Science produces in me a tremendous awe," says Sister Mary White of the Benedictine Meditation Center in St. Paul, Minn. "Science and spirituality have a common quest, which is a quest for truth." And if science has not yet

influenced religious thought and practice at the grass-roots level very much, just wait, says Ted Peters of CTNS. Much as feminism sneaked up on churches and is now shaping the liturgy, he predicts, "in 10 years science will be a major factor in how many ordinary religious people think."

Not everyone believes that's such a hot idea. "Science is a method, not a body of knowledge," says Michael Shermer, a director of the Skeptics Society, which debunks claims of the paranormal. "It can have nothing to say either way about whether there is a God. These are two such different things, it would be like using baseball stats to prove a point in football." Another red flag is that adherents of different faiths—like the Orthodox Jews, Anglicans, Quakers, Catholics and Muslims who spoke at the June conference in Berkeley—tend to find, in science, confirmation of what their particular religion has already taught them.

Take the difficult Christian concept of Jesus as both fully divine and fully human. It turns out that this duality has a parallel in quantum physics. In the early years of this century, physicists discovered that entities thought of as particles, like electrons, can also act as waves. And light, considered a wave, can in some experiments act like a barrage of particles. The orthodox interpretation of this strange situation is that light is, simultaneously, wave and particle. Electrons are, simultaneously, waves and particles. Which aspect of light one sees, which face an electron turns to a human observer, varies with the circumstances. So, too, with Jesus, suggests physicist F. Russell Stannard of England's Open University. Jesus is not to be seen as really God in human guise, or as really human but acting divine, says Stannard: "He was fully both." Finding these parallels may make some people feel, says Polkinghorne, "that this is not just some deeply weird Christian idea."

Jews aren't likely to make the same leap. And someone who is not already a believer will not join the faithful because of quantum mechanics; conversely, someone in whom science raises no doubts about faith probably isn't even listening. But to people in the middle, for whom science raises questions about religion, these new concordances can deepen a faith already present. As Feit says, "I don't think that by studying science you will be forced to conclude that there must be a God. But if you have already found God, then you can say, from understanding science, 'Ah, I see what God has done in the world.'"

In one sense, science and religion will never be truly reconciled. Perhaps they shouldn't be. The default setting of science is eternal doubt; the core of religion is faith. Yet profoundly religious people and great scientists are both driven to understand the world. Once, science and religion were viewed as two fundamentally different, even antagonistic, ways of pursuing that quest, and science stood accused of smothering faith and killing God. Now, it may strengthen belief. And although it cannot prove God's existence, science might whisper to believers where to seek the divine.

HOW THE HEAVENS GO

(By Kenneth L. Woodward)

That many contemporary scientists make room for god in their understanding of the cosmos should hardly be surprising. For most of history, religion and science have been siblings—feeding off and sparring with each other—rather than outright adversaries in the common human quest for understanding. Only in the West, and only after

the French Enlightenment in the 18th century, did the votaries of science and religion drift into separate ideological camps. And only in the 19th century, after Darwin, was the supposed irreconcilability between "God" and "science" elevated to the status of cultural myth. History tells a different, more complicated story.

In the ancient world, religious myth invested nature and the cosmos with divine emanations and powers. But this celestial pantheism did not prevent sober observation of the heavens and sophisticated mathematical calculations. By 1400 B.C. the Chinese had established a solar year of 365 days. Ancient India formulated the decimal system. Ancient Greece bequeathed Euclidean geometry, Ptolemy's map of the solar system and Aristotle's classification of living organisms, which served biologists until Darwin.

But none of these advances seriously disrupted religions' more comprehensive worldviews. Buddhists, for example, showed no interest in investigating nature since it was both impermanent and, at bottom, an illusion. Islam made great advances in algebra, geometry and optics, as well as philosophy. But Muslim scholars left the mysteries of physics—motion, causality, etc.—to the power of Allah and to the aphorisms of Aristotle, whose works they recovered and transmitted to the Christian West.

The Bible, of course, has its own creation myth, and it is that very story that eventually led scientists to realize that nature had to be discovered empirically and so fostered the development of science in the Christian West. The universe created by a rational God had to be rational and consistent—that much the Greeks already knew. But a universe created out of nothing, as Genesis described, also had to be contingent—that in other words, it could have turned out other than it did. It was only one of an infinite number of possibilities open to a wholly transcendent deity. Gradually, scientists realized that the laws governing such a universe could not be deduced from pure thought—as Aristotle supposed—but instead needed to be discovered through experiment. Thus was experimental science nurtured by religious doctrine.

When the scientific revolution did occur, in Europe early in the 17th century, and researchers for the first time began to regard the world as a mechanism whose workings they could probe through the scientific method, it wasn't God's existence that was thrown in doubt. Rather, it was Aristotle's "sacred geography," in which Earth and the heavenly bodies were fixed and eternal. Relying on Aristotle, medieval Christianity had imagined a tidy geocentric universe in which nature served man and mankind served God. "In a certain sense, religion got burned for locking itself too deeply into a particular scientific view which was then discarded," says Owen Gingerich, a professor of astronomy and the history of science at Harvard.

First Copernicus, then Galileo (aided by one of the first telescopes) and Kepler demonstrated with ever greater precision that the earth and other planets circled the sun. Humankind, it seemed, was peripheral to God and the universe. All three scientists, however, were devout Christians who defended their new worldview as most worthy of the Creator. But Copernicus and Kepler were denounced by Martin Luther for views he thought contradicted the bible, and Galileo was tried and condemned to house arrest by the Roman Inquisition. Although Pope John Paul II declared in 1992 that the

church had erred in condemning Galileo, the incident was never a simple conflict between science and religion. Galileo overstated the proof he could provide for a heliocentric (suncentered) cosmos and incautiously caricatured the pope in a published tract. Yet he could also quote one of the pope's own cardinals in his defense: "The intention of [the Bible] is to teach us how one goes to heaven, not how the heavens go."

In subsequent centuries, however, scientific theories of "how the heavens go" increasingly determined the place and power of God. The "celestial mechanics" of Isaac Newton produced a god who designed a world machine and somehow sustained it in motion. Theologians readily accepted whatever proofs for God's existence the new science chose to give. The result was a diminished "god of the gaps" inhabiting whatever dark corners science had not yet brought to rational light. In this way, says Jesuit theologian Michael Buckley of Boston College, theologians themselves cooperated in the advent of modern atheism by relying on science to explain God and ignoring "the traditional sources of religious insight and experience that make belief in God intelligible." By the 18th century, astronomer Pierre Laplace could explain nature as a self-sufficient mechanism. As for God, he told Emperor Napoleon, "I have no need of that hypothesis." Nor, a century later, did Darwin in his theory of evolution.

Now, at the end of the millennium, religion and science are beginning to talk, though neither answers to the other's authority. John Paul II consults with his Pontifical Academy of Science—most of whom are not Catholic. Philosophers of science examine the often-hidden assumptions on which scientific theories rest. Confronted by dimensions of the world no scripture has encoded, theologians are discovering a God who resists domestication into any single theory of how the world works. And at the center—still—are flawed and fragile human beings trying to understand a universe that has the uncomfortable feel of a home away from home.

AUGUSTUS ENGLEKEN STEVENS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, August is from the Latin Augustus, the eighth month of our calendar year, a time of harvest and of plenty, named after Augustus Caesar. Augustus Caesar, or, more formally, Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus. He was the grandnephew of Julius Caesar, and he was the first emperor of Rome, from 27 B.C. through 14 A.D. August is also an adjective, derived from the Latin verb meaning to increase, and in English meaning: to inspire awe and reverence, impose, something that is imposing and magnificent, or dignified and majestic. The adjective augustan refers also to the age of Augustus Caesar and his reign and suggests that anything so described is classical and elegant. The term Augustan age specifically refers to a period of Latin literature during the reign of Augustus Caesar, when elegance and correctness were highly valued. Oh, that we might return to that age at least in one sense, when elegance and correctness—not political correctness, but correctness—were highly valued.

Augustine, a diminutive form of Augustus, was the name of two saints, Saint Augustine of Hippo (354-430 A.D.), a Latin church father and bishop of Hippo, in northern Africa, known for his "Confessions" and his work "The City of God." The second Saint Augustine—the dates we are not sure of but we can believe that he lived until about 604 A.D. He was a Roman monk who went to spread Christianity among the English and who was the first Archbishop of Canterbury.

We can see from this that the name Augustus is fraught with significance and with portent. It is a name to be lived up to with great deeds and great learning. It is also the name conferred upon the newest member of Senator TED STEVENS' growing family, Augustus Engleken Stevens. My guess would be the middle name is Anglo-Saxon. And this is the third child of Senator STEVENS' third son, Ben.

It is also the tenth grandchild to join the impressive Stevens clan. This newest Caesar to rule with his chubby and imperious fist, and to issue edicts in a piercing wall, was born on Monday, July 27, at 3:20 p.m., weighing in at a healthy 7 pounds, 10 ounces.

I congratulate Senator STEVENS and his wife, Catherine, on this blessed addition to their family. As they well know, there is no greater joy than to gather into one's arms a tiny, peaceful bundle, and to gaze down upon that small, sleeping face, to gently stroke the soft, velvety down of hair and rounded cheek, and to listen closely for the faint murmurs and coos that slip almost unnoticed from that perfect cupid's bow of a mouth. What happier moment could there be, than to see that little mouth open in a sleepy, toothless yawn, or to catch a glimpse of a little foot—not much longer than a peanut, with toes so small that they could not possibly have working bones inside them—kicking out on bowed leg from within the folded blanket?

In choosing a name as ancient and as illustrious as Augustus, his parents—I surmise—have high hopes and grand ambitions for their infant son. I am sure that grandfather TED has great, grandiloquent schemes afoot as well, to bounce him on a hobbyhorse knee, or to take him salmon fishing in pristine Alaskan waters. I suspect that those who see TED on the Senate floor, shepherding appropriations bills through contentious debate to final passage—fists pounding and voice booming—might not recognize Senator STEVENS in his happier and more serene role as grandfather. But to be a grandfather is to be a happy man.

And what feelings of immortality, to be a grandfather. Holding this youngest member of his family, born in the waning days of this second millennium, the namesake of one whose life spanned the opening days of the first millennium, and poised to come into his own

birthright in the third millennium, Senator STEVENS can see history unfold into the coming ages. Through children and grandchildren, one has a glimpse of the glorious future, the immortality of the human race, tinged with the bittersweet sorrow of time passing too swiftly and of children who grow up much too quickly.

Lest I overwhelm young Augustus with the great weight of such high expectations and such intimations of immortality, I hasten to wish him a happy childhood, complete with much exploring, great adventures, barked shins and skinned knees, of quiet moments of wonder and learning, of great books to be shared with his parents and grandparents, and of countless hugs and kisses. Be a boy, Augustus, with moments good and bad, tender and terrible. Be like the Augustus in these lines by Heinrich Hoffman (1809-1874), who said:

Augustus was a chubby lad;
Fat ruddy cheeks Augustus had:
And everybody saw with joy
The plump and hearty, healthy boy.
He ate and drank as he was told,
And never let his soup get cold.
But one day, one winter's day,
He screamed out, 'Take the soup away!
O take the nasty soup away!
I won't have any soup to-day.'

Welcome, young emperor, and carry on, bringing ever your illustrious grandfather under your sway with the dictatorial charms of a much loved child.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am uncharacteristically speechless. I think—to listen to my good friend talk about my latest grandchild—he is absolutely right in one thing; and that is, there is nothing so humbling as to look at a grandchild and realize what that child means. Senator BYRD told me once that to have a grandchild is to touch infinity. And it is a very sobering thing to think about. But it is a joy to have these grandchildren. If one must get old, it helps a lot.

I thank the Senator very much.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2312, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2312) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, and the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 3379, to provide for appointment and term length for the staff director and general counsel of the Federal Election Commission.

Glenn amendment No. 3380, to provide additional funding for enforcement activities of the Federal Election Commission.

Graham/Mack amendment No. 3381, to provide funding for the Central Florida High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area.

Stevens amendment No. 3385, to provide for an adjustment in the computation of annuities for certain Federal officers and employees relating to average pay determinations.

Campbell (for Grassley) amendment No. 3386, to protect Federal law enforcement officers who intervene in certain situations to protect life or prevent bodily injury.

Harkin amendment No. 3387, to provide additional funding to reduce methamphetamine usage in High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.

Kohl (for Kerrey) amendment No. 3389, to express the sense of the Senate regarding payroll tax relief.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, yesterday I engaged in a colloquy with Senators KOHL and MOSELEY-BRAUN regarding the intent of report language in S. 2312 concerning tax standards for tax-exempt health clubs. In that colloquy, I stated that my expectation was that the report would "focus on adult fitness provided by tax-exempt organizations that serve only adults." However, both tax-exempt health clubs and for-profit health clubs serve entire families including young adults and children. While I believe the report should focus on adult fitness provided by tax-exempt organizations, tax-exempt organizations also offer non-adult service. The fact that they offer service to non-adults does not qualify an entity for tax-exempt status. Therefore, to eliminate any entity that provides any level of services to non-adults would greatly restrict the usefulness of this report in providing guidance to Congress. Again, I want to emphasize that my intent here is only for the IRS to provide Congress guidance in this area.

Therefore, I want to clarify that it is my expectation that the report will reflect the language in the report accompanying S. 2312 with the input of yesterday's colloquies as well as this clarification. Again, I want to thank Senators CAMPBELL and KOHL for their assistance on this and I look forward to working with them and all other interested Senators and parties on this issue.

AMENDMENT NO. 3388

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor to amendment number 3388 to the FY 1999

Treasury-Postal Appropriations legislation currently under consideration. This amendment is a combination of several amendments aimed at increasing support for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas administered by the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The Midwest HIDTA program has been extremely helpful to cracking down on drug trafficking in my rural state by coordinating federal, state and local law enforcement efforts to combat methamphetamine trafficking. While the Campbell-Kohl amendment addresses HIDTA programs nationwide, the Midwest HIDTA will be increased by \$3.5 million, bringing the total methamphetamine elimination funding to \$13 million for the Midwestern States of South Dakota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska and Kansas. The amendment will also add North Dakota to the Midwest HIDTA program which is crucial to tightening law enforcement's grip on meth traffickers in the area. I appreciate the efforts of my colleagues from Colorado and Wisconsin for recognizing that drug trafficking is not a uniquely coastal or urban problem, and that federal coordination and assistance is necessary for fighting drug use and trafficking nationwide.

DENVER COURTHOUSE

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an important funding issue contained in the Treasury and General Government appropriations bill. This appropriations bill provides \$84 million for construction of an annex to the Rogers Courthouse in Denver. The General Services Administration has included this project high on its list of priorities, at the recommendation of the Administrative Offices of the Courts. GSA and the AOC have provided me with detailed information on the costs of this courthouse and assured me repeatedly that these costs are prudent, practical and necessary to meet the future judicial needs of Colorado. I have also been assured that the renovated courthouse will be functional, but not extravagant. I have demanded this of every project on the list and will continue to work to ensure that this standard is applied to all new construction. Members of the Federal bench in Colorado have expressed gratitude that I have included construction money for the Rogers Courthouse. I am of course happy to help meet the needs of our federal legal system, especially in Colorado. In addition to the Rogers Courthouse, this bill contains fourteen other projects totaling almost \$500 million. I believe that if Congress is going to pass laws, we'd better provide sufficient attorneys and judges to enforce those laws and adequate facilities in which those laws may be administered.

I am aware of the growing federal caseload in other parts of Colorado. For example, the City of Grand Junction is experiencing rapid growth, and with that comes a need for more government attorneys and judges. Being

from the West Slope, I appreciate the time and expense required to travel to Denver. Traveling 5 or 8 hours to get to a federal court can be a burden to all parties in federal lawsuits.

While I am happy to accommodate the wish of the federal bench in Colorado to provide this money, I will continue to listen to members of the Colorado Federal Bar, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and other areas of the state that experience growing needs for judges and courtroom space to ensure that this appropriations bill accurately provides for the needs of the entire state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senate is to proceed to a sequence of votes on Amendments to the Treasury-Postal bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3385, WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 3385.

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

The amendment (No. 3385) was withdrawn.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

AMENDMENT NO. 3379

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first vote is on amendment No. 3379.

Mr. STEVENS. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been ordered.

This is the McConnell amendment. There are 2 minutes equally divided.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I urged last night to put this on the table. This would really knock the socks off any election law enforcement over at the FEC. We oppose this very much. It would mean there would be a restriction on the FEC that is not on any other agency or department of government as far as their general counsel goes and their staff director.

The efforts to oust him over there, I think, are unconscionable. He has been doing a good job. This just stands starkly opposed to our efforts for campaign finance reform.

At the appropriate time I will move to table this, but I yield the remaining time to Senator LEVIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this amendment is directly aimed at the independence of the Federal Elections Commission. It is aimed at no other commission. Its purpose is obvious—to eliminate a general counsel who has taken an independent position, following the Federal Election Commission's decision relative to soft money and other issues. We should not muzzle them. We should not throttle them. We should not destroy their independence.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the amendment is really quite simple. The Federal Election Commission is like no other commission of the Federal Government. It has three Republicans and three Democrats. The general counsel, under the current system, could serve for a lifetime. All the McConnell amendment does is require that every 4 years the general counsel come up for reappointment and not be reappointed unless he can achieve at least four votes, thereby demonstrating to the full Commission, on a bipartisan basis, enough confidence to continue for another 4-year term.

This guarantees that the general counsel will operate in a bipartisan manner, because a general counsel who, after 4 years, could not achieve votes from both parties, it seems to this Senator, clearly would fail a test of bipartisanship.

This is not about the current occupant of the office. It is about ensuring that the Federal Election Commission continues to operate on a bipartisan basis. I hope the amendment will be approved.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to table the McConnell amendment numbered 3379.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 3379. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "no."

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

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 246 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Felngold	Leahy
Baucus	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Lieberman
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Breaux	Harkin	Moynihan
Bryan	Hollings	Murray
Bumpers	Inouye	Reed
Byrd	Johnson	Reid
Cleland	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerry	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Torricelli
Dorgan	Landrieu	Wellstone
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wyden

NAYS—54

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Roth
Burns	Gregg	Santorum
Campbell	Hagel	Sessions
Chafee	Hatch	Shelby
Coats	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Collins	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Enzi	Mack	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Helms

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3379) was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have had, obviously, extensive consultation about how to proceed to this point. There is disagreement about this particular amendment and how we can complete the Treasury-Postal Service and other related agencies appropriations bill at this time.

In the interest of Senators to have time to work on the substance, what we have agreed to do is to set this bill aside—I will ask unanimous consent to that effect in a moment—and we would go on to the Department of Defense appropriations amendments and continue to work progressively, with the idea of finishing the Department of Defense appropriations bill as early as possible—hopefully, even tonight—which will allow us time to work on some nominations and allow Senators to attend the funeral tomorrow and adjourn for the recess at a reasonable hour tomorrow, or earlier if there is any way of doing it.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill be laid aside, not to recur prior to September 1, unless agreement is worked out in the meantime. There is hope that could be done. Maybe we could act on it after the DOD appropriations bill is completed. If not, it would be September 1. And no call for the regular order serves to displace the treasury bill, when it is pending in September, in the status quo.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, just for purposes of clarification, this would lock into place the current situation. The pending amendment would be, of course, the McConnell amendment. Senators wishing to offer amendments in the second degree subject to recognition would be recognized as authors of amendments in the second degree.

It is with that understanding that I do not object. I am sure the majority

leader would clarify and would conform with that understanding.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, that is correct. Second-degree amendments would be in order. We are freezing everything in place. We would not take it up again before September 1, unless an agreement were worked out. When we do go back to it, we will be right where we are now, and second-degree amendments will be in order.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I don't plan to object, I want to clarify, this would in no way affect the voting order we agreed to last night on other amendments?

Mr. LOTT. Everything would be just like it is at this very moment on this appropriations bill.

Mr. GLENN. Thank you.

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

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the defense bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2132) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3397

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes equally divided on the Feingold amendment.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, this amendment is about the National Guard. This amendment is about priorities in our Armed Forces, not about the merits of any aircraft proposed to be added to the Navy's aviation fleet. This amendment fills in almost all of the dangerous \$225 million shortfall in the National Guard's O&M account. As an offset, we use the House's recommendation on Super Hornet procurement for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, this amendment is supported by 25 State adjutants general. I hope my colleagues contact their State adjutants generals to get their opinion before casting their vote. I urge colleagues to support the National Guard and to vote against tabling this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment will eliminate the Navy's highest priority, or I would say the Defense Department's highest priority for the Navy, the F-18 E/F. It would move that money into the National Guard. We have already increased the National Guard by more than \$500 million above the budget request. So that approval of the National Guard Adjutants is a facade. This is to kill the F-18. I urge that the Senate support my motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 3397.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 247 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Akaka	Feinstein	McConnell
Allard	Ford	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Frist	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Biden	Gramm	Murray
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Boxer	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Gregg	Robb
Burns	Hagel	Roberts
Byrd	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Hollings	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Cleland	Hutchison	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kennedy	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
D'Amato	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Landrieu	Thomas
Dodd	Levin	Thompson
Domenici	Lieberman	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lott	Torricelli
Durbin	Lugar	Warner
Enzi	Mack	

NAYS—19

Bingaman	Graham	Leahy
Breaux	Harkin	Reid
Bryan	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Johnson	Wellstone
Conrad	Kerrey	Wyden
Daschle	Kohl	
Feingold	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—1

Helms

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3397) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, could we have order for just one moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to inform the Senate that tomorrow there will be another funeral. It is the funeral for Officer Chestnut. The agreement today was we would not have any votes until 1 p.m. Then we made that 2 p.m. because of the Intelligence Committee meeting. But we are going to have the same agreement now that we will not vote on the amendments that we take up later this evening until tomorrow at 1 p.m.

I am soon going to seek agreement that all amendments will have to be debated tonight, and we will start vot-

ing tomorrow at 1 p.m. on those that require a vote. We will have taken over half—we have agreed to take over half the amendments we know of now, and we very soon hope to be able to know what amendments there are, but we will work out that time agreement.

I think Senators should realize that without regard to anything else we do now, we are going to be here tomorrow, and we are going to start voting at 1 o'clock and not before. The alternative is if we get through these—we might be able to get through them tonight if Senators want to do that and be finished tonight. But we can't do that unless we see the amendments.

Now, I have asked two or three times for an agreement that Senators bring amendments through, that we have a time limit on when they must be disclosed, and we will try that again after the next vote. But we have to have some certainty. If Senators want to, we are going to be here until Sunday, because I will never, never allow a defense bill to hang over a recess. It just will not do. And I think anybody who understands defense understands it cannot happen. So we are going to finish this bill tonight or tomorrow or Saturday or Sunday. My plane doesn't leave until Monday.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. What is the next vote?

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield, Mr. President?

I inquire of the chairman of the committee, are we going to have votes this evening? Why wouldn't we vote on into the evening rather than having votes hanging over until tomorrow?

Mr. STEVENS. We might be able to do that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no vote on this bill take more than 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. Are we going to have votes then this evening, all into the evening?

Mr. STEVENS. We are going to vote on amendments when they come up. Whenever they come up, we will vote on them. Most of them are going to be motions to table, I will tell you. Most of them are going to be motions to table because most of this stuff is not relevant to this bill at all. So you might as well be put on notice, Republican or Democrat, I am going to move to table any nonrelevant amendments.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If I can question the floor manager relative to his intent, if we are in tomorrow and votes start at 1 o'clock, might it be possible to stack the votes in the event that actuality should be determined, because the last plane that I can catch is 2:20;

otherwise, I have to leave the next day. And I don't request special consideration. On the other hand, it just means another day's delay. So if we did go into tomorrow and we start voting, the 2:20 plane is the last one I can catch.

Mr. STEVENS. I tell my colleague I will do my best.

I renew my unanimous consent request that all remaining first-degree amendments in order to be offered to this bill must be presented and offered before 5 p.m.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, objection. I object.

Mr. STEVENS. There is the answer to my friend. I do not see how we can finish before 2:30 tomorrow afternoon unless we know what we are voting on.

What is the next order of business, Mr. President?

AMENDMENT NO. 3124

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the Hutchinson amendment No. 3124. There are 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I might say I am prepared to accept this. It is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment primarily.

This is the Senator from Arkansas. I do have a tabling motion in place on this, do I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the vote after 1 minute on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes equally divided.

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

There are 2 minutes equally divided. The Senator deserves to be heard.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, thank you for bringing the Senate to order.

This is an amendment that would simply deny visas and travel to those in the Chinese Government who the Secretary of State finds, by credible evidence, are involved in either forced abortions or religious persecution. It is not MFN, it is not IMF, it is not sanctions, but it would deny visas. China denies these practices are taking place. If that is the case, there would be no obstruction at all in diplomatic relations.

We provide in the amendment, and I hope everybody will look closely at the amendment, a Presidential waiver if it is in the national interest. This amendment passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives. I think, since the President returned, the most recent round of arrests of democratic dissidents underscores the need for this amendment.

It is a fleshshot, not a shotgun. We want to go after the bad guys, and that is all. It is not against trading. It

doesn't deal with trading. A vote against tabling this amendment is a vote for freedom in China.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the tabling motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the motion to table.

Mr. STEVENS. Senator THOMAS has a minute on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was under the impression the Senator from Alaska yielded back the time. If that is incorrect—

Mr. STEVENS. No; I did not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to follow the leadership of the floor leader and the bill leader here on this one. No. 1, it doesn't belong in this area. We are taking away all these amendments. I think that is the right thing to do.

The second point is those of us who have been working in this area for a very long time feel as if there is a process that is going on to make things better with China, to make our relations better.

No one disagrees with doing something about religious freedom. No one disagrees with any of these issues. The question is, How do you best do it? And the best way to do it is not to refuse to provide visas to the Chinese.

I urge we table this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce the the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

I further announced that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "no."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 70, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Akaka	Glenn	Moynihan
Baucus	Grams	Murray
Bingaman	Hagel	Reed
Bond	Hollings	Robb
Bumpers	Inouye	Roberts
Burns	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kennedy	Stevens
Cleland	Landrieu	Thomas
Domenici	Levin	Thurmond
Feinstein	Lugar	

NAYS—70

Abraham	Collins	Ford
Allard	Conrad	Frist
Ashcroft	Coverdell	Gorton
Bennett	Craig	Graham
Biden	D'Amato	Gramm
Boxer	Daschle	Grassley
Breaux	DeWine	Gregg
Brownback	Dodd	Harkin
Bryan	Dorgan	Hatch
Byrd	Durbin	Hutchinson
Campbell	Enzi	Hutchison
Coats	Faircloth	Inhofe
Cochran	Fetngold	Johnson

Kempthorne	McConnell	Smith (NH)
Kerrey	Mikulski	Smith (OR)
Kerry	Moseley-Braun	Snowe
Kohl	Murkowski	Specter
Kyl	Nickles	Thompson
Lautenberg	Reid	Torricelli
Leahy	Roth	Warner
Lieberman	Santorum	Wellstone
Lott	Sarbanes	Wyden
Mack	Sessions	
McCain	Shelby	

NOT VOTING—1

Helms

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3124) was rejected.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I am informed now there are at least two, maybe three, amendments that will be offered to this amendment. Under the circumstances, I would like to just suggest we set that aside for a minute and have the proponents talk to the author of the first-degree amendment to see if we might work something out as to how we limit the time or deal with this, if that is agreeable. If it is, then I would ask it be temporarily set aside.

I would like to take up the amendment No. 2964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Is that a unanimous consent request?

Mr. STEVENS. It is a request. I ask unanimous consent that it be temporarily set aside, and we take them up one by one. Hopefully, they will talk while we are doing this.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. When we temporarily set this aside and do the negotiations on the various second-degree amendments that are to be considered, when do you anticipate returning to—

Mr. STEVENS. I say to the Senator, there are two other amendments we could act upon now. Your amendment will automatically be the order when we finish those.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order would bring back the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2964

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the next amendment would be amendment No. 2964, offered by Senator ABRAHAM. There was no request for time that I know of for this. We are prepared to and do ask that—are the yeas and nays ordered on that amendment? I do not think they have been ordered. Have they?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the adoption of Senator ABRAHAM's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the Abraham amendment No. 2964.

The amendment (No. 2964) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Was there one more amendment we had to dispose of before we come back to the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is the Kyl amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. For the information of the Senate, Senator KYL asked that his amendment be set aside temporarily because the Armed Services Committee is meeting to consider a similar amendment. We would like to have that set aside until Senator KYL asks that it be brought up. I ask unanimous consent that Senator KYL's amendment be set aside.

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

We have two amendments pending from the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON.

Mr. STEVENS. There is one amendment on which the debate has been finished.

May I inquire of the Senator from Texas, is debate finished on the one amendment?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. That is correct. I have spoken on the first amendment, No. 3409. I am happy to yield back time on that.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am informed there is reluctance to accept that amendment until the Bosnia amendment is considered. I ask unanimous consent to set it aside temporarily, also, until that is resolved.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3124

Mr. STEVENS. We come back, then, to the pending amendment. As I understand, it is the regular order. And that is the amendment that was not tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. HUTCHINSON. The motion to table was not agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. That is open to amendment.

Mr. President, I think they are following the suggestion and perhaps discussing those second-degree amendments. I ask unanimous consent that, again, that be the pending business but it be temporarily set aside until the sponsor of that amendment can return to the floor. I also ask unanimous consent that we proceed with the Bosnia amendment by the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will

be amendment No.—I ask the Senator from Texas, 3409 or 3413?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Amendment No. 3413 has to do with Bosnia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 3413.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3413

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, amendment No. 3413 is to condition the use of appropriated funds for the purpose of an orderly and honorable reduction of U.S. ground forces in Bosnia.

It is a fact that the U.S. Armed Forces have accomplished the military mission assigned to them as a component of the implementation and stabilization forces. The continuing and open-ended commitment of U.S. ground forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is subject to the oversight authority of Congress.

Mr. President, this is the first time that Congress will vote on any kind of resolution that would establish some kind of policy on Bosnia since the President decided that it would be an unending mission.

On November 27, 1995, the President said that America would be part of a multinational military implementation force that would terminate in about a year. The President declared the expiration of the mandate to be December 20, 1996.

The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time expressed the critical importance of establishing a firm deadline in the absence of which there is a potential for expansion of the mission of U.S. forces. That was a forceful statement by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. He said it is a recipe for mission creep not to have a termination date.

On October 3, 1996, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs announced the intention of the United States to delay removal until March 1997. In November of 1996, the President announced that we would delay until June of 1998. The President did not request authorization by the Congress of a policy that would result in the further deployment of U.S. forces in Bosnia until June 1998.

Notwithstanding the passage of two previously established deadlines, the reaffirmation of those deadlines by senior national security officials, and the endorsement by those same national security officials of the importance of having a deadline, nevertheless, the President announced on December 17, 1997, that establishing a deadline had been a mistake and that U.S. ground combat forces would be committed to the NATO-led mission in Bosnia for an indefinite amount of time.

What my amendment does is very simple. It says that funds appropriated will not be made available except as conditioned below; that the President

will bring the number of troops down to 6,500 by February of next year and 5,000 by October of 1999, so we are staying within this fiscal year. Now, the exceptions are very broad at the discretion of the President and the Secretary of Defense that U.S. forces would have enough forces to protect themselves as the drawdowns proceed. So we are, of course, going to give the protection to the forces as the drawdown goes forward.

This doesn't take us out of Bosnia, which many in this body feel that we should do, that we should begin this at the base, for an honorable withdrawal. It just says, by the end of the fiscal year of the budget that we are considering, that our troop level would be down from about 8,500 to about 5,000. This should start the process of working with our allies to have a better distribution and sharing of responsibility among our allies and the United States.

This is a European security issue. The United States has approximately double the number of forces that any of our European allies have. We want to be a good ally. In fact, I don't want to pull up stakes and leave Bosnia without doing it in a responsible way. I think that is our responsibility. But, in fact, many of us have asked the President repeatedly to lay the groundwork with an established and clear mission that has a chance to succeed, a mission that has a finite term so that both our allies and any enemies of our cause would know exactly what to expect from America. That would not be possible at this time. We have said we were going to leave twice, and we have not left. We have not left, and we have not laid a proper base to leave.

What I am asking the President to consider and what I ask the American people to consider is that we start the process of realigning the forces in Bosnia so that our contribution would be reduced and our allies in NATO would begin to take a greater share of the burden.

Why is this important? We are looking at a time when our military readiness is being called into question. In fact, if you look at all of the responsibilities that America has in the world, we are spending too much on Bosnia and putting the future security of the United States and our ability to respond in the future in other places where America may have to respond, even unilaterally, in jeopardy. That is not the course we should be taking.

It is most important that America start with the issue of Bosnia and address it in a way that we should by putting it in context with our overall responsibilities in the world. The Bosnia operation has already diverted nearly \$10 billion from our national defense. A growing lament at the Pentagon among senior officers is that we are in danger of returning to the hollow

forces of the militaries of the late 1970s.

Let me mention some of the indicators that demonstrate our military is once again at risk. Last year, the military had its worst recruiting year since 1979. The Army failed to meet its objective to recruit infantry soldiers, the single most important specialty in the Army. A Senate Budget Committee investigator recently reported finding serious Army-wide personnel and readiness problems. At the National Training Center, where our troops go for advanced training, units rotating in typically come with a 60 percent shortage in mechanics and often a 50 percent shortage in infantry. These shortages were blamed on the fact that these personnel, especially the mechanics, are deployed abroad for missions such as Bosnia.

More than 350 Air Force pilots turned down the \$60,000 bonuses they would have received to remain in the cockpit another 5 years—a 29 percent acceptance rate. That is compared with 59 percent last year and 81 percent in 1995. That is a stark trend. The Air Force is finding that whatever the perks, it can't hold its best pilots. Last year, about 500 pilots resigned. Most of them were lured by the airlines. This year the number will be 700, and the Air Force says it is not able to train enough new pilots to replace them.

When I have gone and visited our bases overseas and at home and I ask our enlisted military men and women why we are losing our experienced people, almost every time the answer is: Too much time away from our families on operations that don't seem that necessary. A Senate Budget Committee investigator also found that some small units are now being led by junior people because sergeants are off on peacekeeping duty. As a result, subunits from basic squads on up do not train with the leaders they would go to war with—breaking the rule of training just as you would go to war.

Since 1991, the United States has cut its Armed Forces by about a third. It may be more difficult, more risky, and possibly more costly to invade Iraq right now. We are going to debate and vote on a resolution today, hopefully, expressing our support for the President's strong actions toward Iraq. But the fact is, if anything went wrong, we would have to divert troops from every theater in the world to prevail. Defense cuts of almost 50 percent over the last decade have put our security at risk. But this has been made worse by the diversion of U.S. resources and readiness to places where there is no security threat to the United States, such as Bosnia, Haiti, and elsewhere.

We have spent more time discussing Bosnia than missile defense, which is a security risk to our country. We are not developing a policy that is going to put our country in the best position to

deal with the myriad of issues that will face this country and our security in the next century.

President Clinton and his administration are missing a big-picture view of the world and the proper role for the United States. Our growing involvement in Bosnia is a good example of that. Just last week, U.S. forces were directly involved in tracking down and capturing a war criminal.

The Dayton accords have made it clear that apprehension of war criminals would be the responsibility of the parties to Dayton—civilian police and government officials. In fact, a little more than 1 year ago now, the former NATO commander, George Joulwan, told the Congress this:

The military are not policemen. And I think the proper responsibility rests on the parties. That is what Dayton says. . . [I]f we are not careful, we will go down this slippery slope where the military will be put in the position of hunting down war criminals. That is not within the mandate.

That is Gen. George Joulwan.

I joined with many of my colleagues in the Senate to oppose the decision to send troops to Bosnia. One of our principal concerns was that, once there, our mission would be indefinite, and that it might lead to mission creep. We were bolstered in our concerns by former Secretary of Defense William Perry and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Shalikashvili. They both warned that without a specific deadline for withdrawal there would be the potential for expanding the mission.

I am concerned that Secretary Perry's warnings are coming true. While we were on a recent recess, the President announced that thousands of U.S. troops would remain in Bosnia after the June 30 deadline, remembering that the Senate had unanimously endorsed that deadline of June 30, 1998, which his administration had established.

After 240 U.S. Marines were killed in Lebanon in 1984, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger established six principles upon which the decision to send U.S. ground troops should be based. Here is what he said:

The U.S. should not commit forces unless the engagement is in our vital national interest. If we do commit forces, we should have clearly defined political and military objectives. We should know how those objectives can be accomplished, and we should send the appropriate forces to complete the objectives. We must constantly reassess and adjust our relationship between our objectives and forces, if necessary. The commitment of troops should be a last resort, not the first.

We have violated virtually every one of Secretary Weinberger's principles in Bosnia. It was supposed to be a 1-year peacekeeping operation that would keep the factions apart until their own forces could come in and keep the peace from the ground up. They would have local elections and general elec-

tions for their national leadership. They would begin to resettle refugees.

Dayton has long since passed. I was in Brcko a year ago, 1 week before the eruption there in which U.S. troops were harmed. I was able to see how far we had come. I have been to Bosnia four times.

What I saw in Brcko was the resettling of refugees who did not even meet their next-door neighbors from the other factions, and I thought this is going to take a long time. The atrocities committed right in Brcko against thousands of Muslims are as bad as anything I have ever heard reported from the Nazi atrocities of World War II. Yet, we are trying to say "come and live together like Americans do." It looks like we are trying to create multiethnic neighborhoods, forcing people to do this prematurely, after the atrocities that have occurred in that country. This in itself can be antipeaceful. I think it is going to prolong the uprisings if we try to force this before the people themselves are ready—before the wounds have healed.

So I hope that we can let things settle, let the peace settle in, and let's do what we said we were going to do. Let's start training the people who are there to be a peacekeeping and police force. This could be done in an orderly way. We could begin with a NATO force that transitions and trains the forces that would come in behind them. They will be able to keep their peace, but it will not be an incentive for them to take over this job if they know that we are going to be there to do it for them.

I hope that we can create the base for an honorable exit. My amendment just tries to get a more equitable distribution of forces so that the burden is more equally shared between the United States and our NATO allies in Europe. It validates the legitimate responsibility that Congress has to authorize the long-term deployment of forces around the world by requiring a vote on the President's plan.

Without this amendment, we will be looking at American troops in Bosnia indefinitely. We will be looking at a never-ending commitment, and we will be taking resources that are vitally necessary for our own security and for our responsibilities around the world.

It is most important that we establish a policy that can succeed. Keeping thousands of American troops in a 30,000-troop enclave in Bosnia in perpetuity is not good military strategy and is not based on good policy. Remember what Shalikashvili said: "Having a defined deadline is important to avoid mission creep." We have learned that before and we should not forget the lesson. I think it is important for us to begin to act like the superpower that we are. When a superpower makes a commitment, it must be willing to back it up and do what it says it is going to do. It is so important that we

act firmly. It was important in Iraq. It is important in Bosnia that when we set deadlines, we meet them, so that everyone knows what to expect. It is most important, Mr. President, that we look at our security forces and the money that we are spending on our defense. We are lowering our defense expenditures while increasing the OPTEMPO—increasing the operations we are getting involved in around the world. This is despite warning after warning from past Presidents, from past Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs, from the experts who have seen history and have learned from it.

We can do things that no one else in the world can do. We can provide an umbrella of defense for ballistic missiles, for nuclear weaponry, but that takes a commitment of money and a commitment of will. If we are dissipating to the tune of about \$3 billion a year in a peacekeeping mission, which can be done just as well by any of our other allies, we are walking away from the responsibility we have to our allies to protect them in a way that only we can, because only we have the resources to do it.

Mr. President, I don't see how our colleagues can express alarm about the decline in U.S. readiness, and at the same time, ignore the policies that are causing the decline. It is our responsibility to act when our troops are going to be sent to an overseas conflict or missions of any kind when they are long-term. The President has now said it is going to be long-term—in fact, unending. If we don't have any set time, we will forget and the Bosnia operation will be in perpetuity. Those who are relying on us will continue to. Why shouldn't they? What incentive do they have to start the training of their own forces, which was envisioned in the Dayton accords?

I hope my colleagues will look at this very small first step in exercising Congress' responsibility. This is a precedent that has been set by Congresses in the past. We have set time deadlines. We have stopped the funding for operations that Congress did not think should be continued. This has happened in Cambodia, Vietnam, Somalia, Rwanda, and even in Korea, in the Philippines, and in Japan. We have spoken. In the past, Congress has stepped up to its responsibility. I hope it will today.

Mr. President, I will stop at this point because others want to speak. I do hope that my colleagues will focus carefully on this step. It is not even a major step of withdrawing from Bosnia. It is to just say we want our allies to accept more of the responsibility so that our troops will be able to do what they do best, and that is to train for the contingency that only we can address; that we will have the money to be able to invest in the technology that will protect the world from ballistic missiles and nuclear, biological, and

chemical weapons; and that we will not lose our most experienced personnel because they are worn out from mission fatigue on operations they do not see as threats to U.S. security.

Mr. President, I thank you. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of the Hutchison amendment, No. 3413, to the DOD appropriations bill concerning Bosnia.

I want to very sincerely commend the Senator from Texas for all the hard work she continues to devote to this important issue and for trying to craft a compromise that would be acceptable to a majority of our colleagues regarding the United States' ongoing presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As my friend from Texas has already explained, this amendment mandates a withdrawal of U.S. forces participating in the NATO Stabilization Force, or S-FOR, requiring that that force, or any future multi-national successor force, shall not exceed 6,500 troops by February 2, 1999, and 5,000 troops by October 1, 1999. The amendment enforces these levels by tying any appropriated funds for the Bosnia mission to this troop reduction.

This amendment represents something less than a funding cut-off for the mission, although that is a policy I have pursued in the past.

Rather, it suggests a slow and careful drawdown of U.S. forces in the region. In fact, it allows for troops to stay there past October of next year!

Mr. President, this is July 30. This is exactly 1 month after the date that we were supposed to be out of Bosnia in the first place. That isn't even accurate, because really we were supposed to be out of Bosnia in the first place, according to the promises that were made by both parties, by December 30, 1996. So we are way beyond that date.

Our troops have been there since 1995—much longer than the original 1-year mandate, and already longer than the expanded 18-month mandate for S-FOR—and I do not think anyone has a good idea how many more years we will be there.

More significantly, the cost of our involvement in Bosnia has increased dramatically—easily more than quadrupling the original \$2 billion estimate to over \$9 billion.

The estimate is that it is now well over \$9 billion for this commitment that has already been spent or obligated.

Mr. President, I regret that the managers of this bill earlier today agreed to a provision that would allow \$1.8 billion in additional funds for the Bosnia mission to be added to this bill with an emergency designation.

Mr. President, the mission in Bosnia has clearly ceased to be an emergency,

and this amendment even recognizes that fact.

The fact that the emergency designation was inserted into the bill this morning unfortunately highlights the fact that we in Congress continue to be lax in establishing some kind of accountability for our continued operation in Bosnia, and particularly for the taxpayer dollars that are needed to support that operation, soon to approach the astounding figure of \$10 billion.

I recognize that my continued opposition to the mission in Bosnia is not shared by everyone in Congress. But I think all of us would agree that the Congress has a constitutional responsibility to provide a check on the manner in which the executive branch spends money.

This is the way the President spends an annual budget request to the Congress with his plans for the following year's spending. From time to time there are emergencies that can not be foreseen, and we deal with those accordingly as emergencies.

But let me repeat again, U.S. involvement in Bosnia has ceased to be an emergency.

Rather, our presence in Bosnia has clearly become a substantial, long-term commitment. It is something the United States has, for better or worse, decided to do for the long-term. And we need to evaluate this operation on its merits accordingly, and not pretend that it is an appropriate occasion for an emergency designation.

The amendment by the Senator from Texas can at least put some real pressure on the administration to develop plans for a reduction in troop levels in Bosnia. The amendment also would have a positive budgetary impact, because we would need fewer resources to support a smaller troop presence.

Mr. President, with or without this amendment, I think we all recognize that there will be troops in Bosnia next year.

So, this is not an emergency, and I think the Congress has a responsibility to face that fact and deal with it accordingly.

I hope, therefore, that those of my colleagues who do support the mission in Bosnia will cease to resort to maneuvers regarding the funding of this mission that seek to avoid our budget spending caps! This has been going on far too long, and has eaten up too many of our resources—human, financial and otherwise. We cannot continue with this budgetary game.

Mr. President, I am pleased once again to join the junior Senator from Texas in trying to assert some kind of accountability for this mission. I urge my colleagues to support her amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is with reluctance I rise to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague, the Senator from Texas, because we share much the same goal. We had the same concerns about the deployment of our troops to Bosnia initially. We had the same concerns about the Dayton accord, which, as presented to us, was transparent on its face. It was disingenuous on its face that we could accomplish the task incorporated in Dayton with a 1-year period of time of deployment of our troops on the ground, a timetable unachievable by any measure. The continued existence of our involvement in Bosnia is something that I don't support.

But I believe that the amendment has a fatal flaw, and the fatal flaw is that it makes Congress the determiner of how many troops and what time period those troops will be deployed once that decision has been made by the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

I find it difficult to stand up here and defend the powers of the President of the United States, particularly at a time like this. But there are constitutional prerogatives and constitutional powers that I think need defending regardless of what your personal assessment is of any particular President.

Second, I believe it is unwise policy for those of us to make decisions about the force levels of our troops or decisions that micromanage how those troops conduct themselves and how they accomplish their mission once the decision has been made. Clearly, our responsibility, if we disagree with the presence of those troops and the deployment of those troops, is to address that by eliminating the funding for those troops, but not to determine the force level of those troops, the kind of equipment they ought to have, and what their timetable ought to be.

I quote from a letter from the Secretary of Defense dated May 21, 1998, when he says, "Our military commanders in the field have determined the level and type of force required to carry out the mission within acceptable risks. The mission force and guidance of the force currently planned for have been fully agreed to by military authorities. Military commanders"—under the amendment offered here—"Military commanders would be forced to restructure their force and mission tasks based on an arbitrarily mandated schedule rather than on mission accomplishment, operational consideration, and the fluid tactical situations they face. In addition, legislating withdrawal would incite heightened intransigence and extremism."

Mr. President, we sadly learned in Somalia, to cite one example, the disastrous and tragic consequences of political decisions overriding military requests. We lost some brave Americans unnecessarily because the political de-

cision was made to not provide those forces with the necessary equipment and not base a sufficient force there until our mission was accomplished. I don't want to see us doing that again.

We in Congress do not have the expertise to make that decision. Even if we did, we shouldn't make that decision. That is a decision that ought to be made by those who command the troops and make the decisions about their presence and what they need to be there.

So I strongly, strongly urge my colleagues to vote to table this amendment, not because they necessarily agree or disagree with whether or not this is a proper deployment, not because this impacts our readiness, which it does, not because it is costing a lot of money, which it is, not because it was a bad decision to start with, and an unachievable mission and objective to start with, because it is, but because it tells our troops that we in Congress know more about what they need, what the troop levels should be, what the date of withdrawal should be, how we accomplish the mission of our military commanders. Those men and women in uniform who we put in harm's way have to have every advantage we can give them in terms of protecting their security, in terms of accomplishing their mission, and it is a decision that has to be made by people with military expertise and not Members of Congress. For that reason, I strongly urge that we table this well-intended but, I think, misguided amendment.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the Bosnia amendment introduced by the junior Senator from Texas. Before I discuss the reasons for my opposition, I would like to commend the Senator for her continuing interest and involvement in U.S. foreign policy. The Senator is one of this body's most active Members, and while I have often opposed her legislative initiatives, which seemed to me unnecessarily to limit American involvement abroad, I value her enthusiasm and engagement.

The amendment that Senator HUTCHISON has proposed today sets arbitrary caps on our troop strength in Bosnia and micromanages their duties from the vantage point of Washington, D.C.—4,000 miles from Bosnia and Herzegovina! The amendment is fatally flawed.

Mr. President, the Hutchison amendment is predicated upon a false assertion: that the U.S. contribution to SFOR is inequitable and disproportionately large. I will return to that inaccurate claim in a moment.

Moreover, the amendment makes several incorrect claims about the current situation in Bosnia, for example that NATO forces participate in law enforcement activities there.

In circumscribing future activities, it also incorrectly implies that NATO

forces are transferring refugees or that refugees are relocating in order to control the territory of the other Bosnian entity.

But, Mr. President, the core of my opposition to the Hutchison amendment is the same as was my opposition last month to the Thurmond amendment to the Defense authorization bill.

Put quite simply, if the United States wishes to remain the leader of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, then it must continue to lead!

Mr. President, leadership means being present in all aspects of NATO operations and sharing in the risks.

The Hutchison amendment is a prescription for "NATO à la carte."

By February 1999 it would allow exceptions in Bosnia to the arbitrary troop limits in Bosnia only for self-protection as we withdraw our forces, to protect U.S. diplomatic facilities, or in advisory support roles.

That might work for a junior member of the Alliance, but not for the United States of America. Not for the leader of NATO.

Let me return to the false assumption that underlies the Hutchison amendment—that our participation in SFOR is disproportionately large.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, while the U.S. contribution to SFOR remains the largest single national contribution, the proportion of U.S. forces within NATO forces in Bosnia has declined dramatically since initial deployment in December 1995.

At the outset, U.S. troops made up fully one-third of IFOR. As a result of steady, measured reductions, U.S. participation has dropped to one-fifth of SFOR.

In other words, our allies and other SFOR partners have agreed to the U.S. taking disproportionate cuts in force numbers at each milestone, while continuing to accept U.S. command of the overall force.

At the current time, our European allies alone contribute more than three-and-one-half times the number of troops in SFOR than we do.

Attempting to lower the U.S. proportion to equal or below that of any single European ally would almost certainly cost us our command position. Some Members of the Senate might welcome such a development. I would not.

I want the United States to retain command of SFOR in order to ensure that the pace of implementing the Dayton Accords holds steady or accelerates.

I want the United States to retain command of SFOR in order to maximize the effectiveness and protection of the U.S. forces in Bosnia.

We are in Bosnia because helping to resolve the Bosnian problem is in our national interest.

As was repeatedly pointed out by this Senator and many others during the

debate on NATO enlargement last spring, that is the reason we are in Europe at all.

In political, security, and economic terms, we are a European power. Our engagement in Europe, including Bosnia, is not a charity operation. Stability in Europe benefits us.

The European allies of the United States are playing a major role in Bosnia.

Because of our leadership role in NATO, and because of our superior logistical capabilities, we have maintained command of SFOR. This is how it should be.

Like my colleagues, I am in favor of the speediest fulfillment of the Dayton Accords so that Bosnia and Herzegovina will have a self-sustaining democracy and all foreign troops may be withdrawn. American command of SFOR is the best guarantee that we can rapidly achieve this goal.

The Hutchison amendment would, I submit, gravely undermine that American command in Bosnia and would set in motion a process that could ultimately result in loss of the position of SACEUR, the command of NATO land forces in Europe.

For all these reasons, I oppose the Hutchison amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating it.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. President, I will take no more time. I know my friend from Arizona is about to make some comments.

Last spring this was a bad idea. Nothing has caused it to become a good idea in the summer. It was a bad idea then; it is a bad idea now. I hope it will be tabled.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank my friend from Delaware, who obviously is very knowledgeable on this issue and has stayed focused on these issues for many, many years.

I also wish to thank the Senator from Indiana for his very forceful presentation.

Mr. President, I believe everyone in this body knows that I have long had serious concerns about our mission in Bosnia. From the time the IFOR mission was first briefed to the Congress, I knew the job could not be completed in one year—nor against any arbitrary deadline. Instead, I urged the Administration to set concrete objectives and benchmarks for measuring success.

Now, as many members have pointed out, we are in an open-ended and ill-defined military commitment. The Administration has scrapped all the artificial deadlines. But no clear set of objectives and well-defined military missions has taken its place. We seem to drift in and out of going after war criminals, of using the military to resettle refugees, and of taking on a direct political role in parts of Bosnia in

the name of supporting international civilian authorities. The role of our military has expanded, and there is no end in sight.

The answer to this problem, however, is not to go back and set new artificial deadlines or troop levels. And make no mistake about it, Mr. President. The amendment before us is little different than the one the Senate rejected last month.

Bosnia is a long-term, complicated problem. It involves not only the warring factions, but has direct effects on Croatia and Serbia, including Kosovo, and threatens to spill over to the wider Balkan region. The credibility of NATO and especially the United States is tied up with finding a solution for the Bosnia crisis. It would be sheer irresponsibility, probably leading to renewed warfare, if we were to precipitously pull out of Bosnia after investing so much. It would be a betrayal of our commitment to cooperating with our Allies. And it could well lead to an even more costly and dangerous re-introduction of American forces to stop the renewed fighting.

Dealing with the Bosnia crisis—even if though our objective is to get American troops out of there—requires treating Bosnia as a serious long-term challenge. It is not an issue that lends itself to artificial deadlines for withdrawal. Nor is there any rationale for forcing the Congress to vote by some artificial deadline. Worse still would be a funding cut-off, which would only punish our troops for the failure of policy makers in Washington to craft a viable long term policy.

I would like to offer six principles that I believe should guide our policy:

(1) The U.S. has no permanent national interests in Bosnia. We are not interested in nation-building for its own sake. All we want is to create a self-sustaining peace. We must carry out our responsibilities and then get out.

(2) Our withdrawal must not precipitate renewed warfare in Bosnia.

(3) There must be no phony deadlines—whether for a withdrawal date, a Senate vote, or anything else. We have all the power we need to act whenever we want. We don't need a deadline. We need sound policy.

(4) There must be no funding cut-offs or troop limits. This would only hurt our troops on the ground. The real problem is policy making here in Washington. It needs to be solved here.

(5) There must be no micro-management of the military. The Congress and Administration must provide political leadership. We must make the tough decisions and bear the consequences. The military's job is to implement our decisions as effectively as possible based solely on military considerations. The military has no business making political decisions for us, and we have no business making military decisions for them.

(6) The U.S. must provide leadership. No other country in the world has the political, military, and moral authority to exert leadership. Simply packing our bags and walking away is not an option. We must not simply abandon our Allies. We must leave Bosnia, but with dignity and leadership, leaving behind a well-planned succession.

Handling the Bosnia crisis requires us to look beyond just this fiscal year. It requires the United States to develop a multi-year strategy that sets out our objectives, the means for achieving these objectives, and a target timetable for getting us there—but no phony deadlines. For the sake of our troops, we need to set out clearly the military and nonmilitary missions they are being asked to perform. 'Creative ambiguity' may be useful in politics, but it is dangerous for soldiers. We need to be honest with ourselves about the risks we are asking our troops to face, and the costs to the taxpayers of continuing the mission.

I am convinced that the direction we should be taking is to move toward a force made up of European nations inside Bosnia, with U.S. forces just "over-the-horizon" outside of Bosnia—providing a rapid response capability to deter security threats, and providing logistical, intelligence, and air support to the European forces inside Bosnia. This step would free up U.S. forces to prepare for other contingencies.

But it is not possible to achieve this goal simply by setting arbitrary numbers, or even numbers arrived at through an averaging process involving contributions of countries with militaries' a fraction the size of our own, and deadlines for troop withdrawals. Doing so could provoke a crisis with our Allies and could have the effect of simply setting a timeable for restoring violence to Bosnia. Instead, achieving this goal requires working together with our Allies and realistically taking account of the situation inside Bosnia.

Mr. President, the Senate already approved an amendment, of which I sponsored, that seeks to do exactly these things. It imposes a number of reporting requirements, designed to provide the basis for moving us in the direction we all want to go. According to the amendment already passed by the Senate just over one month ago, each time the Administration submits a budget request for funding military operations in Bosnia, the Administration must clearly state its best assessment of six items:

(1) our overall objectives and multi-year timetable for achieving these objectives—taking account of the benchmarks already required under the supplemental appropriation passed earlier this year;

(2) the military and nonmilitary missions the President has directed U.S. forces to carry out—including specific language on our policy on war

criminals, returning refugees, police functions, and support for civil implementation;

(3) the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's assessment of the risks these missions present to U.S. military personnel;

(4) the cost of executing our strategy over several fiscal years.

(5) the status of plans to move forward a European force inside Bosnia with a U.S. force outside Bosnia that would deter threats and provide support to the European force; and

(6) an assessment of the impact of reducing our forces according to the timetable proposed in the original Byrd-Hutchison amendment.

This may seem like a detailed and onerous reporting requirement, but it is nothing more than the king of long-term planning the Administration should be doing anyway. And by requiring it in a report to Congress, we ensure that the Congress is operating off the same set of assumptions and plans as the Administration. This will give us an opportunity to look more thoughtfully at the real challenges in Bosnia and structure our decisions more appropriately. Instead of broad swipes through artificial deadlines or prohibitions on certain missions, we will be able to target our policy choices more effectively.

Mr. President, I am not going to elaborate very much on what the Senator from Indiana had to say, except to ask unanimous consent that a letter to Senator STROM THURMOND, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, written by General Shelton and Secretary Cohen be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, 21 May 1998.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We write to express our concerns with any amendment that would legislate a date or schedule for withdrawal or reduction of US forces from the NATO-led mission in Bosnia. Such amendments would make it more difficult to accomplish the mission, which has been remarkable successful to date.

It is our intention to reduce our forces in Bosnia. Based on the progress achieved to date, our commanders already have been able to reduce US troop levels from almost 20,000 in 1996 to the 6,900 that will be deployed after the current drawdown is completed in September. We will conduct regular reviews of our force posture and progress toward the benchmarks we have established, and we expect further reductions will be possible. But that determination is best based on the actual situation on the ground, the military advice of our commanders in the field, and the approval of the NATO military and political authorities, not an arbitrary withdrawal or reduction dates determined long in advance.

Our military commanders in the field have determined the level and type of force re-

quired to carry out the mission within acceptable risk. The mission, forces and guidance of the force currently planned for June 1998 have been fully agreed to by NATO political and military authorities. Under a legislated approach, military commanders would be forced to restructure their force and mission tasks based on an arbitrarily mandated schedule rather than on mission accomplishment, operational considerations, and the fluid tactical situation they face. In addition, while those opposed to the Dayton Accords have been steadily isolated and diminished in their influence, legislating withdrawal of reduction dates would invite heightened intransigence and extremism.

Additional factors that Congress should consider in reviewing any such amendment are the following:

Under the proposed amendment, command of the SFOR operation and its element in MND-North might well be transferred to a non-US officer early next year.

Shifting to a posture in which the US has much smaller force levels in Bosnia but enhances its force presence in regions surrounding Bosnia, as envisioned by the amendment, will not save money and indeed could cost more than our current operation in Bosnia. We are continually evaluating the force posture for Bosnia, and do not consider an over-the-horizon force appropriate now.

Accordingly, we strongly urge you to oppose any legislated fixed date or timetable for withdrawal or reduction of US forces in Bosnia.

There is one other factor related to operations in Bosnia of great concern to us, and that is funding. The Department submitted an addition to the FY99 budget to fund a 6,900-person force in Bosnia. Authorizing that request is essential to accomplishing the mission without significantly reducing readiness in other areas. Without that funding, we would have to choose between Bosnia operations and the overall readiness of our Armed Forces.

Sincerely,

HENRY H. SHELTON.
BILL COHEN.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, in Secretary Cohen and General Shelton's letter the Senator from Indiana just referred to, it is very important to understand what they are saying here:

Under a legislated approach, military commanders will be forced to restructure their force and mission tasks based on an arbitrarily mandated schedule rather than on mission accomplishment, operational considerations and the fluid tactical situation they face. In addition, while those opposed to the Dayton Accords have been steadily isolated and diminished in their influence, legislating withdrawal of reduction dates would invite heightened intransigence and extremism.

So that is the view of the people to whom we entrust the care of our men and women in the military.

I think it would be very appropriate to have a vigorous and, I think, illuminating debate on the issue of whether the troops should be there at all. Congress clearly has the right to cut off funding for any military operation anywhere in the world. But I see nowhere in the Constitution where we have the right to, indeed, decide the levels of troops that should be there. I pride myself on the fact that I had some time in the service of our country

wearing a uniform, but no way does that give me the expertise or the knowledge to set a troop level. That responsibility is entrusted to our civilian and military commanders.

So it is with reluctance, because I agree with the thrust of what Senator HUTCHISON is saying, Mr. President, I move to table the Hutchison amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to speak on this amendment before he moves to table?

Mr. McCAIN. Absolutely.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Will the Senator also allow others who said they would like to speak on this amendment to speak and then move to table?

Mr. McCAIN. I do not intend that the request—I will allow the distinguished manager of the bill. It is nearly 5 o'clock. We have 50 pending amendments.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would like to be able to close.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw the motion to table?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCAIN. I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair needs to know whether the Senator has withdrawn his motion to table.

Mr. McCAIN. I withdraw my motion to table and I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I was trying to condition that motion to table. I know Senator BYRD is one of the original cosponsors, Senator HUTCHISON also. But we do have to move along. I am a cosponsor also. But I do think we have to have some time limit.

Would the Senator be willing to have some discussion as to a time when we might be able to vote?

Mr. BYRD. I, first of all, wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for withholding his motion. I would probably need 25 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. And how much time does the Senator want?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, Senator INHOFE and Senator SESSIONS have both asked to speak for approximately 10 minutes each, and then I would like to close on my amendment with about 10 minutes.

Mr. McCAIN. Senator INHOFE said he does not wish to speak on the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. He has gone to a meeting.

Mr. President, I would like to put some time restraints on this, if we could. I would like to see if we could have the vote take place no later than quarter to 6.

Could we have that agreement?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, a lot of us withheld speaking against this amendment, and

I hope that maybe just the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, would speak and then all those who already spoke refrain from speaking again so people such as me don't feel compelled to stand up and respond. We are trying to get this done. Because the Senator from Arizona was kind enough to withhold his motion to table, I hope we could agree that after the Senator from West Virginia speaks, and maybe the Senator from Texas takes a couple minutes to close out, we then let the Senator move. It would be helpful.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would then ask unanimous consent that Senator BYRD be recognized, and the Senator from Texas have whatever time is remaining, and the Senator from Arizona be recognized to make his motion to table at 5:30. And it is with the understanding that if the amendment is not tabled, there is no agreement on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. After Senator BYRD speaks, I would be allowed at least 5 minutes to close?

Mr. STEVENS. That leaves 10 minutes, I might say to the Senator, in her control; 25 minutes in the control of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. That will be fine. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The unanimous consent agreement is accepted.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. STEVENS. Pardon me. The agreement is the Senator from Arizona will be recognized, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is part of the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Has the agreement been entered into?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, it has. Is the Senator from Michigan upset?

Mr. LEVIN. I would like 5 minutes, if I could.

Mr. STEVENS. On which amendment?

Mr. LEVIN. On the pending amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator has not spoken on the amendment.

May I extend him another 5 minutes. We will vote, then—let's put that off. When that time has expired, I do want to ask unanimous consent that we then proceed to the Hutchinson amendment in the second degree to his amendment, and following that, there will be a vote. I understand there is an agreement so I don't think we need a time agreement. But I would ask that the time on this expire at 5:40 and that we then proceed to the Hutchinson amendment in the second degree—there will be three comments about that amendment—and that we vote on both of those amendments at 6 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BIDEN. Reserving the right to object, why didn't the Senator just leave it at 5:30 the way you had it? I think the Senator from Michigan may be willing to take, say, a minute.

Mr. STEVENS. Very well. At 5:30 he gets a minute, and we will go back. We still want to have a vote on the two amendments at the same time. I will renew that request later.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, but I will not object, could I just inquire, did I understand the Senator to say that the second degree will be in order if the amendment is not tabled?

Mr. STEVENS. If it is not tabled. There is no second-degree amendment available because the Senator from Arizona will be recognized to table at the end of these statements.

Mr. COATS. If not tabled, the second degree—

Mr. STEVENS. If not tabled, the second degree is still in order.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank all Senators, and I, again, thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, for offering this amendment regarding the continued participation of U.S. forces in the NATO operation in Bosnia. She has been a persistent and thorough overseer of the situation there. I share her concern that Bosnia not become another forgotten war, another long term military mission whose purpose and even existence is largely ignored, unremarked upon unless something terrible happens. In that unhappy event, of course, much shouting and finger-pointing would ensue, amid calls to "bring our boys home, now."

It is Congress's Constitutional duty to provide for the maintenance of the military, as we are doing in this bill, and that includes those instances in which U.S. troops are pressed into service. We have an obligation to the men and women in our military services not only to provide for them, but also to provide our concurrence and oversight on the ways and places that they are employed. I believe that that calls for something more compelling than Sense of Congress resolutions, such as those that have been passed, one that has been passed during the debate on the Department of Defense Authorization bill last month, but I recognize that, sadly, the majority of my colleagues do not share my opinion. So I applaud Senator HUTCHISON for steaming ahead on the strength of her convictions, despite the somewhat daunting odds.

U.S. troops have been in Bosnia since the Dayton Peace Accords were signed in December 1995. Some 25,000 U.S. troops formed the U.S. contingent of

the NATO-led force that replaced the failing United Nations peacekeeping effort there since 1992. The original mission of the NATO force was quite limited—to separate the warring factions, contain the heavy weapons that were bombarding defenseless towns and cities, and begin to mark the hazardous and indiscriminately strewn minefields so that civilians could take over the arduous task of clearing mines. The U.S. had to lead, because our European allies would not rally behind anyone else. This task, we were assured at that time, would take "about one year." And that was in 1995.

As that initial year drew to a close, the military tasks were declared essentially complete, and the situation on the ground was, indeed, transformed. While far from enjoying the kind of security that we in the United States take for granted, people could at least seek water without dodging shells and gunfire. The civilian efforts to reestablish Bosnian society, however, had barely begun. NATO leaders agreed to leave substantial numbers of troops in place to keep the peace while the civilian rebuilding effort continued. That is understandable. Again, the U.S., we were assured, must take the lead, because if we left, our European NATO allies would march out right behind us. We were told that the troops would be needed only through June 1998. That was in 1996.

Now it is July 1998, almost August. We have been told that the considerable progress being made in rebuilding a government and civilian infrastructure requires the continued reassurance of a NATO peacekeeping force. Elections are scheduled for September, and more work needs to be done to establish a competent and impartial justice system that has the trust of the populace. Therefore, the Administration announced a substantial shift in U.S. policy on Bosnia in December 1997—there would be no further estimates regarding the end of a U.S. presence in Bosnia. The U.S. and NATO would leave when sufficient progress was made in achieving certain benchmarks. The complete and detailed benchmarks are classified, but the unclassified summary that I have seen is fairly lengthy. It basically says that when Bosnian government and institutions resemble those of the United States, then our troops might leave.

Mr. President, that is a pretty big order. Bosnia has never previously resembled the United States, with free press, alternative media, free and fair multiparty elections, a clean and impartial judiciary, free access throughout the country, and so forth. For most of this century, Bosnia was part of communist Yugoslavia. Prior to that, it was part of a monarchy, and before that, it was part of the Ottoman Empire. This leads me to suspect that U.S. troops might be in Bosnia for a very

long time, indeed, before Bosnia becomes a happy, peaceful, multi-ethnic republic. And this assumes, of course, that everyone in Bosnia shares this same aspiration, and that no one will try to undermine the progress towards this utopian vision.

Now, Mr. President, I do not want to create the impression that I am against helping the suffering people of Bosnia to establish a sound government that can lead them into a peaceful and prosperous future in the family of nations. The amendment of the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, also does not call for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Bosnia. This amendment appreciates the investment that has been made for peace in Bosnia and does not jeopardize that still fragile situation, but it also recognizes the considerable costs of that investment.

I believe that Senator HUTCHISON's effort addresses three very basic questions regarding the continuing role of U.S. forces in Bosnia. These are the questions:

First, does this Senate really want to acquiesce to an open-ended commitment in Bosnia for the foreseeable future? The United States has spent \$8.6 billion, or about \$2 billion a year, to maintain our presence in Bosnia from Fiscal Year 1996 through Fiscal Year 1999. If you include the U.S. share of the United Nations operation in Bosnia from 1992 through 1995, the total cost is about \$9.5 billion.

That is a lot of money. That is \$9.50 for every minute since Jesus Christ was born, 2,000 years ago. For every minute since Jesus Christ was born, 2,000 years ago, \$9.50. For every minute. That is what it equals.

This bill provides \$1.86 billion for Bosnia operating costs for Fiscal Year 1999, under an emergency declaration.

There are approximately 6700 troops inside Bosnia now, down from almost 10,000, and another 3,000 more are supporting them from bases in Hungary, Italy, and on ships in the Mediterranean. These troops and these funds are not available to meet other crises that might arise, such as that developing in Kosovo, and they are not available to protect U.S. core national security interests. Further, the support troops employed in this mission are drawn heavily from the Guard and Reserves, creating hardships for our part-time military and their employers. The President will need to request continued Reserve call-up authority in August to maintain the Bosnia operation. These readiness questions must be measured against the estimate of how many troops are needed to provide continued reassurance for civilian reconstruction in Bosnia—what is the minimum number of troops required to provide that reassurance? And for how long? And at what cost? Let us not be satisfied with the status quo, if a lower number is adequate or if a shorter time

is sufficient. There are too many other demands being placed upon U.S. Armed Forces for us to be spendthrifts in this regard.

Second, does the Senate wish to continue to allow the United States to be led by the reluctance of others? Must the United States continue to provide a substantially greater number of troops than any of the other NATO allies, as is now envisioned? If we cannot pass the baton of leadership because our European allies will not lead, then should we not at least push them into carrying an equal military burden for a situation that is, after all, on their borders, not on ours? I know that it is easier to be a follower than a leader, easier to be a critic rather than a playwright, but as the Bosnia operation settles into a routine, surely some of this burden could be assumed by our allies.

Third, does the Senate want to abstain from placing limits on the role that U.S. forces should play in Bosnia? Or do we want to enhance the safety of the men and women we are supporting on the ground there by prohibiting them from performing the kinds of activities that put them in harm's way by making them appear to side with one ethnic group over another? NATO forces have played an increasing role in the capture of war criminals, and have taken over radio transmission towers linked with propaganda practices. A news story from early July reported that U.S. special operations teams came very close to mounting a "snatch and grab" exercise designed to capture Serb military leaders before commanders on the ground declared that the intelligence was insufficient to ensure a reasonable chance of success. The longer we stay in Bosnia, and the more manpower we have to spare, the more such jobs we will be drawn into doing. It is the American way, to say, "we'll pitch in." And we are suckers for the underdog. But that can be dangerous in a place as rife with centuries-old animosities as Bosnia. These ethnic and religious factions know how to carry a grudge, how to nurse an injustice, through centuries if need be.

With these questions in mind, consider the current situation in the Balkans, as Senator HUTCHISON has. Bosnia is relatively stable. No one is shooting at each other, and no one is shooting at the NATO forces. But, Kosovo, on its borders, is not stable. There, the situation is rapidly degenerating. Already more than 10,000 refugees have fled into neighboring Albania to seek refuge from Serbian dominated Yugoslav military forces who are ruthlessly squashing a separatist movement in ethnically Albanian Kosovo, which had been an autonomous region of Yugoslavia until 1989. The situation is complex and, frighteningly, contains the potential to draw in neighboring nations and even NATO members. This

is the dreaded "spillover" that was much discussed when the ethnic conflagration in Bosnia erupted in 1992.

NATO officials have already contemplated what forces might be necessary to contain the conflict in Kosovo. Even with over 20,000 troops spread along the mountainous border between Kosovo and Albania, they concluded, the probability of success would be low. Air strikes are under consideration. Diplomatic efforts are ongoing, but the Yugoslav leader, Slobodan Milosevic has an unsavory history of playing both ends against the middle to achieve his goals.

It is clear that the cost of maintaining a large presence in Bosnia could be fairly high if forces are needed to contain the conflict in Kosovo and keep it from engulfing a large part of the Balkans. Our NATO allies will happily continue to let the U.S. carry the heaviest load in addition to the burdens of leadership, if all it takes is to threaten to beat us through the exit door, should we decide to leave. To hear them say it, it would be quite a stampede, no matter what the consequences are for Bosnia and their own continent's future.

The amendment offered by Senator HUTCHISON calls for a gradual ramping down of the U.S. presence in Bosnia, reducing our forces there to 5,000 by October 1, 1999, a number roughly equivalent to that of Britain, the next largest contributor to the NATO mission. The amendment of the Senator from Texas also limits the mission of those remaining forces to the security role assigned to them in 1995. This honors U.S. NATO commitments in Bosnia, protects our men and women in the military from being put in a position of playing favorites and therefore creating enemies, while freeing up troops, energy, and funds for other pressing security matters.

The United States cannot continue to pick up the largest burden of every NATO military mission. While our allies have been reducing their military budgets and forces since the cold war ended, the United States military has been strained by the increasing number of calls to respond to crises around the world—in Somalia, Rwanda, Haiti, Iraq, Bosnia, and next, perhaps, in Kosovo. Our generosity in picking up the bulk of the tab has, I fear, marked us as a patsy, a patsy who can be suckered into bankrolling everyone's problems with funds and troops. If we keep doing it, what incentive is there for anyone else to develop the expertise, training, and tools to take over appropriate parts of that role?

I wish that the administration would put its support behind this amendment. I think it would strengthen the administration's position in talking with our allies in Europe, and it would seem to me that would be a very beneficial thing, insofar as the administration is concerned.

Mr. President, I believe that Senator HUTCHISON has offered a blueprint for the continued U.S. participation in Bosnia that supports our NATO commitment, even our leadership role, but not at the cost of maintaining a disproportionate force size. The most important thing we can do here today is to let the soldiers and airmen out there so far away know that we are watching, and that we care enough about them to act in their best interests. They are not America's forgotten heroes, out of sight and out of mind unless trouble comes their way. We are there with them, in thought and in deed, and we will not keep any more of them engaged in lengthy and lonely overseas deployments for any longer than is absolutely necessary. I will vote for the Hutchison amendment. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to say a couple things that I think are very important. I think this amendment is much more important than it may appear to some who probably will be casting their vote on it. We are a great Nation, the greatest Nation in the history of the world. This body, this Senate, has traditionally been involved in American foreign policy and American national defense. We are spending a very large sum of money on this mission which is ill-defined and provides little immediate benefit to our Nation. Other nations which have a far clearer and more direct interest in it are contributing far less to it.

This mission has exceeded \$10 billion, money which comes from the American taxpayers. We went through a BRAC process, a base-closing process of which the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Oklahoma, who is here today, are all quite aware. We saved \$9 billion. We spent more than that already on Bosnia, an operation that has very little vision. The President has articulated very poorly and inadequately, in my opinion, any justification for an extended mission with no end in sight.

As the President said in remarks earlier, it was a political decision to move into this area of the world. Therefore, it is a decision quite appropriate for this body to respond to. I say it is time for us to confront the issue, demand some answers, require the President to be responsible, and assert our rightful role as a U.S. Senate in American national defense. I am, frankly, disappointed that a Senator would move

to table and cut off debate on this issue.

I think we ought to say a lot more about it, and we ought to have a lot of time talking about it, not be cutting off this debate. Maybe some of them have made up their minds, they think they know what is best for everybody else here, but I am not so certain they do. So I don't know.

I do not have much time. I know others do. And we are going to have the vote on the motion to table shortly. And I just feel very strongly about it. We have a role in this world, not to be the policemen. We have ballistic missile defense. We have chemical, biological weapons. We have strategic capabilities that we must fulfill. We cannot just drift into this without a clear understanding of our mission.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I yield up to 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding the time. It is very precious time. There isn't nearly time to get into the seriousness of this issue. The Senator from Alabama is exactly right, there is no issue before this body that is more significant than this particular issue.

We have stood here and debated this at least once a month since November of 1995. If I could criticize the Senator from Texas, I would say this isn't strong enough. But I know she knows it is not strong enough either. We should have a date. We should be out of there. And it isn't being hardhearted, it isn't being uncompassionate.

This is something where the times are different now than they were back in 1995. If you just look at a very recent development, the Rumsfeld report came out. And if you will remember, the national intelligence estimate that came out in 1995, that said we would have a good 3 years' warning, in 3 years, to participate in preparing for a national missile defense system. Now the Rumsfeld report has come out and said that isn't true at all, that we are out of time, we are naked—if we started today to deploy a system and put it into effect, we would not be able to do it.

What has that got to do with Bosnia? It is very simple, because in Bosnia right now they are using up our military assets to the extent that we are not able to carry out the minimum expectations of the American people, which would be to defend America on two regional fronts.

If you do not believe this, go to the 21st TACOM in Germany. They are responsible for the ground support, anything that will happen in that theater. That theater includes Iraq. That means that if something should happen, we should have to surgically strike Iraq—I do not think there is a person in America who does not believe that is a

possibility—we would eventually have to go in on the ground and clean it up.

How do you do that? If you go to the 21st TACOM in Germany, they will say we are right now over 100 percent capacity in just supporting Bosnia. We have M-915 trucks that have a million miles on them right now trying to carry the support over there and support Bosnia on the ground. Until we are able to get that out, we are not going to be able to adequately meet the defense needs.

I hope that you read, Mr. President, just in this morning's Inside the Pentagon: "The Navy's ability to retain its carrier aviators has hit its lowest historical annual rate. . . ."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. I thought I had 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We believe the time allocated to the Senator was 2 minutes. If it was 3, the Senator may continue.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I had 10 minutes. I authorized up to 3 minutes for Senator SESSIONS and up to 3 for the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may continue.

Mr. INHOFE. I will wrap up real quickly. I think the point is here in today's report. We talk about the fact that only 27 eligible carrier pilots had applied for the ACP agreements. The minimum expectation of the Navy was 82. That means that approximately one-third are re-upping for this particular duty.

It costs \$6 million to put a new pilot in the seat of an F-16. We are at the lowest retention rate in the history of America. And if you look at the exits surveys, they will say it is not because of pay, it is because of the type of operation they are having to do to support Bosnia. And they are unable to carry out the red flag training and all the serious training that would be necessary should we have to send them into combat.

So I do support this. I would like a much stronger amendment than this, but I would certainly support—this is the best thing out there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas—the Chair would advise we have restored the time taken in discussing the misallocation of time back to the Senator. The Senator now has 4 minutes remaining.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

I will withhold until the Senator from Michigan uses his time that was allocated, and then I will finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand I have been allocated 1 minute. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this amendment would set arbitrary dates for reductions of troops. It runs smack against the advice of our top military officials, both uniformed and civilian.

In a letter which has been quoted by a number of Senators, including the Senator occupying the Chair, General Shelton and Secretary Cohen, on May 21, told us the following:

Under a legislated approach, military commanders would be forced to restructure their force and mission tasks based on an arbitrarily mandated schedule rather than on mission accomplishment, operational considerations, and the fluid tactical situation they face.

Mr. President, that is why military commanders, including our top commander, oppose this amendment. That is why General Shelton opposes this amendment. It is why Secretary Cohen opposes this amendment. It would be mandating an arbitrary date for a troop reduction. That jeopardizes the well-being of our forces in Bosnia.

Mr. President, I want to talk about a number of provisions in the amendment with which I disagree.

First of all, I want to correct an impression that I believe is created by the findings in this amendment. The findings imply that Congress has not played any role nor exercised its oversight authority since U.S. forces were first deployed to Bosnia. I would remind my colleagues of the provisions that were included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 and the National Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998. Those Acts required the President to certify that the continued presence of U.S. armed forces in Bosnia, after June 30, 1998, is required in order to meet the national security interests of the United States and that it is the policy of the United States that U.S. armed forces will not serve as, or be used as, civil police in Bosnia. It also required the President to submit to Congress a report on why the U.S. armed forces' presence in Bosnia was in the U.S. national security interests, the expected duration of such deployment, the mission and objectives of the U.S. armed forces, the exit strategy of such forces, and a number of other matters.

The President submitted the required certifications and report to Congress on March 3, 1998. In detailing the exit strategy for U.S. forces, the report contained 10 benchmarks that were the goal of the NATO-led Stabilization Force in Bosnia. The report stated that "These benchmarks are concrete and achievable, and their achievement will enable the international community to rely largely on traditional diplomacy, international civil personnel, economic incentives and disincentives, confidence-building measures, and negotiation to continue implementing the Dayton Accords over the longer term." I ask unanimous consent that the 10

benchmarks from the President's March 3, 1998 report to Congress be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEVIN. Those 10 benchmarks, however, were established unilaterally by the Administration and were not shared with or agreed upon by our NATO allies. Accordingly, I offered an amendment when the Senate was considering the emergency supplemental bill at the end of March. That amendment, which was accepted and eventually became part of the 1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act, urged the President to seek concurrence among the NATO members on the ten benchmarks, on estimated target dates for achieving the benchmarks, and on a process for NATO to review progress towards achieving the benchmarks. It also required the President to submit to Congress a report on these matters by June 30, 1998 and semiannually thereafter so long as U.S. ground combat forces remain in the Stabilization Force in Bosnia.

Mr. President, two days ago the President submitted that report as required by the amendment to the 1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act. That report advises that benchmarks parallel to ours have been incorporated in NATO's Operation Plan or OPLAN for the post-June 1998 mission in Bosnia. The OPLAN requires SFOR to develop detailed criteria for each of those benchmarks, to be approved by the North Atlantic Council.

The President's report also advises that the NATO allies agreed on June 10 to the United States' proposal that the NATO military authorities provide an estimate of the time likely to be required for the implementation of the military and civilian aspects of the Dayton Agreement based on the benchmark criteria. During his testimony before the Armed Services Committee on June 4, General Wes Clark, NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, stated that the development and approval of the criteria and estimated target dates should take two or three months.

The President's report further advises that the benchmark criteria will be used during NATO's regular six-month review of the Bosnia mission in December. The President added that, although not required by the amendment to the Supplemental Appropriations Act, the Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council has included language that corresponds to the benchmarks in its Luxembourg declaration of June 9. The Peace Implementation Council also called on the High Representative to submit a report on the progress being made in meeting those goals by mid-September. This means that both General Shinseki, the

NATO on-scene commander, and High Representative Westendorp, the international community's senior civilian in Bosnia, will be using the same framework and that the North Atlantic Council will have the benefit of the judgment of both of these officials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's July 28, 1998 report to Congress be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 2.)

Mr. LEVIN. Finally on this point, I would note that the Senate adopted an amendment during its consideration of the Defense Authorization bill for Fiscal Year 1999 that expressed the sense of Congress that, among other things, stated that the President should work with our NATO allies to withdraw U.S. ground combat forces from Bosnia within a reasonable period of time, consistent with the safety of those forces and the accomplishment of SFOR's military tasks. That amendment passed by a vote of 90-5 on June 24—a little more than a month ago.

Mr. President, I thought that it was important to get that information on the record to correct any impression that Congress has not paid attention to the participation of U.S. military forces in the NATO-led force in Bosnia. But it is far more important, in my view, to focus on the other sections of the amendment, particularly the mandatory reduction of U.S. ground elements from Bosnia to a level of 6,500 by February 2, 1999, and 5,000 by October 1, 1999.

First, I think it would be useful to put the size of the U.S. contingent in Bosnia in perspective. It should be noted that the United States provided about 20,000 of NATO's Implementation Force in 1996—or about 33 percent of the total force. Up until approximately June of this year, the United States provided about 8,500 troops to NATO's Stabilization Force—or about 25 percent of the total force. By September of this year, the United States will provide about 6,900 troops—or about 22 percent of the total force. So the percentage of the U.S. contribution to the NATO-led force has been declining over time—from 33 to 25 to 22 percent.

The amendment before us, however, would use the power of the purse to reduce the number of U.S. ground troops in Bosnia by another 400 by February 2 of next year and then by an additional 1,500 by October 1 of next year. That is the main purpose and impact of this amendment. That is also what makes this amendment unacceptable to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and should make it unacceptable to us. When the Armed Services Committee was considering a series of amendments during its markup of the Defense Authorization bill earlier this year, we sought the

views of the Department of Defense. Secretary Cohen and General Shelton, in their letter of May 21, 1998, gave us their views and I would like to quote from a few parts of their letter:

We write to express our concerns with any amendment that would legislate a date or schedule for withdrawal or reduction of US forces from the NATO-led mission in Bosnia. Such amendments would make it more difficult to accomplish the mission, which has been remarkably successful to date.

We will conduct regular reviews of our force posture and progress toward the benchmarks we have established, and we expect further reductions will be possible. But that determination is best based on the actual situation on the ground, the military advice of our commanders in the field, and the approval of the NATO military and political authorities, not an arbitrary withdrawal or reduction dates determined long in advance.

Under a legislated approach, military commanders would be forced to restructure their force and mission tasks based on an arbitrarily mandated schedule rather than on mission accomplishment, operational considerations, and the fluid tactical situation they face.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the May 21, 1998 letter from Secretary Cohen and General Shelton be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

(See Exhibit 3.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, Secretary Cohen and General Shelton said it well. I agree with them—Congress should not mandate troop reduction by arbitrary dates.

Mr. President, I also disagree with other sections of this amendment dealing with exceptions to the mandated drawdown and limitations on support for law enforcement activities in Bosnia.

Finally, I would note that the Statement on Administration Policy states that the President's senior advisors would recommend veto of this bill if it contains a provision that would prescribe a arbitrarily scheduled force drawdown in Bosnia.

Mr. President, for all these reasons I will vote against this amendment and I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment as well.

EXHIBIT 1

TEN BENCHMARKS

1. The Dayton cease-fire remains in place, supported by mechanisms for military-to-military transparency and cooperation.
2. Police in both entities are restructured, re-integrated, re-trained and equipped in accordance with democratic standards.
3. An effective judicial reform program is in place.
4. Illegal pre-Dayton institutions (e.g. Herceg Bosnia, Strategic Reserve Office, Centres and Selek Impeks) are dissolved and revenue and disbursement mechanisms under control of legitimately elected officials.
5. Media are regulated in accordance with democratic standards; independent/alternative media are available throughout B-H.

6. Elections are conducted in accordance with democratic standards, and results are implemented.

7. Free-market reforms (e.g. functioning privatization and banking laws) and an IMF program are in place, with formal barriers to inter-entity commerce eliminated.

8. A phased and orderly minority return process is functioning, with Sarajevo, Mostar, and Banja Luka having accepted significant returns.

9. In Breko, the multi-ethnic administration functioning and a secure environment for returns is established.

10. The Parties are cooperating with ICTY in the arrest and prosecution of war criminals.

These benchmarks are concrete and achievable, and their achievement will enable the international community to rely largely on traditional diplomacy, international civil personnel, economic incentives and disincentives, confidence-building measures, and negotiation to continue implementing the Dayton Accords over the longer term.

EXHIBIT 2

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 105-174, I am providing this report to inform the Congress of ongoing efforts to meet the goals set forth therein.

With my certification to the Congress of March 3, 1998, I outlined ten conditions—or benchmarks—under which Dayton implementation can continue without the support of a major NATO-led military force. Section 7 of Public Law 105-174 urges that we seek concurrence among NATO allies on: (1) the benchmarks set forth with the March 3 certification; (2) estimated target dates for achieving those benchmarks; and (3) a process for NATO to review progress toward achieving those benchmarks. NATO has agreed to move ahead in all these areas.

First, NATO agreed to benchmarks parallel to ours on May 28 as part of its approval of the Stabilization Force (SFOR) military plan (OPLAN 10407). Furthermore, the OPLAN requires SFOR to develop detailed criteria for each of these benchmarks, to be approved by the North Atlantic Council, which will provide a more specific basis to evaluate progress. SFOR will develop the benchmark criteria in coordination with appropriate international civilian agencies.

Second, with regard to timelines, the United States proposed that NATO military authorities provide an estimate of the time likely to be required for implementation of the military and civilian aspects of the Dayton Agreement based on the benchmark criteria. Allies agreed to this approach on June 10. As SACEUR General Wes Clark testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee June 4, the development and approval of the criteria and estimated target dates should take 2 to 3 months.

Third, with regard to a review process, NATO will continue the 6-month review process that began with the deployment of the Implementation Force (IFOR) in December 1995, incorporating the benchmarks and detailed criteria. The reviews will include an assessment of the security situation, an assessment of compliance by the parties with the Dayton Agreement, an assessment of progress against the benchmark criteria being developed by SFOR, recommendations on any changes in the level of support to civilian agencies, and recommendations on any other changes to the mission and tasks of the force.

While not required under Public Law 105-174, we have sought to further utilize this

framework of benchmarks and criteria for Dayton implementation among civilian implementation agencies. The Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council (PIC) adopted the same framework in its Luxembourg declaration of June 9, 1998. The declaration, which serves as the civilian implementation agenda for the next 6 months, now includes language that corresponds to the benchmarks in the March 3 certification to the Congress and in the SFOR OPLAN. In addition, the PIC Steering Board called on the High Representative to submit a report on the progress made in meeting these goals by mid-September, which will be considered in the NATO 6-month review process.

The benchmark framework, now approved the military and civilian implementers, is clearly a better approach than setting a fixed, arbitrary end date to the mission. This process will produce a clear picture of where intensive efforts will be required to achieve our goal: a self-sustaining peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina for which a major international military force will no longer be necessary. Experience demonstrates that arbitrary deadlines can prove impossible to meet and tend to encourage those who would wait us out or undermine our credibility. Realistic target dates, combined with concerted use of incentives, leverage and pressure with all the parties, should maintain the sense of urgency necessary to move steadily toward an enduring peace. While the benchmark process will be useful as a tool both to promote and review the pace of Dayton implementation, the estimated target dates established will be notional, and their attainment dependent upon a complex set of interdependent factors.

We will provide a supplemental report once NATO has agreed upon detailed criteria and estimated target dates. The continuing 6-month reviews of the status of implementation will provide a useful opportunity to continue to consult with Congress. These reviews, and any updates to the estimated timelines for implementation, will be provided in subsequent reports submitted pursuant to Public Law 105-174. I look forward to continuing to work with the Congress in pursuing U.S. foreign policy goals in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
The White House, July 28, 1998.

EXHIBIT 3

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1998.

HON. CARL LEVIN,
Ranking Democrat, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CARL: We write to express our concerns with any amendment that would legislate a date or schedule for withdrawal or reduction of U.S. forces from the NATO-led mission in Bosnia. Such amendments would make it more difficult to accomplish the mission, which has been remarkably successful to date.

It is our intention to reduce our forces in Bosnia. Based on the progress achieved to date, our commanders already have been able to reduce U.S. troop levels from almost 20,000 in 1996 to the 6,900 that will be deployed after the current drawdown is completed in September. We will conduct regular reviews of our force posture and progress toward the benchmarks we have established, and we expect further reductions will be possible. But that determination is best based on the actual situation on the ground, the military advice of our commanders in the field, and the approval of the NATO military and political authorities, not an arbitrary

withdrawal or reduction dates determined long in advance.

Our military commanders in the field have determined the level and type of force required to carry out the mission within acceptable risk. The mission, forces and guidance of the force currently planned for June 1998 have been fully agreed to by NATO political and military authorities. Under a legislated approach, military commanders would be forced to restructure their force and mission tasks based on an arbitrarily mandated schedule rather than on mission accomplishment, operational considerations, and the fluid tactical situation they face. In addition, while those opposed to the Dayton Accords have been steadily isolated and diminished in their influence, legislating withdrawal of reduction dates would invite heightened intransigence and extremism.

Additional factors that Congress should consider in reviewing any such amendment are the following:

Under the proposed amendment, command of the SFOR operation and its element in MND-North might well be transferred to a non-U.S. officer early next year.

Shifting to a posture in which the U.S. has much smaller force levels in Bosnia but enhances its force presence in regions surrounding Bosnia, as envisioned by the amendment, will not save money and indeed could cost more than our current operation in Bosnia. We are continually evaluating the force posture for Bosnia, and do not consider an over-the-horizon force appropriate now.

Accordingly, we strongly urge you to oppose any legislated fixed date or timetable for withdrawal or reduction of U.S. forces in Bosnia.

There is one other factor related to operations in Bosnia of great concern to us, and that is funding. The Department submitted an addition to the FY99 budget to fund a 6,900-person force in Bosnia. Authorizing that request is essential to accomplishing the mission without significantly reducing readiness in other areas. Without that funding, we would have to choose between Bosnia operations and the overall readiness of our Armed Forces.

Sincerely,

HENRY H. SHELTON.
BILL COHEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from West Virginia, who have all made very strong statements about their commitment and the commitment of Congress to support our troops. It is our responsibility to do this.

I want to answer a couple of points that were made. Somalia—the argument was made that troops were not provided equipment and we lost 18 rangers. That is exactly correct. I would hold up Somalia as the very reason that we should be doing something today to protect our troops in the field—because, in fact, in Somalia Congress was never consulted. The decision not to send the equipment was made by the Pentagon. It is precisely because Congress was not consulted and was not committed to this that it failed so miserably. The mission creep in Soma-

lia is exactly what we are trying to avoid in Bosnia today. And that is why I have this amendment on the floor.

Let us talk about precedent. On July 31, 1989, there was a resolution requiring the President to reduce the number of U.S. forces in Korea. That is exactly what I would hope that we would do today. Nine years ago, almost to the day, Congress met its responsibility. This was an amendment that specifically asked the President to come forward with a plan to have gradual reductions in the number of U.S. military personnel stationed in the Republic of Korea.

This is exactly what we are doing today. We are saying, in this appropriations bill for this fiscal year, that we should reduce the number of forces so that the President can go to our allies and start negotiating for a more equitable spread. That is exactly what we did in Korea.

With Korea we said, "The Republic of Korea should assume increased responsibilities for its own security." This was an amendment that was sponsored by Senator McCAIN, Senator Nunn, Senator WARNER, Senator EXXON, Senator DIXON, Senator WIRTH, Senator SHELBY, Senator THURMOND, Senator COHEN, Senator WALLOP, Senator GORTON, Senator LOTT, and Senator COATS.

This is exactly what I hope we will do today. It is the responsibility of Congress to provide support for our troops. We cannot stand by and watch our military disintegrate, lose our most experienced warriors, put them in harm's way, and do nothing.

Have we lost our backbone in 9 years? Or have we lost our compass? Have we lost the will to do what is right for this country?

Congress is responsible for providing the support for our troops. And I hope that we will meet our responsibility today.

Thank you, Mr. President. And I yield the floor.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Nearing the moment, I think, according to the previous unanimous consent agreement, for me to make a motion to table, I would just like to make one quick point.

Back several years ago, in 1990, I was speaking in support of an amendment—in support of the Bush administration, the President of the United States, not in opposition. And it was a peacetime deployment to Korea, a rearrangement of forces, not the situation in Bosnia. An important factor is, I was supporting the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense.

The Hutchison amendment is in opposition to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, as well as the President of the United States. I think there is a significant difference there.

Second, one of the Members came to the floor and said that we need to debate this more. As the Senator from Indiana pointed out, this is the same amendment we voted on last May; basically, fundamentally the same thing. We did have lots of debate on it.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee pointed out, we have 50 or 60 amendments that we need to address between tonight and tomorrow, all of which deserve also very thorough debate and discussion, as well, if we expect to get out at a reasonable timeframe either tomorrow or Saturday or Sunday, as the distinguished chairman and ranking member point out.

The hour of 5:30 having arrived, I move to table the Hutchison amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I want to announce, there appears there now is a second-degree amendment to the Hutchison amendment that could be offered and may settle the issue with regard to the previous amendment which was not tabled.

AMENDMENT NO. 3419 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3124

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now turn to the Hutchinson amendment in the second-degree and that there be a short period of debate. Can you tell me how long you think it will take?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I think the amendment has been agreed to and would not need debate, from my standpoint.

Mr. STEVENS. I think we should have at least 10 minutes equally divided between the Senator from Arkansas and the Senators from Michigan and Delaware, and I am informed it will require a rollcall vote.

I ask unanimous consent there be that period now for 10 minutes on this amendment that Senator HUTCHINSON will offer, and following that time that the rollcall on his amendment take place after the rollcall vote on the motion to table that has just been made by the Senator from Arizona.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to offer an a second-degree amendment numbered 3419, and I send that amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], for himself and Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BIDEN and Mr. LIEBERMAN proposes an amendment numbered 3419 to amendment 3124.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the word "Title" and insert the following:

IX

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

Subtitle A—Forced Abortions in China

SEC. 9001. This subtitle may be cited as the "Forced Abortion Condemnation Act".

SEC. 9002. Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Forced abortion was rightly denounced as a crime against humanity by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal.

(2) For over 15 years there have been frequent and credible reports of forced abortion and forced sterilization in connection with the population control policies of the People's Republic of China. These reports indicate the following:

(A) Although it is the stated position of the politburo of the Chinese Communist Party that forced abortion and forced sterilization have no role in the population control program, in fact the Communist Chinese Government encourages both forced abortion and forced sterilization through a combination of strictly enforced birth quotas and immunity for local population control officials who engage in coercion. Officials acknowledge that there have been instances of forced abortions and sterilization, and no evidence has been made available to suggest that the perpetrators have been punished.

(B) People's Republic of China population control officials, in cooperation with employers and works unit officials, routinely monitor women's menstrual cycles and subject women who conceive without government authorization to extreme psychological pressure, to harsh economic sanctions, including unpayable fines and loss of employment, and often to physical force.

(C) Official sanctions for giving birth to unauthorized children include fines in amounts several times larger than the per capita annual incomes of residents of the People's Republic of China. In Fujian, for example, the average fine is estimated to be twice a family's gross annual income. Families which cannot pay the fine may be subject to confiscation and destruction of their homes and personal property.

(D) Especially harsh punishments have been inflicted on those whose resistance is motivated by religion. For example, according to a 1995 Amnesty International report, the Catholic inhabitants of 2 villages in Hebei Province were subjected to population control under the slogan "better to have more graves than one more child". Enforcement measures included torture, sexual abuse, and the detention of resisters' relatives as hostages.

(E) Forced abortions in Communist China often have taken place in the very late stages of pregnancy.

(F) Since 1994 forced abortion and sterilization have been used in Communist China not only to regulate the number of children, but also to eliminate those who are regarded as defective in accordance with the official eugenic policy known as the "Natal and Health Care Law".

SEC. 9003. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 to issue any visa to any official of any country (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers) who the Secretary finds, based on credible and specific information, has been directly involved in the establishment or enforcement of population control policies forcing a woman to undergo an abortion against her free choice, or forcing a man or woman to undergo sterilization against

his or her free choice policies condoning the practice of genital mutilation.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1999 to admit to the United States any national covered by subsection (a).

(c) The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) if the President—

(1) determines that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to Congress containing a justification for the waiver.

Subtitle B—Freedom on Religion in China

SEC. 9011. (a) It is the sense of Congress that the President should make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of United States foreign policy with respect to China.

(b) As part of this policy, the Department of State should raise in every relevant bilateral and multilateral forum the issue of individuals imprisoned, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government on religious grounds.

(c) In its communications with the Chinese Government, the Department of State should provide specific names of individuals of concern and request a complete and timely response from the Chinese Government regarding the individuals' whereabouts and condition, the charges against them, and sentence imposed.

(d) The goal of these official communications should be the expeditious release of all religious prisoners in China and Tibet and the end of the Chinese Government's policy and practice of harassing and repressing religious believers.

SEC. 9012. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 to issue a visa to any official of any country (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers) who the Secretary of State finds, based on credible and specific information, has been directly involved in the establishment or enforcement of policies or practices designed to restrict religious freedom.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1999 to admit to the United States any national covered by subsection (a).

(c) The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) with respect to an individual described in such subsection if the President—

(1) determines that it is vital to the national interest to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to the appropriate congressional committees containing a justification for the waiver.

SEC. 9014. In this subtitle, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the Senators on the other side of the aisle who, I think, have made very positive and productive suggestions to improve the amendment that I have offered regarding human rights abuses in China.

The simple explanation for the changes that are made, we have made the bill generic in nature rather than

country-specific. I have some reservations about that because I don't want to in any way dilute, I think, the proper attention that should be placed upon what our State Department says is the greatest abusers of human rights in the world today. But at the same time, I think this makes this a very, very powerful human rights amendment applicable to all nations of the world. The "finding" section of the amendment remains in which we are able to outline some of the abuses evident in China today.

We would add, I think, a positive suggestion, that the genital mutilation issue be added. So in addition to religious persecution and forced abortions, genital mutilation and those who would condone it would be added as criteria for those countries that would be denied their visas for those condoning that practice, the terrible practice that human rights advocates the world over and all people, I think, condemn.

I want to thank Senator BIDEN for, I think, some very good suggestions regarding the "definitions" area on the Secretary's obligations in determining who would be denied these visas. The addition to the phrase "credible information," adding "and specific information," and adding to the phrase "has been involved in the establishment or enforcement," the word "directly"; so, "has been directly involved in the establishment or enforcement of population control policies." I think that is a very helpful change that will make this much more enforceable and make it much more clear. I am grateful for that suggestion, as well.

We have struck section 9012, which simply lists a number of associations and organizations which are agents of the government in carrying out some of these abuses. It is really unnecessary, an unnecessary provision that has caused confusion, because anyone, any individual, any official, who is involved in perpetrating persecution of religious minorities, coerced abortions or the genital mutilation would be covered by the amendment, without what is really extraneous language and unnecessary language.

So I think these are all very positive changes and that is the content of the second-degree amendment. I think this is relevant. I think it is a very positive improvement to the appropriations bill. I appreciate the support of those on both sides of the aisle in the defeat of the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I want to thank the Senator from Arkansas. He has been a gentleman.

His amendment is, I think, a good amendment and I thank him for considering some of the suggestions that I and a few others had.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEVIN of Michigan, Senator KERRY

of Massachusetts and Senator BIDEN of Delaware be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I particularly want to thank my friend from Arkansas for adding the prohibition, the ability to deny visas to those countries that engage in the heinous practice of engaging in female genital mutilation. I am not one who thinks we should be erecting sanctions all over the world, but there are certain things that are so, so contrary to our basic values—forced abortion, forced sterilization, mutilation of body parts—that I think that it is appropriate that we use sanctions in those circumstances.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. BIDEN. I realize I have a few more minutes, but in order to accommodate this bill moving along, again, I close by thanking the Senator from Arkansas for accommodating some of the changes that he has for his amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Michigan is on his way.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. 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. LEVIN. Mr. President, let me commend the Senator from Arkansas for the second-degree amendment, the modification in effect, which he has sent to the desk.

I reluctantly voted to table his original amendment because I was troubled by his narrow focus on one country, when the problem exists not only in China, but a number of other countries. The problems he identifies in his amendment are real problems and they are problems we must be concerned with. He has shown that concern, and I think it is wise that we reflect the concern relating to people engaging in those practices that come from any country—China or anyplace else. And while I reluctantly voted to table his original amendment, the first-degree amendment, for the reason I just gave, I enthusiastically cosponsored the second-degree amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and I hope it passes with a resounding vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the second-degree amendment? Time will be equally divided.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I now have before me here a managers' pack-

age that lists some 33 amendments. Following the next two votes, I intend to ask that no more amendments be in order. I urge Members to come and look at the list and see if their amendment is here. If there are more, fine. I urge Members to let us know if they intend to offer the amendments shown here. Secondly, if they intend to offer any other amendment, I am pleased to have them do that.

Mr. President, as I understand it, the first vote will be on a motion to table offered by the Senator from Arizona, and the second will be the amendment in the second degree offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. If the pending motion to table is not carried, that amendment will still be open. If the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas passes in the second degree, I intend to ask that the—are the yeas and nays requested on the Senator's original amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only on the motion to table the original amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Very well. If that is adopted, which I urge the Senate to adopt, then we will move to adopt the original amendment, as amended, with a voice vote. I call for the vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 3413

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield back any time I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "no."

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

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 249 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Abraham	Bumpers	DeWine
Akaka	Burns	Dodd
Baucus	Chafee	Domenici
Bennett	Cleland	Durbin
Biden	Coats	Feinstein
Bingaman	Cochran	Ford
Boxer	Collins	Glenn
Breaux	Conrad	Graham
Brownback	D'Amato	Hagel
Bryan	Daschle	Harkin

Hatch	Levin	Robb
Hollings	Lieberman	Roberts
Inouye	Lott	Rockefeller
Jeffords	Lugar	Roth
Johnson	Mack	Sarbanes
Kennedy	McCain	Snowe
Kerrey	McConnell	Specter
Kerry	Mikulski	Thurmond
Kohl	Moseley-Braun	Torricelli
Kyl	Moynihan	Warner
Landrieu	Murray	Wellstone
Lautenberg	Reed	Wyden
Leahy	Reid	

NAYS—31

Allard	Frist	Nickles
Ashcroft	Gorton	Santorum
Bond	Gramm	Sessions
Byrd	Grams	Shelby
Campbell	Grassley	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Gregg	Smith (OR)
Craig	Hutchinson	Stevens
Dorgan	Hutchison	Thomas
Enzi	Inhofe	Thompson
Faircloth	Kempthorne	
Feingold	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Helms

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3413) was agreed to.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I failed to ask that Senator FEINSTEIN of California be added as a cosponsor to the Hutchinson amendment. I ask unanimous consent she be added.

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

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, on roll-call vote No. 249, I voted "yea." It was my intention to vote "no." Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote. This will in no way change the outcome of the vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I believe the Senator from Delaware wished to be recognized for just one minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has been recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. He has been?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3419

Mr. STEVENS. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBB, be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the second-degree amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 250 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Abraham	Faircloth	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Boxer	Grams	Murray
Breaux	Grassley	Nickles
Brownback	Gregg	Reed
Bryan	Hagel	Reid
Bumpers	Harkin	Robb
Burns	Hatch	Roberts
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hutchinson	Roth
Chafee	Hutchison	Santorum
Cleland	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Coats	Inouye	Sessions
Cochran	Jeffords	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kennedy	Snowe
Craig	Kerrey	Specter
D'Amato	Kerry	Stevens
Daschle	Kohl	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dodd	Landrieu	Thurmond
Domenici	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Warner
Durbin	Levin	Wellstone
Enzi	Lieberman	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Mr. Helms

The amendment (No. 3419) was agreed to.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3124, AS AMENDED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the first-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question before the Senate is on the underlying amendment No. 3124, as amended.

The amendment (No. 3124), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have now exchanged lists. We have a managers' package which we will present in a moment. We have the two lists now from the two sides of the aisle.

I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the only first-degree amendments remaining in order, other than the managers' package, and that they be subject to only relevant second-degree amendments:

D'Amato—Air Guard, Coast Guard Search & Rescue.

Faircloth—Spend Fiscal Year 1998 fund (PFNA).

DeWine—Drug interdiction.

Mack—Electronic combat testing.

Santorum—60mm mortar ?.

Mack—Commercial Space Act.

D'Amato G.Smith—Sanctions—Serbia/Montenegro.

Coats—Sense of Senate.

Coats—Next QDR.

Stevens—relevant.

Frist—LME.

Baucus—Bear Paw development canal (20=divided).

Bingaman—Dual use.

Bingaman—White Sands.

Bingaman—Health centers.

Boxer—Relevant.

Bumpers—Relevant.

Byrd—Relevant.

Byrd—Relevant.

Daschle—Relevant.

Daschle—Relevant.

Daschle—Relevant.

Dodd—Army pensions.

Dodd—Lyme disease.

Dodd—Relevant.

Durbin—Land conveyance.

Durbin—Military operations/war powers.

Dorgan—Indian incentive program.

Dorgan—Relevant.

Ford—National Symphony.

Graham—Land transfer.

Graham—Relevant.

Graham—Space.

Harkin—Outlays.

Harkin—P.O.O.

Harkin—Veterans medals.

Harkin—Gulf war illness research.

Harkin—Smoking funding.

Hollings—Environmental report.

Inouye—Manager's amendment.

Inouye—Manager's amendment.

Inouye—Manager's amendment

Kerrey—Sense of Senate on payroll tax.

Kerry—Relevant.

Kerry—Relevant.

Leahy—JSAT.

Reed—Environmental training.

Robb—Reimbursement for Italy accident.

Wellstone—Child soldiers.

Wellstone—Domestic violence.

Wellstone—Relevant.

Mr. STEVENS. I further ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the listed amendments, the bill be advanced to third reading and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the House companion bill; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 2132, as amended, be inserted; and that the bill be advanced to third reading and passage occur without any further action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, as I understand what the Senator from Alaska—

Mr. STEVENS. I really can't hear the Senator, I am sorry.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object, have you eliminated time on debate? I am not quite sure.

Mr. STEVENS. We have not yet addressed the question of time on debate. The only real limitation here is that this list be the only first-degree amendments in order and that they only be subject to relevant second-degree amendments in the event they are considered and not adopted.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I have been trying to work out on our side as it relates to amendments, and I have not seen this list yet. I want to be sure, when I have told my colleagues that their amendment has been accepted, I want it on the managers' list or I want it on the amendments yet to be worked out.

Mr. STEVENS. I say to the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. President, many of the amendments that are on the list that have come from your side are, in fact, on the managers' list. But they will all be qualified if they are on the list you have given us.

Mr. FORD. I want to be sure that all of these amendments—I have not seen the list, I say to my friend, and would like to work it out.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I will be happy to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my request is still pending.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, as I understand the unanimous consent request, what the Senator is saying is that after disposal of the last amendment, we go right to final passage; is that correct? But there is no limit on debate on amendments; is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. These listed amendments will be disposed of. Once they are disposed of, the bill will go to third reading. They will have to be either acted upon or withdrawn.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I understand. But there is no limit on debate on the individual amendments; is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. There is no limit there on debate time. I intend to do my best to do that.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. I reserved my right to object a moment ago, and I have no objection now. I thank the chairman for his courtesy.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I have been asked to amend my request and add this following portion—I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators STEVENS, COCHRAN, SPECTER, DOMENICI, BOND, MCCONNELL, SHELBY, GREGG, HUTCHISON, INOUE, HOLLINGS, BYRD, LEAHY, BUMPERS, LAUTENBERG, HARKIN, and DORGAN, and the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate, and I further ask that when the Senate passes H.R. 4103, as amended, that S. 2132 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are proceeding now to a look at the amendments that are not in the managers' package. I would like to address that issue with the Senate.

It is my understanding that Senator BAUCUS has an amendment that he wishes to have 20 minutes equally divided; Senator BINGAMAN has two amendments; Senator BOXER's amendment that was on the list is in the managers' package; Senator BUMPERS' amendment is on the list in the managers' package; Senator BYRD has two amendments which are to be in the managers' package; Senator DASCHLE's relevant amendments are withdrawn, as I understand it; Senator DODD has one amendment dealing with Army pensions which we have not seen; Senator DURBIN's amendment on land conveyance is in the package; his amendment on military operations and war powers will be opposed and we will have to deal with it; Senator DORGAN's amendment on Indian incentive program is in the package, and I understand his second amendment will not be offered; Senator FORD's amendment on National Symphony is not in the package and would have to be debated; Senator GRAHAM has a land transfer amendment which is in the package now, and the space amendment, as I understand it, is the same as the amendment from Senator MACK, and that will have to be debated; Senator HARKIN has the outlay amendment, and the POO amendment is in the package, the vets medals amendment we have not seen and we cannot discuss now; Senator HOLLINGS' amendment will be accepted; Senator INOUE's manager's amendment is in the managers' package; Senator KERREY's SOS payroll tax amendment cannot be accepted and

will have to be debated; there are two relevant amendments by Senator KERRY which we have not seen; Senator LEAHY's amendment cannot be accepted; Senator REED's amendment we have not seen; and Senator ROBB's amendment on reimbursement we would like to discuss with Senator ROBB—it is in the House bill; we prefer not to take it up at this time if we can avoid it—and Senator WELLSTONE's amendment on child soldiers has been accepted, the domestic violence one has not been agreed to yet—we will have to discuss it with them.

Those are the amendments on the Democratic side.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. FORD. I was trying to keep up with you, with the Senator. Senator DODD has one as it relates to Lyme Disease.

Mr. STEVENS. That is in the package.

Mr. FORD. That is in the package?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. FORD. Then he still has two left.

Mr. STEVENS. I realize the relevant one is just a place holder.

Mr. FORD. I understand. That is correct.

Mr. INOUE. Will the chairman yield? I am now working on an amendment for Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN. Can I discuss that with you later?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. I would be happy to do that. The Senator has the right to an amendment in the managers' package. That may be the way that is considered.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder whether I could ask my colleague from Alaska whether he could include the child soldiers amendment in the managers' package since it has been accepted?

Mr. STEVENS. It is in there.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am sorry.

Mr. STEVENS. The domestic violence one I do not think I have seen yet. That is also being reviewed by the Armed Services Committee and we cannot report that yet.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague, I am ready to debate it if you want to, but let me know.

Mr. STEVENS. I could not hear you.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague, I am pleased to debate it if you want, but you just let me know.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, while the chairman is working on the list, I have a quick unanimous consent agreement we have worked out. I would like to go ahead and get that done while we have a break here.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 629

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the conclusion of morning business, following the reconvening of the Senate from the August recess, the Senate proceed to the conference report to accompany the Texas Compact, H.R. 629, and the conference report be considered as having been read. I further ask that there be 4 hours of debate, equally divided, between the Senator from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE, and Senator HATCH, or their designees, and following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on adoption of the conference report, without any intervening action or debate.

Now, I did not specify whether this would be Monday the 31st or Tuesday, September 1st. I need to talk further about the exact date with the Senators involved, and Senator DASCHLE, but the first day we are back. And I appreciate the cooperation I received from Senator WELLSTONE on this UC.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I do not object. I would also like to thank the majority leader for his cooperation.

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

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3420 THROUGH 3464, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk the first managers' package. And I believe that it has been cleared on both sides. So there is no misunderstanding about it, because Senators may wonder whether the amendments are in this or not, I want to read this package and then ask for its immediate consideration. Senator AKAKA's amendment on electric vehicles R&D funds; Bingaman-Domenici on the Air National Guard Program at White Sands; an amendment that I have offered for Senator COCHRAN on acoustic sensor technology; the Domenici-Harkin amendment on food stamp report; the Durbin amendment on land conveyance at Fort Sheridan; the Gregg amendment on conveyance of former Pease Air Force Base; the Hollings amendment on environmental restoration; my amendment for strategic materials manufacturing; the Inouye amendment on American Samoa vets; the Inouye amendment on Ford Island; the Kennedy amendment on cybersecurity; the Sarbanes amendment on the Korean war vets memorial repairs; the McConnell amendment on

chemical demilitarization; the Mack amendment on NAWC transfer of property; the Mikulski amendment on ship-breaking; the Lott amendment on the next-generation Internet; the Murkowski amendment on FERTEC; my amendment for Senator SHELBY on the electronic circuit board manufacturing; the Specter amendment on proliferation of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission; my amendment on the MILES training and equipment issue; my amendment on rescission as of the date of enactment; my amendment for Senator COATS on the near-term digital radio issue; my amendment for Senator WARNER on Palmtop computers for soldiers; the Boxer amendment on what we call Shop Stop; the Ford amendment on counterdrug interdiction; the Dodd amendment on Lyme Disease; the Kerry amendment on solid-state dye lasers; the McCain-Kyl amendment on land transfer; my amendment for Senator KYL on passenger safety system for tactical trucks; the Grassley amendment on problem disbursements threshold; the Harkin amendment on the gulf war illness; my amendment on the air combat training instrumentation issue; Faircloth amendment on TRICARE; my amendment on firefighting equipment leasing; the Bumpers amendment on the DTRTCA, Domestic Preparedness Training Center; the Faircloth amendment on the Aerostat Development Program; Burns-Baucus for redevelopment of the Havre Air Force Base; the McCain amendment on foreign students' reimbursements; Dorgan on Indian incentive payments; the McConnell-Ford amendment on chemical demilitarization; the Wellstone SOS, child soldiers, global use amendment; my amendment for Senator FAIRCLOTH on spending 1998 funds, so-called PFNA issue; the Bennett amendment on alternate turbine engines; and the Gramm amendment on military voting rights.

There should be 44 separate amendments in that package. They have been cleared on both sides, and unless there is some discussion, I ask unanimous consent the first managers' package be adopted and any statements offered by any Senator appear in the RECORD prior to adoption of that Senator's amendment that is in the package.

I add to it, Senator INOUE has a managers' amendment—this would be the first amendment of Senator INOUE—for Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN that pertains to the National Guard Armory in Chicago.

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

The managers' amendment is adopted.

Mr. STEVENS. I send the last amendment to the desk to be included, and it makes 45 amendments in the package.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the en bloc amendments.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes amendments No. 3420 through and including 3463 en bloc, and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, proposes amendment numbered 3464.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3420

(Purpose: To set aside \$12,000,000 for continuation of electric and hybrid-electric vehicle development)

On page 33, line 25, insert before the period at the end the following: "Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$12,000,000 shall be available only to continue development of electric and hybrid-electric vehicles".

Mr. AKAKA. I have offered an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill to provide \$12 million for electric and hybrid-electric vehicle development. The funds will be administered by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, known as DARPA. Senators INOUE, JEFFORDS, LEAHY, COATS, and BOXER have joined me as cosponsors of the amendment.

This is not a new program. Congress provided \$115 million to the Department of Defense for the electric vehicle program over the past five fiscal years. Industry has contributed more than \$115 million in matching funds. In fiscal year 1998, the appropriation was \$15 million, so my amendment represents a budget reduction of 20 percent compared to the current fiscal year.

Seven regional consortia, comprised of more than 200 member companies, participate in the program. Individual consortia, which were selected competitively, include Hawaii, Sacramento, the Mid Atlantic Consortium in Johnstown, PA, the Northeast Consortium in Boston, the Southern Consortium in Atlanta, the Mid America Consortium in Indianapolis, and CALSTART in Burbank, CA.

The President's fiscal year 1999 budget proposed that the DARPA program be transferred to the Department of Energy and the Department of Transportation. The object of the fiscal year 1999 change was to transfer DoD-developed technology to commercial service vehicles such as buses, delivery vans, and service trucks. I support this transfer.

Unfortunately, despite the best efforts of all three federal agencies and the consortia that participate in the electric vehicle program, another year of funding through the Department of Defense is needed before the transition can proceed.

The Department of Defense has long been interested in hybrid electric combat vehicles because they can reduce fuel consumption by 50 percent, leading to a reduced fuel logistics burden, increased endurance, and reduced emissions. In addition, hybrid electric com-

bat vehicles use electric power for mobility, weapons, countermeasures and sensors, and have reduced thermal and acoustic signatures.

The five-year DARPA program has resulted in the development of a number of combat vehicles with hybrid electric propulsion. These include an Army M-113 Armored Personnel Carrier, a Bradley Fighting Vehicle, two High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles, commonly known as Humvees, and a prototype composite armored vehicle.

Other DoD projects are in the planning stages. DARPA and the Marine Corps are jointly developing a hybrid-electric reconnaissance, surveillance and targeting vehicle, designed as a stealthy, fuel efficient vehicle that can be transported by the V-22 Osprey in support of the Marine Corps Sea Dragon operation. DARPA and the Army are jointly developing a combat hybrid power system for a 15-ton future combat vehicle. The system will provide pulse power for electric guns, directed energy weapons, and electromagnetic armor, as well as other components and systems.

The funds provided by my amendment should be used in the same manner, and for the same program objectives, as in fiscal year 1998 funding. As the author of the amendment, it is my intention that DARPA administer the program as it did in fiscal year 1998, and that funds can be used for the development of defense and non-defense electric and hybrid-electric vehicles.

I thank the Chairman, and my colleague from Hawaii, the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee for their consideration of my amendment. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3421

(Purpose: To set aside \$2,250,000 for the Defense Systems Evaluation program for support of test and training operations at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and Fort Bliss, Texas)

On page 99 in between lines 17 and 18, insert before the period at the end the following:

"SEC. 8104. (a) That of the amount available under Air National Guard, Operations and Maintenance for flying hours and related personnel support, \$2,250,000 shall be available for the Defense Systems Evaluation program for support of test and training operations at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and Fort Bliss, Texas".

AMENDMENT NO. 3422

(Purpose: The purpose is to provide \$1,000,000 for Acoustic Sensor Technology Development Planning for the Department of Defense. The funds are provided from within the funds appropriated for Defense-wide RDT&E)

On page 99 insert at the appropriate place the following new section:

SEC. . That of the funds appropriated for Defense-wise research, development, test and evaluation, \$1,000,000 is available for Acoustic Sensor Technology Development Planning.

AMENDMENT NO. 3423

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to report on food stamp assistance for Armed Forces families, and to require the Comptroller General to study and report on issues relating to the family life, morale, and retention of members of the Armed Forces)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on food stamp assistance for members of the Armed Forces. The Secretary shall submit the report at the same time that the Secretary submits to Congress, in support of the fiscal year 2000 budget, the materials that relate to the funding provided in that budget for the Department of Defense.

(b) The report shall include the following:

(1) The number of members of the Armed Forces and dependents of members of the Armed Forces who are eligible for food stamps.

(2) The number of members of the Armed Forces and dependents of members of the Armed Forces who received food stamps in fiscal year 1998.

(3) A proposal for using, as a means for eliminating or reducing significantly the need of such personnel for food stamps, the authority under section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, to lease housing facilities for enlisted members of the Armed Forces and their families when Government quarters are not available for such personnel.

(4) A proposal for increased locality adjustments through the basic allowance for housing and other methods as a means for eliminating or reducing significantly the need of such personnel for food stamps.

(5) Other potential alternative actions (including any recommended legislation) for eliminating or reducing significantly the need of such personnel for food stamps.

(6) A discussion of the potential for each alternative action referred to in paragraph (3) or (4) to result in the elimination or a significant reduction in the need of such personnel for food stamps.

(c) Each potential alternative action included in the report under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (b) shall meet the following requirements:

(1) Apply only to persons referred to in paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(2) Be limited in cost to the lowest amount feasible to achieve the objectives.

(d) In this section:

(1) The term "fiscal year 2000 budget" means the budget for fiscal year 2000 that the President submits to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

(2) The term "food stamps" means assistance under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

SEC. 8105. (a) The Comptroller General shall carry out a study of issues relating to family life, morale, and retention of members of the Armed Forces and, not later than June 25, 1999, submit the results of the study to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Comptroller General may submit to the committees an interim report on the matters described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c). Any such interim report shall be submitted by February 12, 1999.

(b) In carrying out the study, the Comptroller General shall consult with experts on the subjects of the study who are independent of the Department of Defense.

(c) The study shall include the following matters:

(1) The conditions of the family lives of members of the Armed Forces and the members' needs regarding their family lives, including a discussion of each of the following:

(A) How leaders of the Department of Defense and leaders of each of the Armed Forces—

(i) collect, organize, validate, and assess information to determine those conditions and needs;

(ii) determine consistency and variations among the assessments and assessed information for each of the Armed Forces; and

(iv) use the information and assessments to address those conditions and needs.

(B) How the information on those conditions and needs compares with any corresponding information that is available on the conditions of the family lives of civilians in the United States and the needs of such civilians regarding their family lives.

(C) How the conditions of the family lives of members of each of the Armed Forces and the members' needs regarding their family lives compare with those of the members of each of the other Armed Forces.

(D) How the conditions and needs of the members compare or vary among members in relation to the pay grades of the members.

(E) How the conditions and needs of the members compare or vary among members in relation to the occupational specialties of the members.

(F) What, if any, effects high operating tempos of the Armed Forces have had on the family lives of members, including effects on the incidence of substance abuse, physical or emotional abuse of family members, and divorce.

(G) The extent to which family lives of members of the Armed Forces prevent members from being deployed.

(2) The rates of retention of members of the Armed Forces, including the following:

(A) The rates based on the latest information available when the report is prepared.

(B) Projected rates for future periods for which reasonably reliable projections can be made.

(C) An analysis of the rates under subparagraphs (A) and (B) for each of the Armed Forces, each pay grade, and each major occupational specialty.

(3) The relationships among the quality of the family lives of members of the Armed Forces, high operating tempos of the Armed Forces, and retention of the members in the Armed Forces, analyzed for each of the Armed Forces, each pay grade, and each occupational specialty, including, to the extent ascertainable and relevant to the analysis of the relationships, the reasons expressed by members of the Armed Forces for separating from the Armed Forces and the reasons expressed by the members of the Armed Forces for remaining in the Armed Forces.

(4) The programs and policies of the Department of Defense (including programs and policies specifically directed at quality of life) that have tended to improve, and those that have tended to degrade, the morale of members of the Armed Forces and members of their families, the retention of members of the Armed Forces, and the perceptions of members of the Armed Forces and members of their families regarding the quality of their lives.

(d) In this section, the term "major occupational specialty" means the aircraft pilot specialty and each other occupational specialty that the Comptroller General considers a major occupational specialty of the Armed Forces.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am pleased to have Senator HARKIN as a cosponsor of this amendment.

There are two parts to my amendment; both parts have no cost.

The first part addresses the 12,000 military families on Food Stamps.

For 3 years the Defense Department has refused to take this problem seriously.

I first wrote to DoD in 1996; then I was told that this was a problem only because military personnel have decided, and I quote, "to have a larger family than he/she can afford." In other words, it is Defense Department policy to discourage military families and to engineer the size of those families.

In 1997, I wrote again to Secretary Cohen because he publicly stated that it was "not acceptable" for military personnel to be on Food Stamps. I regret to say that he wrote back saying only that he would "monitor" the issue.

Last year in the fiscal year 1998 Defense Authorization bill, Congress mandated a DoD report on potential solutions. The report is now several months late and will not be submitted in the foreseeable future.

Congress is getting the bureaucratic stiff-arm from DoD on this issue. It's time to bring that to an end.

My amendment will require DoD to propose low cost solutions to this problem, and it requires these proposals as a part of DoD's FY 2000 budget request.

Next year. If DoD still refuses to take this problem seriously, I will propose my own solution. If the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee see fit to support me, I'm sure we can be successful.

The second part of the amendment will permit us to better understand our growing problems in military family life, morale, and retention.

This year, I collected information from each of the services on these issues. Unfortunately, the information I collected confirms my suspicions that the Defense Department has failed to collect data properly. For example:

Each service collects data on these issues differently—or not at all—which prevents comparing among the services. This also means that successes and failures to address these problems cannot be identified.

Now that everyone agrees that readiness is a serious problem, everyone wants to do something about it. But, because the issues are not fully understood, some of the proposed "solutions" may be off the mark. For example, Congress is increasing re-enlistment bonuses for pilots to compete with airline salaries, but there are indications that high airline salaries are not the real problem. We won't really understand the problem until we have better data; only then can we apply effective solutions.

The nature of military life has gone through profound change in the last 20 years, but those changes are not fully understood or taken into account in DoD national security decision making. It is not clear how the new prominence of families in military life should—or should not—be taken into account in making national security decisions.

Because of these problems, my amendment requires a special unit in the General Accounting Office to collect and study the data. They will use an Advisory Panel of experts to assist the study and will report back to the Appropriations Committees next year. With these issues better understood, we will be able to apply more effective solutions, and we should be able to make some real improvements in how Congress and DoD address quality of life and family issues.

AMENDMENT NO. 3424

(Purpose: Relating to the conveyance of the remaining Army Reserve property at former Fort Sheridan, Illinois)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out any conveyance of land at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, unless such conveyance is consistent with a regional agreement among the communities and jurisdictions in the vicinity of Fort Sheridan and in accordance with section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104-106; 110 Stat. 573).

(2) The land referred to in paragraph (1) is a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, located at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, consisting of approximately 14 acres, and known as the northern Army Reserve enclave area, that is covered by the authority in section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and has not been conveyed pursuant to that authority as of the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 3425

(Purpose: To require a conveyance of certain property at former Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, without consideration, to the Town of Newington, New Hampshire, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, together with improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 1.3 acres located at former Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, and known as the site of the old Stone School.

(b) EXCEPTION FROM SCREENING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall make the conveyance under subsection (a) without regard to the requirement under section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, that the property be screened for further Federal use in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a)

shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the Secretary.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 3426

(Purpose: To make available up to \$10,000,000 for the Department of Defense share of environmental restoration at Defense Logistics Agency inventory location 429 (Macalloy site) in Charleston, South Carolina)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense by this Act, up to \$10,000,000 may be available for the Department of Defense share of environmental remediation and restoration activities at Defense Logistics Agency inventory location 429 (Macalloy site) in Charleston, South Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 3427

(Purpose: To designate funds for a strategic materials manufacturing project)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", for Materials and Electronics Technology, \$2,000,000 shall be made available only for the Strategic Materials Manufacturing Facility project.

AMENDMENT NO. 3428

(Purpose: To authorize the transportation of American Samoa veterans to Hawaii on Department of Defense aircraft for receipt of veterans medical care in Hawaii)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2641 the following:

"§ 2641a. Transportation of American Samoa veterans on Department of Defense aircraft for certain medical care in Hawaii

"(a) TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may provide transportation on Department of Defense aircraft for the purpose of transporting any veteran specified in subsection (b) between American Samoa and the State of Hawaii if such transportation is required in order to provide hospital care to such veteran as described in that subsection.

"(b) VETERANS ELIGIBLE FOR TRANSPORT.—A veteran eligible for transport under subsection (a) is any veteran who—

"(1) resides in and is located in American Samoa; and

"(2) as determined by an official of the Department of Veterans Affairs designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, must be transported to the State of Hawaii in order to receive hospital care to which such veteran is entitled under chapter 17 of title 38 in facilities of such Department in the State of Hawaii.

"(c) ADMINISTRATION.—(1) Transportation may be provided to veterans under this section only on a space-available basis.

"(2) A charge may not be imposed on a veteran for transportation provided to the veteran under this section.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) The term 'veteran' has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38.

"(2) The term 'hospital care' has the meaning given that term in section 1701(5) of title 38."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 157 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2641 the following new item:

"2641a. Transportation of American Samoa veterans on Department of Defense aircraft for certain medical care in Hawaii."

AMENDMENT NO. 3429

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . Not later than December 1, 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the President and the Congressional Defense Committees a report regarding the potential for development of Ford Island within the Pearl Harbor Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii through an integrated resourcing plan incorporating both appropriated funds and one or more public-private ventures. This report shall consider innovative resource development measures, including but not limited to, an enhanced-use leasing program similar to that of the Department of Veterans Affairs as well as the sale or other disposal of land in Hawaii under the control of the Navy as part of an overall program for Ford Island development. The report shall include proposed legislation for carrying out the measures recommended therein.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to raise a matter which I believe could revolutionize the way we finance our defense infrastructure, our family housing, barracks and other base facilities. If successful, it would allow us to recapitalize our bases with a much smaller investment than is currently required. In so doing, it could dramatically improve the quality of life of the men and women in uniform.

Mr. President often Members rise and offer that theirs is a simple amendment. This is not a simple matter, and it will take some time to describe it, but I want all of my colleagues to understand what it would do for national defense.

Several years ago, I sponsored legislation to sell defense property in Hawaii to the State.

In return the proceeds were used to build a new bridge to connect the Pearl Harbor Naval Base to Ford Island, a piece of Navy property located in Pearl Harbor.

Over the years Ford Island has been the home of Battleship Row, the site of the Arizona Memorial, and just last month it became the final home for the U.S.S. *Missouri*. It has had a small airstrip on which some of the Navy's earliest aviators trained.

It has housed a few sailors and families, and has been the workplace for selected other military activities.

But because there was no bridge connecting the island, it could never be fully utilized. The Island comprises 450 acres, about half the size of Pearl Harbor Navy Base, yet it contains less than one tenth of the working and residential population of Pearl Harbor.

The only access to the island has been by ferry. For years, boats have shuttled passengers and cargo from the

rest of base about once per hour. In short it has been a very inefficient use of space. And for a small State like mine, especially in and around Honolulu, space is a premium.

In April of this year, this situation was changed forever. Ford Island was opened to the rest of Oahu by the new Chick Clarey Bridge.

Ford Island is now poised to be a more useful part of the Pearl Harbor naval facility. However, as is unfortunately so often the case in these matters, there simply is not enough money in the Navy budget to build the facilities that could make this base more useful. And so, without action, Ford Island will remain underutilized.

About two years ago, when he took over as the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, Admiral Clemins saw the bridge being constructed and recognized the prospect of developing Ford Island. He began to investigate how he could maximize its vast potential to improve the Navy in Hawaii. He quickly came to the conclusion that there simply was not enough money to build the new facilities the Navy needs.

While some might have given up when faced with this obstacle, that is not the Admiral's way. Instead he directed his staff to keep studying this and identify other ways to achieve his objective.

The Admiral took to heart what we have often heard coming from the Congress, that we need to revolutionize the way the Pentagon does business.

He agreed that we have to become more efficient, more like the private sector. He noted that public/private venture legislation had been approved by the Congress at the request of former Secretary of Defense William Perry for a few family housing projects and he suggested that a similar but expanded approach was needed for Ford Island.

At every step there were those that told him why he couldn't do this.

Some said it would cost billions, others that the State would not support developing Ford Island, still others raised technical arguments on our arcane accounting practices in the Government. But, the Admiral kept after it.

While the lawyers raised legal concerns, and the Navy staff and others raised objections, every decision maker, the leaders of the Navy, State, and local governments, and business leaders always had the same response. This is a good idea, we must figure out how we can do it.

That was the reaction of the Commander in Chief of The Pacific Command, Admiral Prueher. Recently he testified to the Appropriations Committee that he has reviewed the legislation and believes it is the right approach to solving some of the critical housing and facility shortfalls for the Navy.

But, because of the difficulty of moving the legislative proposal within the bureaucracy, the measure was not included in the President's formal budget request. Still the Fleet Commander and CINCPAC were undeterred.

Admiral Clemins brought the idea to Washington directly, where he quickly won support from the uniformed Navy.

The Chief of Naval Operations gave the proposal his approval. He then received personal support from the Secretary of the Navy. His arguments even won the informal support from the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Finally, the Navy gave the proposal its official blessing. And after many, many months, the legislation was finally forwarded unofficially to the Congress.

Unfortunately, all of this took time and the delays in winding through the internal chain of command did not allow the Senate's Armed Services Committee time to review this matter prior to its mark up.

I offered this same amendment to that bill and it was adopted. However, there are some in the House that do not agree with the Navy, DOD and the Senate Armed Services Committee and they hope to gut the proposal.

This amendment requires DOD to report on the current legislative proposal and to submit legislation to carry out the proposal by December 1, 1998. That will provide sufficient time for the authorization committee to pass judgement on the matter next year.

The amendment does not mandate any specific terms for the Defense Department to follow, but offers several Navy ideas to be considered.

What the Navy seeks to do, as a pilot project only for this one base, is to provide authority to the Secretary of the Navy to use his resources in conjunction with the private sector to develop Ford Island. The plan would examine whether it is feasible to provide incentives and other guarantees to businesses to carry out this idea, and establish a framework to carry it out.

It is important that we understand how this differs from our current system and how it might work. Under our normal course of operations, the Navy would identify how much the development of Ford Island would cost, and it would develop a spending plan. It is estimated that the costs of developing the island under normal procedures could be as much as \$600 million.

Judging from the military construction budget it would probably require 15 to 20 years to identify sufficient funds to pay for this. That means a whole generation of Navy sailors would enlist, serve and retire, before the base could be completed. This is simply unacceptable to Admiral Clemins as it should be to all of my colleagues.

By relying on a joint venture, the Navy can use resources gained by leasing, exchanging, or selling property that it currently holds in Hawaii and

use those assets and revenues to leverage development of the island. It is like taking out a long term loan. The Navy can put down the down payment using its property or newly generated cash resources, and, as is the case under the family housing pilot program, the sailors housing allowances can be used to make the mortgage payments.

In theory, the Navy might offer a commercial developer the opportunity to establish a few small commercial facilities—like parking garages, child care facilities, shops and restaurants—on the base to support the families, and in return the private concern would be responsible for developing additional Navy facilities.

In each case, the Secretary of the Navy would have to approve the specific uses and the Congress would have to allow the funding to be used for the proposed purpose. This means that sufficient oversight would exist at all levels to ensure that the project stayed on course.

Let me tell my colleagues that the business community in my State is very excited about this proposal.

They are positive that the legislation will provide a mechanism for creating a public-private partnership to develop the island.

From Congress' viewpoint, the development will involve very few taxpayer dollars which is exactly what is needed in today's tight budget environment.

Most important is what this will do for the men and women in the Navy. Today in Hawaii, the Navy is spread out throughout the island of Oahu at a number of small posts and with large numbers of military families living in poor conditions a long way away from their jobs at Pearl Harbor.

The development of Ford Island will allow the Navy to move many of its sailors right to the base to live and work. This will cut down on their commutes, and it will keep them on base.

It will also help ease what has become a very congested rush hour on the highways in the area. For many what was an hour commute will now become minutes. For families disconnected from the Navy community, they will now be living and working in a quality family environment—a nice home in a beautiful location, with the working spouse only minutes away.

For our commanders this means many more sailors housed right on base and readily available if needed.

It will probably come as a surprise to my colleagues to learn that my State has some of the worst housing in all the Defense Department. The Army says its worst barracks anywhere in the world are in Hawaii. Some of the Navy's housing is so bad that it is an embarrassment to the service.

Several years ago, Mrs. Margaret Dalton, the wife of Navy Secretary John Dalton visited Hawaii and was

taken on a tour of some family housing units. The conditions were so deplorable that she was very troubled. When she returned to Washington she insisted that the Navy provide her with a full briefing on its housing rehabilitation plans for the State. Single handedly she moved the Navy forward.

Since then, the Navy has made great strides toward improving living conditions. But it has become painfully clear, that there simply isn't enough money to do what is required. There are many areas that still need to be torn down and rebuilt. Or, that property could be turned over for a new use by the private sector. Mrs. Dalton will long be remembered by the sailors who serve in Hawaii as the person who started to turn around the Navy's living conditions in my State. This proposal will provide us a means to expand upon her work, but this time without enormous investment in this constrained budget environment.

The benefits of the proposal to the Navy and my State are enormous.

I am sure many are now thinking this sounds good, but if it is that simple why hasn't it been done before. To that I would say, it is not simple.

It will require great leadership and management by the Navy to work with the local authorities and business community to carry this out. But, I am confident that we have the right man for the job in Admiral Clemins. He was demonstrated his skills as both a warrior and as a manager and he has the skills necessary to accomplish this task.

This approach has not been tried before, because no one put the time and energy into working through all the details to formulate a legislative plan to achieve this goal. Furthermore, how many opportunities arise when a military department, for all practical purposes, receives what amounts to a land grant adjoining a base? This is in some ways a unique opportunity because of the location of Ford Island and the new bridge. That is why a pilot proposal is proper. It could also serve as a model for other revitalization efforts at other bases, perhaps not on this grand a scale, but using elements from this approach.

My colleagues all know that there will come a time when the Defense Department will want to establish a new base somewhere. This public private venture could be the method where building new bases could become affordable.

Mr. President, this is an excellent idea, that has been shepherded this far by the Navy because they recognized that it is the only way that we can take Ford Island and develop it in a timely and cost effective manner.

Ten years from now, we can be discussing how we will get enough money and authority to proceed to develop Ford Island for the Navy, or we can be

discussing how this model pilot program established a method whereby we have begun to recapitalize our defense infrastructure affordably. This is our choice, there is only one answer, we need to approve this legislation to get the ball rolling.

I think my colleagues for their attention, and I urge all to support this measure.

AMENDMENT NO. 3430

(Purpose: To reduce funds available for Navy S-3 Weapon System Improvement program and to provide funds for a cyber-security program)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provisions:

SEC. 8104. Within the amounts appropriated under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", the amount available for S-3 Weapon System Improvement is hereby reduced by \$8,000,000: *Provided*, Within the amounts appropriated under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", the amount available for a cyber-security program is hereby increased by \$8,000,000: *Provided further*, That the funds are made available for the cyber-security program to conduct research and development on issues relating to security information assurance and to facilitate the transition of information assurance technology to the defense community.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Department of Defense and many other government agencies are increasing their use and reliance on information technology for a wide variety of applications.

The growing frequency and increasing sophistication of attacks on the Defense Department's computer networks is cause for concern. Other government agencies, as well as the private sector, are also subject to these attacks on their network infrastructure.

Last year, the Administration organized an exercise to test the Pentagon's ability to deal with cyber attacks. In this exercise, several computer specialists from the National Security Agency targeted computers used by our military forces in the United States and our forces in the Pacific. Using computers, modems, and software technology widely available on the Internet, these friendly "hackers" were able to penetrate unclassified military computer networks in Hawaii, Washington, D.C., Chicago, St. Louis and Colorado.

We need to do more to protect the Defense Department networks that are critical for the operation of our military forces around the world. My amendment, which is fully offset, adds \$8 million to the Air Force Information Systems Security Program. The additional funds will be used for research by the Air Force and will rely on the expertise of two federally funded research and development centers currently working on issues of information security. These efforts will facili-

tate the development of information security technology for the Armed Forces, and I urge the Senate to approve it.

AMENDMENT NO. 3431

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for repair of the Korean War Veterans Memorial)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8 . ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL.

Section 3 of Public Law 99-572 (40 U.S.C. 1003 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(C) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts made available under subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary of the Army may expend, from any funds available to the Secretary on the date of enactment of this paragraph, \$2,000,000 for repair of the memorial.

"(2) DISPOSITION OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM CLAIMS.—Any funds received by the Secretary of the Army as a result of any claim against a contractor in connection with construction of the memorial shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury."

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering would fix and restore one of our most important monuments, the Korean War Veterans Memorial. It authorizes the Secretary of the Army to provide, within existing funds, up to \$2 million to complete essential repairs to the Memorial. Joining me as a cosponsor of this amendment is my distinguished colleague from Colorado—a Korean War veteran himself—Senator CAMPBELL.

The Korean War Memorial is the newest war monument in Washington, DC. It was authorized in 1986 by Public Law 99-752 which established a Presidential Advisory Board to raise funds and oversee the design of the project, and charged the American Battle Monuments Commission with the management of this project. The authorization provided \$1 million in federal funds for the design and initial construction of the memorial and Korean War Veterans' organizations and the Advisory Board raised over \$13 million in private donations to complete the facility. Construction on the memorial began in 1992 and it was dedicated on July 27, 1995.

For those who haven't visited, the Memorial is located south of the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial on the Mall, to the east of the Lincoln Memorial. Designed by world class Cooper Lecky Architects, the monument contains a triangular "field of service," with 19 stainless steel, larger than life statues, depicting a squad of soldiers on patrol. A curb of granite north of the statues lists the 22 countries of the United Nations that sent troops in defense of South Korea. To the south of the patrol stands a wall of black granite, with engraved images of more than 2,400 unnamed service men and women detailing the countless ways in which Americans answered the call to service. Adjacent to the wall is a fountain

which is supposed to be encircled by a Memorial Grove of linden trees, creating a peaceful setting for quiet reflection. When this memorial was originally created, it was intended to be a lasting and fitting tribute to the bravery and sacrifice of our troops who fought in the "Forgotten War." Unfortunately, just three years after its dedication, the monument is not lasting and is no longer fitting.

The Memorial has not functioned as it was originally conceived and designed and has instead been plagued by a series of problems in its construction. The grove of 40 linden trees have all died and been removed from the ground, leaving forty gaping holes. The pipes feeding the Pool of Remembrance' return system have cracked and the pool has been cordoned off. The monument's lighting system has been deemed inadequate and has caused safety problems for those who wish to visit the site at night. As a result, most of the 1.3 million who visit the monument each year—many of whom are veterans—must cope with construction gates or areas which have been cordoned off instead of experiencing the full effect of the Memorial.

Let me read a quote from the Washington Post—from a Korean War Veteran, John LeGault who visited the site—that I think captures the frustration associated with not having a fitting and complete tribute to the Korean War. He says, "Who cares?" "That was the forgotten war and this is the forgotten memorial." Mr. President, we ought not to be sunshine patriots when it comes to making decisions which affect our veterans. Too often, we are very high on the contributions that our military makes in times of crisis, but when a crisis fades from the scene, we seem to forget about this sacrifice. Our veterans deserve better.

To resolve these problems and restore this monument to something that our Korean War Veterans can be proud of, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers conducted an extensive study of the site in an effort to identify, comprehensively, what corrective actions would be required. The Corps has determined that an additional \$2 million would be required to complete the restoration of the grove work and replace the statuary lighting. My amendment would provide the authority for the funds to make these repairs swiftly and once and for all.

With the 50th anniversary of the Korean War conflict fast approaching, we must ensure that these repairs are made as soon as possible. This additional funding would ensure that we have a fitting, proper, and lasting tribute to those who served in Korea and that we will never forget those who served in the "Forgotten War." I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3432

(Purpose: To set aside \$18,000,000 for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment for demonstrations of technologies and a pilot scale facility)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds available under title VI for chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense, for research and design, \$18,000,000 shall be made available for the program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (under section 8065 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997) for demonstrations of technologies under the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment, for planning and preparation to proceed from demonstration of an alternative technology immediately into the development of a pilot-scale facility for the technology, and for the design, construction, and operation of a pilot facility for the technology.

AMENDMENT NO. 3433

(Purpose: To authorize the lease of real property at the Naval Air Warfare Center, Training Systems Division, Orlando, Florida)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may lease to the University of Central Florida (in this section referred to as the "University"), or a representative or agent of the University designated by the University, such portion of the property known as the Naval Air Warfare Center, Training Systems Division, Orlando, Florida, as the Secretary considers appropriate as a location for the establishment of a center for research in the fields of law enforcement, public safety, civil defense, and national defense.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term of the lease under subsection (a) may not exceed 50 years.

(c) As consideration for the lease under subsection (a), the University shall—

(1) undertake and incur the cost of the planning, design, and construction required to establish the center referred to in that subsection; and

(2) during the term of the lease, provide the Secretary such space in the center for activities of the Navy as the Secretary and the University jointly consider appropriate.

(d) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the lease authorized by subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 3434

(Purpose: To provide for the funding of a vessel scrapping pilot program)

On page 99 in between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Funds appropriated under O&M Navy are available for a vessel scrapping pilot program which the Secretary of the Navy may carry out during fiscal year 1999 and (notwithstanding the expiration of authority to obligate funds appropriated under this heading) fiscal year 2000, and for which the Secretary may define the program scope as that which the Secretary determines sufficient for gathering data on the cost of scrapping Government vessels and for demonstrating cost effective technologies and techniques to scrap such vessels in a manner that is protective of worker safety and health and the environment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3435

(Purpose: Relating to the Next Generation Internet (NGI) initiative)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. The Department of Defense shall, in allocating funds for the Next Generation Internet (NGI) initiative, give full consideration to the allocation of funds to the regional partnerships that will best leverage Department investments in the DoD Major Shared Resource Centers and Centers with supercomputers purchased using DoD RDT&E funds, including the high performance networks associated with such centers.

AMENDMENT NO. 3436

(Purpose: To provide \$500,000 for payment of subcontractors and suppliers under an Army services contract)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new section: "From within the funds provided, with the heading "Operations and Maintenance, Army", up to \$500,000 shall be available for paying subcontractors and suppliers for work performed at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, in 1994, under Army services contract number DACA85-93-C-0065".

AMENDMENT NO. 3437

(Purpose: To designate funds to continue an electronic circuit board manufacturing program)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision: SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", for Industrial Preparedness, \$2,000,000 shall be made available only for the Electronic Circuit Board Manufacturing Development Center.

AMENDMENT NO. 3438

(Purpose: To reestablish the Commission To Assess the Organization of the Federal Government To Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . COMMISSION TO ASSESS THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO COMBAT THE PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

The Combatting Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (as contained in Public Law 104-293) is amended—

(1) in section 711(b), in the text above paragraph (1), by striking "eight" and inserting "twelve";

(2) in section 711(b)(2), by striking "one" and inserting "three";

(3) in section 711(b)(4), by striking "one" and inserting "three";

(4) in section 711(e), by striking "on which all members of the Commission have been appointed" and inserting "on which the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, is enacted, regardless of whether all members of the Commission have been appointed"; and

(5) in section 712(c), by striking "Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act," and inserting "Not later than June 15, 1999,".

AMENDMENT NO. 3439

(Purpose: To designate funds for the procurement of Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System (MILES) training equipment)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision: SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title III of

this Act under the heading "Other Procurement Army", for Training Devices, \$4,000,000 shall be made available only for procurement of Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System (MILES) equipment to support Department of Defense Cope Thunder exercises.

AMENDMENT NO. 3440

(Purpose: To strike the emergency designation for the funds authorized to be appropriate for the costs of overseas contingency operations)

On page 73, line 4 of the bill, revise the text "rescinded from" to read "rescinded as of the date of enactment of this act from"

AMENDMENT NO. 3441

(Purpose: To reduce funds available for development of the Army Joint Tactical Radio and to provide funds for the development of the Army Near Term Digital Radio)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision: SEC. 8104. Within the amounts appropriated under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", the amount available for Joint Tactical Radio is hereby reduced by \$10,981,000, and the amount available for Army Data Distribution System development is hereby increased by \$10,981,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3442

(Purpose: To designate Army Digitization funds for development of the Digital Intelligence Situation Mapboard)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision: SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", for Digitization, \$2,000,000 shall be made available only for the Digital Intelligence Situation Mapboard (DISM).

AMENDMENT NO. 3443

(Purpose: To set aside \$5,000,000 for Navy research, development, test, and evaluation funds for the Shortstop Electronic Protection System, which is to be developed for use in urban warfare, littoral operations, and peacekeeping operations)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following: SEC. 8104. Of the funds available for the Navy for research, development, test, and evaluation under title IV, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the Shortstop Electronic Protection System".

AMENDMENT NO. 3444

(Purpose: To revise and clarify the authority for Federal support of National Guard drug interdiction and counterdrug activities)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Subsection (a)(3) of section 112 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and leasing of equipment" and inserting in lieu thereof "and equipment, and the leasing of equipment,".

(b) Subsection (b)(2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) A member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under orders authorized under paragraph (1) shall participate in the training required under section 502(a) of this title in addition to the duty performed for the purpose authorized under that paragraph. The pay, allowances, and other benefits of the member while participating in the training shall be the same as those to which the member is entitled while performing duty for the purpose of carrying out drug interdiction and counter-drug activities.

"(B) Appropriations available for the Department of Defense for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be used for paying costs associated with a member's participation in training described in subparagraph (A). The appropriation shall be reimbursed in full, out of appropriations available for paying those costs, for the amounts paid. Appropriations available for paying those costs shall be available for making the reimbursements."

(c) Subsection (b)(3) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) A unit or member of the National Guard of a State may be used, pursuant to a State drug interdiction and counter-drug activities plan approved by the Secretary of Defense under this section, to provide services or other assistance (other than air transportation) to an organization eligible to receive services under section 508 of this title if—

"(A) the State drug interdiction and counter-drug activities plan specifically recognizes the organization as being eligible to receive the services or assistance;

"(B) in the case of services, the provision of the services meets the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of section 508 of this title; and

"(C) the services or assistance is authorized under subsection (b) or (c) of such section or in the State drug interdiction and counter-drug activities plan."

(d) Subsection (1)(1) of such section is amended by inserting after "drug interdiction and counter-drug law enforcement activities" the following: ", including drug demand reduction activities,".

AMENDMENT NO. 3445

(Purpose: To set aside funds for research and surveillance activities relating to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases)

On page 36, line 22, insert before the period at the end the following: "Provided, That, of the funds available under this heading, \$3,000,000 shall be available for research and surveillance activities relating to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases".

AMENDMENT NO. 3446

(Purpose: To make available \$3,000,000 for advanced research relating to solid state dye lasers)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the amounts appropriated by title IV of this Act under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY", \$3,000,000 shall be available for advanced research relating to solid state dye lasers.

AMENDMENT NO. 3447

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary of Defense to lease a parcel of real property from the City of Phoenix)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into an agreement to lease from the City of Phoenix, Arizona, the parcel of real property described in subsection (b), together with improvements on the property, in consideration of annual rent not in excess of one dollar.

(b) The real property referred to in subsection (a) is a parcel, known as Auxiliary Field 3, that is located approximately 12 miles north of Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, in section 4 of township 3 north, range 1 west of the Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Maricopa County, Arizona, is bounded on the north by Bell Road, on the east by

Litchfield Road, on the south by Greenway Road, and on the west by agricultural land, and is composed of approximately 638 acres, more or less, the same property that was formerly an Air Force training and emergency field developed during World War II.

(c) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the lease under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I will be brief. I rise to offer an amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999 on behalf of Senator KYL and myself. The amendment would authorize the Secretary of The Air Force to enter into an agreement to lease from the City of Phoenix, Arizona a parcel of land near Luke Air Force Base that is known as Auxiliary Field 3 for a cost not in excess of one dollar.

I offer this amendment because the U.S. Air Force may foresee a need to acquire or lease land near Luke Air Force Base to more effectively manage public and private development compatibility with the Luke Air Force Base mission. Many communities on the west side of Phoenix are dedicated to ensuring that the Air Force has the additional flexibility it may need in the near and long term to meet Air Force operational and training requirements and preserve its overall readiness.

Mr. President, this simple amendment is discretionary in nature and meets the criteria which I have ensured that my colleagues must meet when amendments are offered to appropriations bills. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3448

(Purpose: To designate Army RDT&E funds for integration and evaluation of a passenger safety system for heavy tactical trucks)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", up to \$1,300,000 may be made available only to integrate and evaluate enhanced, active and passive, passenger safety system for heavy tactical trucks.

AMENDMENT NO. 3449

At the end of title VIII, add the following: SEC. . Effective on June 30, 1999, section 8106(a) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under section 101(b) of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), is amended—

(1) by striking out "not later than June 30, 1997," and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than June 30, 1999,"; and

(2) by striking out "\$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 3450

(Purpose: To increase by \$10,000,000 the amount provided for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Of the total amount appropriated under title IV for research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide, for

basic research, \$29,646,000 is available for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses.

Mr. HARKIN. I offered an amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill important to Persian Gulf War veterans. My amendment increases Department of Defense spending on research to determine the causes and possible treatments of those suffering from Gulf War illness by \$10 million. It is my understanding that the amendment has been accepted. This is similar to the amendment I offered and was also accepted as part of the Defense Authorization bill.

While the Persian Gulf War ended in 1991, the physical and psychological ordeal for many of the nearly 700,000 troops who served our country in Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield has not ended. It's been seven years since our troops were winning the war in the Gulf. Unfortunately, they continue to suffer due to their deployment.

Many of our troops returned from the Persian Gulf suffering from a variety of symptoms that have been difficult to trace to a single source or substance. Our veterans have experienced a combination of symptoms in varying degrees of seriousness, including: fatigue, skin rash, muscle and joint pain, headache, loss of memory, shortness of breath, and gastrointestinal and respiratory problems. Unfortunately, the initial response from the Pentagon and the Department of Veterans affairs was to express skepticism about veterans' claims of illness and disability. This strained the government's credibility with veterans and their loved ones who dealt with the very real affects of their service in the Gulf.

I vividly remember a series of roundtable discussions I held with veterans across Iowa after being contacted by several families of Gulf War veterans stricken with undiagnosed illnesses. And these folks weren't just sick. They were tired. They were tired of getting the runaround from the government they defended. They were tired of people who refused to listen . . . or told them it was in their head . . . or that it had nothing to do with their service in the Gulf.

Their stories put a human face on the results of a study I requested through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The results add to the increasing volume of evidence that what these veterans were experiencing was indeed very real. More than one in three Gulf War veterans reported one or more significant medical problems. Fifteen percent reported two or more significant medical conditions. These Iowa veterans also reported significantly greater problems with quality of life issues than others on active duty at the time but not deployed in the Gulf. For example, Persian Gulf veterans had lower scores on measures of

vitality, physical and mental health, ability to work, and increased levels of emotional problems and bodily pain.

In addition, over 80 percent of the Gulf War veterans in the CDC study reported having been exposed to at least one potentially hazardous material during their Persian Gulf Deployment. A recent General Accounting Office report provided an alarming laundry list of such hazards including: "compounds used to decontaminate equipment and protect it against chemical agents, fuel used as a sand suppressant in and around encampments, fuel used to burn human waste, fuel in shower water, leaded vehicle exhaust used to dry sleeping bags, depleted uranium, parasites, pesticides, multiple vaccines used to protect against chemical warfare agents, and smoke from oil-well fires."

To this rather exhaustive list, we can also add exposure to nerve gas. The DOD and CIA have admitted that as many as 100,000 or more . . . that's 1 in 7 troops deployed in the Gulf . . . may have been exposed to chemical agents released into the atmosphere when U.S. troops destroyed an Iraqi weapons bunker. A Presidential Advisory Committee also found credible evidence of exposure to chemical agents in a second incident when troops crossed Iraqi front lines on the first day of the ground war. Chemical weapons specialists in these units said they detected poison gas. Unfortunately, these detections were initially neither acknowledged nor pursued by the Pentagon.

That being said, the Pentagon and others have been more forthcoming recently with relevant information, documents, and research. But more needs to be done. I am pleased that the President, acting based on legislation I cosponsored, extended the time veterans will have to file claims with the government for illnesses related to their service in the Gulf. Previously, they had to show their illness surfaced within two years of their service. Now, they have until the end of 2001. This is a great victory for our veterans. Gulf War illnesses do not surface on a time line convenient to the rules of bureaucrats. This extension will help us meet our responsibility to take care of these soldiers. But, more still needs to be done.

There is still substantial mystery and confusion surrounding the symptoms and health problems experienced by Gulf War veterans. While many veterans have been diagnosed with a recognizable disease, I am concerned about those who have no explanation, no label, no treatment for their suffering. More needs to be done to help these Americans.

For example, the Presidential Advisory Committee has suggested research in three new areas to help close the gaps in what we know about Gulf War illnesses. They suggest research on the

long-term health effects of low-level exposures to chemical warfare agents, the combined effects of medical injections meant to combat chemical warfare with other Gulf War risk factors, and on the body's physical response to stress. It is also imperative to ensure that longitudinal studies and mortality studies are funded since some health effects, such as cancer, may not appear for several years after the end of the Gulf War.

Although there may be no single Gulf-War related disease so to speak, it is widely acknowledged that the multiple illnesses and symptoms experienced by Gulf War veterans are connected to their service during the war. Therefore, we must not forget on our solemn obligation to those who willingly served their country and put their lives in harm's way.

To that end, I offer this amendment to increase research into the illnesses experienced by Persian Gulf veterans by \$10 million. The funds would support much more research, including the evaluation and treatment of a host of neuro-immunological disorders, as well as possible connections to Multiple Chemical Sensitivity, chronic fatigue syndrome and fibromyalgia.

Our veterans are not asking for much. They want answers. They want the truth. Our veterans answered our nation's call in war, and now we must answer theirs. Should our priorities include our Gulf War veterans? I believe the choice is self evident and absolutely clear.

AMENDMENT NO. 3451

(Purpose: To reduce funds available for development of the Navy Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System and to provide funds for the procurement of Joint Tactical Combat Training System (JTCTS) equipment)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Within the amounts appropriated under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", the amount available for Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System is hereby reduced by \$9,827,000, and the amount available for Consolidated Training Systems Development is hereby increased by \$9,827,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3452

(Purpose: To require a comprehensive assessment of the TRICARE program)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. (a) Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing a comprehensive assessment of the TRICARE program.

(b) The assessment under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A comparison of the health care benefits available under the health care options of the TRICARE program known as TRICARE Standard, TRICARE Prime, and TRICARE Extra with the health care benefits available under the health care plan of the Federal Employees Health Benefits program most similar to each such option that

has the most subscribers as of the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(A) the types of health care services offered by each option and plan under comparison;

(B) the ceilings, if any, imposed on the amounts paid for covered services under each option and plan under comparison; and

(C) the timeliness of payments to physicians providing services under each option and plan under comparison.

(2) An assessment of the effect on the subscription choices made by potential subscribers to the TRICARE program of the Department of Defense policy to grant priority in the provision of health care services to subscribers to a particular option.

(3) An assessment whether or not the implementation of the TRICARE program has discouraged medicare-eligible individuals from obtaining health care services from military treatment facilities, including—

(A) an estimate of the number of such individuals discouraged from obtaining health care services from such facilities during the two-year period ending with the commencement of the implementation of the TRICARE program; and

(B) an estimate of the number of such individuals discouraged from obtaining health care services from such facilities during the two-year period following the commencement of the implementation of the TRICARE program.

(4) An assessment of any other matters that the Comptroller General considers appropriate for purposes of this section.

(c) In this section:

(1) The term "Federal Employees Health Benefits program" means the health benefits program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The term "TRICARE program" has the meaning given that term in section 1072(7) of title 10, United States Code.

REQUIRING A COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE TRICARE PROGRAM

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, this amendment directs the General Accounting Office to take a close look at the health care benefit that we provide to our military dependents, retirees, and their survivors. Enough time has passed since we replaced CHAMPUS with the TRICARE program that it is now time to see whether or not we are providing a proper benefit.

When I speak of a "proper benefit," I use a very simple standard. I want to be sure that our men and women in uniform and their loved ones are being cared for as well as our civilian federal employees are. The Federal Employees Health Benefits program (FEHBP) provides civilian federal employees and retirees with a good health care benefit having a wide range of patient choice. It's the program that covers all of us in Congress, and my goal is to make sure that TRICARE is just as good for our military families.

Mr. President, the FEHBP offers many different managed-care, fee-for-service, and preferred-provider plans from which to choose. If the civilian federal employee or retiree finds his or her health care plan to be inadequate, another plan of the same type can be chosen. For our military families, it is not so simple. With TRICARE, you only get a choice of one managed-care,

one fee-for-service, or one preferred-provider plan. To paraphrase Henry Ford, you can pick any HMO-type plan that you want, as long as you choose TRICARE Prime. And if, for example, you are unhappy with TRICARE Prime, you either have to live with it, or go for the one fee-for-service or the one preferred-provider plan—there are no alternate managed-care plans.

Now, I recognize that a comparison between the TRICARE plans and the FEHBP plans will have to be very subjective. The comparison should not be limited simply to objective cost factors, such as co-pays and premiums, but it must be expansive enough to consider factors such as patient satisfaction, administrative requirements, ceilings on reimbursements and timeliness of their payment, covered services, etc. This is why I want the GAO to do this study. They will be independent and can use a combination of objective analyses and subjective surveys and interviews to give us the most clear, unbiased picture.

Of course, we would not have to worry about conducting studies or figuring out how to compare the quality of TRICARE with the FEHBP if we provided more customer choice. Ultimately, the best "study" of the quality of a product or service is its acceptance in the marketplace. For this reason, I have long favored considering Medicare subvention and making FEHBP available for military beneficiaries as well as civilians. But, with TRICARE only offering one of each type of plan and having a captive audience, there are no competitive pressures to keep providers focused on customer service, so this study is necessary.

I am also concerned that Department of Defense policies with regard to TRICARE may be further limiting choice. The GAO should identify reasons why TRICARE Prime enrollees should have priority at Military Treatment Facilities. This decision may be effectively eliminating the TRICARE Standard and Extra options because to choose either of these options may close off treatment at a Military Treatment Facility.

And there is another problem. Medicare-eligible military retirees, since the implementation of TRICARE are now having a very difficult time getting to see the doctor at the Military Treatment Facilities, if not facing an impossibility altogether. Let me explain. Because TRICARE Prime patients have first priority for medical treatment, retirees who wish to be served at a Military Treatment Facility have to sign up for TRICARE Prime—their choice for TRICARE Standard or Extra is effectively eliminated. But, the worst of it is that Medicare-eligible retirees are not eligible to participate in TRICARE at all. They and their Medicare-eligible dependents and survivors, if there are no appoint-

ments available at the Military Treatment Facility, are left with no military medical benefit, which we all know is contrary to the promise made to these veterans when they decided to make a career in the military.

Mr. President, there is no reasonable explanation that I can think of that could justify a health care benefit for our men and women in uniform, their dependents, and survivors, and retirees who give and gave so much of their lives for our country, that is anything less than what we have provided for ourselves and for civil servants. My amendment will give us a clear idea whether the military medical benefit offered is truly "prime," or even "standard," or whether it is substandard and we need to take action.

AMENDMENT NO. 3453

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into one or more multiyear leases of non-tactical firefighting, crash rescue, or snow removal equipment)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force may each enter into one or more multiyear leases of non-tactical firefighting equipment, non-tactical crash rescue equipment, or non-tactical snow removal equipment. The period of a lease entered into under this section shall be for any period not in excess of 10 years. Any such lease shall provide that performance under the lease during the second and subsequent years of the contract is contingent upon the appropriation of funds and shall provide for a cancellation payment to be made to the lessor if such appropriations are not made.

(b) Lease payments made under subsection (a) shall be made from amounts provided in this or future Appropriations Acts.

(c) This section is effective for all fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998.

AMENDMENT 3454

(Purpose: To provide funds for a Domestic Preparedness Sustainment Training Center)

At the appropriate place in the bill in Title VIII, insert the following:

"SEC. . . Of the amounts appropriated in this bill for the Defense Threat Reduction and Treaty Compliance Agency and for Operations and Maintenance, National Guard, \$1,500,000 shall be available to develop training materials and a curriculum for a Domestic Preparedness Sustainment Training Center at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas."

AMENDMENT 3455

(Purpose: To ensure that a balanced investment is made in the Aerostat development program)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", up to \$10,000,000 may be made available only for the efforts associated with building and demonstrating a deployable mobile large aerostat system platform.

AMENDMENT NO. 3456

(Purpose: To provide \$150,000 for the redevelopment of Havre Air Force Base and Training Site, Montana, for public benefit purposes)

On page 99, in between lines 17 and 18, insert before the period at the end the following: "SEC. . That of the amounts available under this heading, \$150,000 shall be made available to the Bear Paw Development Council, Montana, for the management and conversion of the Havre Air Force Base and Training Site, Montana, for public benefit purposes, including public schools, housing for the homeless, and economic development".

AMENDMENT NO. 3457

(Purpose: To repeal limitations on authority to set rates and waive requirements for reimbursement of expenses incurred for instruction at service academies of persons from foreign countries)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Section 4344(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (2), by striking out " , except that the reimbursement rates may not be less than the cost to the United States of providing such instruction, including pay, allowances, and emoluments, to a cadet appointed from the United States"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (3).

(b) Section 6957(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (2), by striking out " , except that the reimbursement rates may not be less than the cost to the United States of providing such instruction, including pay, allowances, and emoluments, to a midshipman appointed from the United States"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (3).

(c) Section 9344(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (2), by striking out " , except that the reimbursement rates may not be less than the cost to the United States of providing such instruction, including pay, allowances, and emoluments, to a cadet appointed from the United States"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (3).

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to offer a simple amendment to the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Appropriations bill on behalf of Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and myself that merits bipartisan support and speedy passage.

My amendment would repeal the limitations on the military departments to waive the requirement for reimbursement of expenses for foreign students at the service academies. Clearly, the authority to set rates and waive reimbursement expenses for persons from foreign countries undergoing instruction at U.S. service academies should rest with our military departments and not be subject to limitations on their ability to determine the costs of instruction of foreign nationals.

Mr. President, the Senate Armed Services Committee included this provision in its version of the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Authorization bill, however it was subsequently dropped in Conference. The service academy superintendents all support this legisla-

tion, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Mr. President, I request that letters of support of my amendment from the service academy superintendents and others be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

AMENDMENT NO. 3458

(Purpose: To make small businesses eligible to participate in the Indian Subcontracting Incentive Program)

On page 54, strike Section 8023 and insert the following:

SEC. 8023. (a) In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, \$8,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by Section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That contractors participating in the in the test program established by section 854 of Public Law 101-189 (15 U.S.C. 637 note) shall be eligible for the program established by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544).

(b) Section 8024 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 105-56) is amended by striking out "That these payments" and all that follows through "*Provided further*,".

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator DORGAN's amendment that would clarify the eligibility of small businesses to participate in the Indian incentive payment program.

Mr. President, I can assure my colleagues that in establishing this program, it was our intent to provide incentives to Defense contractors who would enter into subcontracts with Indian tribal government-chartered entities and tribal enterprises.

Mr. President, it was not our intent to exclude from the Indian incentive payment program, those small businesses that might enter into contracts with the Department of Defense.

It is my understanding that because the original authorizing language which established the Indian incentive payment program refers to a subcontracting plan pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 637(d), the Department of Defense has interpreted that provision to exclude small businesses from participation in the Indian incentive payment program.

Senator DORGAN's amendment would simply strike the reference to a subcontracting plan pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 637(d), to make clear that small businesses who enter into contracts with the Department of Defense may participate in the Indian incentive payment program by entering into subcontracts with tribally-chartered entities or tribal enterprises.

Mr. President, I believe we should include Senator DORGAN's amendment in S. 2132.

I ask unanimous consent to have two pertinent letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, December 19, 1997.

Hon. BYRON L. DORGAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR BYRON: This is in response to your letter dated October 31, 1997, concerning the Department of Defense Indian Subcontracting Incentive Program.

The situation you describe is the consequence of a provision in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998. Specifically, section 8024 of that Act appropriates \$8 million for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544). Section 8024, however, restricts the availability of such incentive payments to contractors that have submitted subcontracting plans pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 637(d). However, subsection 637(d)(7) expressly provides that the provisions relating to submission of a subcontracting plan under section 637(d) do not apply to small businesses. Consequently, the \$8 million is not available for payments to small business under this authority.

Accordingly, in order to permit small businesses to participate in the program supported by the \$8 million available under section 8024, new legislation, rather than an administrative change, would be required. We strongly support maximum practicable participation of small businesses in the performance of Department of Defense contracts, and accordingly we intend to explore, in coordination with the Office of Management and Budget, whether to advance a legislative proposal to eliminate the restrictive language in section 8024 in future years appropriations acts.

I appreciate your bringing this issue to our attention, and trust that this responds to your concerns.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM COHEN.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, November 12, 1997.

Mr. MARC A. KING,
Vice President, Business Development,
GMA Cover Corp., Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. KING: This responds to our telephone conversation of October 9, 1997 relative to whether or not small businesses are eligible to receive incentive payments under the DoD Indian Subcontracting Incentive Program. My staff, in consultation with both the Office of General Counsel and the Office of Defense Procurement, thoroughly reviewed the FY 1998 DoD Appropriations Act and our implementing policy. The conclusion reached based on that review is that the legislation authorizes incentive payments from the \$8 Million appropriated only to firms who submit subcontracting plans pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 637(d). Since 15 U.S.C. 637(d) does not apply to small businesses, even if GMA Cover Corporation agreed to submit a subcontracting plan, such a submission would not be pursuant to this provision of the law. Consequently, payment of incentives for subcontracting with Indian organizations or Indian-owned business enterprises using the \$8 Million appropriated in the FY 1998 DoD Appropriations Act is not authorized for GMA Cover Corporation or other small businesses.

As the restriction on the use of the \$8 Million appropriated for Indian subcontracting incentive payments to large businesses is part of the FY 1998 Appropriations Act, it cannot be eliminated through regulations developed by the Department to implement the legislation. However, since it is our objective

to provide for the maximum practicable participation of Indian organizations and Indian-owned business enterprises in our contracts, I have submitted a legislative initiative proposing an amendment to the FY 1998 Appropriations Act language that will allow incentive payments to small businesses which subcontract to Indian organizations or Indian-owned business enterprises.

The point of contact for this subject is Mr. Ivory Fisher. You may contact him directly on this or any other issues associated with the Indian Subcontracting Incentive Program. He may be reached at (703) 697-1688.

ROBERT L. NEAL, JR.,
Director, Office of Small and
Disadvantaged Business Utilization.

AMENDMENT NO. 3459

(Purpose: To provide for full funding of the testing of six chemical demilitarization technologies under the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Out of the funds available for the Department of Defense under title VI of this Act for chemical agents and munitions, Defense, or the unobligated balances of funds available for chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense, under any other Act making appropriations for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for any fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may use not more than \$25,000,000 for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment to complete the demonstration of alternatives to baseline incineration for the destruction of chemical agents and munitions and to carry out the pilot program under section 8065 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (section 101(b) of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-101; 50 U.S.C. 1521 note). The amount specified in the preceding sentence is in addition to any other amount that is made available pursuant to any other provision of this Act out of funds appropriated under title VI of this Act to complete the demonstration of the alternatives and to carry out the pilot program: *Provided*, That none of the funds shall be taken from any ongoing operational chemical munition destruction programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 3460

(Purpose: To express the Sense of the Senate regarding the use of child soldiers in armed conflict)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

Findings:
child experts estimate that as many as 250,000 children under the age of 18 are currently serving in armed forces or armed groups in more than 30 countries around the world;

contemporary armed conflict has caused the deaths of 2,000,000 minors in the last decade alone, and has left an estimated 6,000,000 children seriously injured or permanently disabled;

children are uniquely vulnerable to military recruitment because of their emotional and physical immaturity, are easily manipulated, and can be drawn into violence that they are too young to resist or understand;

children are most likely to become child soldiers if they are poor, separated from their families, displaced from their homes, living in a combat zone, or have limited access to education;

orphans and refugees are particularly vulnerable to recruitment;

one of the most egregious examples of the use of child soldiers is the abduction of some

10,000 children, some as young as 8 years of age, by the Lord's Resistance Army (in this resolution referred to as the "LRA") in northern Uganda;

the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1997 reports that in Uganda the LRA kills, maims, and rapes large numbers of civilians, and forces abducted children into "virtual slavery as guards, concubines, and soldiers";

children abducted by the LRA are forced to raid and loot villages, fight in the front line of battle against the Ugandan army and the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA), serve as sexual slaves to rebel commanders, and participate in the killing of other children who try to escape;

former LRA child captives report witnessing Sudanese government soldiers delivering food supplies, vehicles, ammunition, and arms to LRA base camps in government-controlled southern Sudan;

children who manage to escape from LRA captivity have little access to trauma care and rehabilitation programs, and many find their families displaced, unlocatable, dead, or fearful of having their children return home;

Graca Machel, the former United Nations expert on the impact of armed conflict on children, identified the immediate demobilization of all child soldiers as an urgent priority, and recommended the establishment through an optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 18 as the minimum age for recruitment and participation in armed forces; and

the International Committee of the Red Cross, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, and the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights, as well as many nongovernmental organizations, also support the establishment of 18 as the minimum age for military recruitment and participation in armed conflict:

SEC. 1. (a) The Senate hereby—

(1) deplors the global use of child soldiers and supports their immediate demobilization;

(2) condemns the abduction of Ugandan children by the LRA;

(3) calls on the Government of Sudan to use its influence with the LRA to secure the release of abducted children and to halt further abductions; and

(4) encourages the United States delegation not to block the drafting of an optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child that would establish 18 as the minimum age for participation in armed conflict.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the President and the Secretary of State should—

(1) support efforts to end the abduction of children by the LRA, secure their release, and facilitate their rehabilitation and reintegration into society;

(2) not block efforts to establish 18 as the minimum age for participation in conflict through an optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child; and

(3) provide greater support to United Nations agencies and nongovernmental organizations working for the rehabilitation and reintegration of former child soldiers into society.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and the Secretary of State.

AMENDMENT NO. 3461

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense shall obligate the funds provided for Counterterrorism Technical Support in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (under title IV of Public Law 105-56) for the projects and in the amounts provided for in House Report 105-265 of the House of Representatives, 105th Congress, first session: *Provided*, That the funds available for the Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis Project should be executed through cooperation with the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

AMENDMENT NO. 3462

(Purpose: To designate funds for the development and testing of alternate turbine engines for missiles)

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", up to \$1,000,000 may be made available only for the development and testing of alternate turbine engines for missiles.

AMENDMENT NO. 3463

(Purpose: to guarantee the right of all active duty military personnel, merchant mariners, and their dependents to vote in Federal, State, and local elections)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . VOTING RIGHTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL.

(a) GUARANTEE OF RESIDENCY.—Article VII of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. 5890 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 704. (a) For purposes of voting for an office of the United States or of a State, a person who is absent from a State in compliance with military or naval orders shall not, solely by reason of that absence—

"(1) be deemed to have lost a residence or domicile in that State;

"(2) be deemed to have acquired a residence or domicile in any other State; or

"(3) be deemed to have become resident in or a resident of any other State.

"(b) In this section, the term 'State' includes a territory or possession of the United States, a political subdivision of a State, territory, or possession, and the District of Columbia."

(b) STATE RESPONSIBILITY TO GUARANTEE MILITARY VOTING RIGHTS:

(1) REGISTRATION AND BALLOTING.—Section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-1) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(a) ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICES.—" before "Each State shall—"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:
"(b) ELECTIONS FOR STATE AND LOCAL OFFICES.—Each State shall—

"(1) permit absent informed services voters to use absentee registration procedures and to vote by absentee ballot in general, special, primary, and run-off elections for State and local offices; and

"(2) accept and process, with respect to any election described in paragraph (1), any otherwise valid voter registration application from an absent uniformed services voter if the application is received by the appropriate State election official not less than 30 days before the election."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for title I of such Act is amended by striking out "FOR FEDERAL OFFICE".

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. From amounts made available by this Act, up to \$10,000,000 may be available

to convert the Eighth Regiment National Guard Armory into a Chicago Military Academy: *Provided*, That the Academy shall provide a 4-year college preparatory curriculum combined with a mandatory JROTC instruction program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (No. 3420 through 3464) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I say with regard to the unresolved issues: We ask Senator DEWINE or his staff to show us the drug interdiction amendment; the D'Amato Serbia amendment; the two Coats amendments on SOS, and the next QDR, so that we can proceed to review those.

Similarly, we have a series on the Democratic side that we have not seen, and I urge that we see those: the Dodd Army pension issues; the Harkin vets' meals issue. Other than that, I believe we have seen them all.

I might state, it appears that the one amendment that will take the longest time to dispose of is Senator DURBIN's amendment, and I see he is here. I invite him to offer his amendment so that we might determine how to handle it.

Is the Senator prepared to suggest any kind of a time arrangement with regard to that? We would like to have a vote sometime around 8 o'clock, to make sure people understand we are going to stay here until we get done.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I am open to the Senator's request for a time limitation. Whatever the Senator from Alaska would like to suggest, I would certainly entertain.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am willing to suggest to the Senator that we divide the time equally between now and 8 p.m., at which time it would be my intention to move to table the Senator's amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. I agree to that. I have no objection. Before agreeing, could I ask the Senator from Alaska, time will be equally divided?

Mr. STEVENS. And I add to that, there will be no second-degree amendments to this motion prior to the motion to table; after the motion to table, it is open.

Mr. DURBIN. And further debate?

Mr. STEVENS. And further debate; obviously, there is no limitation if the amendment is not tabled.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3465

(Purpose: To prohibit the availability of funds for offensive military operations except in accordance with Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 3465.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to initiate or conduct offensive military operations by United States Armed Forces except in accordance with Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, which vests in Congress the power to declare war and take certain other related actions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is the usual custom in the Senate as long as I have been here—almost 19 or 20 months now—to dispense with the reading of an amendment. In this case, I did not—first, because the amendment in its entirety is very brief, only one page; and, second, I wanted those who are following this debate to hear each word of the amendment, because in the wording of this amendment I think we have an important decision to make on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

This amendment which I offer reaffirms that the United States should only go to war in accordance with the war powers vested in the Congress by the Constitution. My colleague, who has just joined us on the floor, Senator BYRD of West Virginia, carries a well-worn and tattered version of that Constitution with him. I bet he has it on his person as this moment—and I win my bet—and Senator BYRD refers to it frequently to remind all of us that we, when we took the oath of office to become Members of the U.S. Senate, swore to uphold this Constitution.

The section of the Constitution which my amendment addresses is one which is central to the power of the U.S. Senate and the power of Congress. Article I, section 8, includes in the powers of Congress, the power:

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water.

Most constitutional scholars will know the meaning of the term "marque and reprisal." We have read it many times, but for those of us who need to be refreshed, that is an effort, short of war, where the United States, short of some commitment of major troop forces and the like, would seek to impose its will or stand for its own national security.

The most operative section of Article I, section 8, are the simple words "To declare War."

This amendment would prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the De-

partment of Defense for "offensive military operations," except in accordance with Article I, section 8, which specifically gives to Congress, and Congress alone, the power to declare war and take other actions to govern and regulate the Armed Forces.

A similar amendment was offered by Congressman DAVID SKAGGS of Colorado and Congressman TOM CAMPBELL of California in a bipartisan fashion. It has passed the House of Representatives. It is part of the Department of Defense appropriations bill, which will be considered in conference with the bill that we are debating.

This amendment that I offer today reaffirms that the Constitution favors the Congress in the decision to go to war, and that Members of Congress have a constitutional responsibility that they cannot ignore with regard to the offensive use of Armed Forces. Why is this necessary? Let me quote from a scholar who has written on this subject extensively. Louis Fisher is a senior specialist in the separation of powers with the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress. He wrote in an article entitled "Sidestepping Congress: Presidents Acting Under the UN and NATO:

Truman in Korea, Bush in Iraq, Clinton in Haiti and Bosnia—in each instance, a President circumvented Congress by relying either on the UN or NATO. President Bush also stitched together a multilateral alliance before turning to Congress at the eleventh hour to obtain statutory authority. Each exercise of power built a stronger base for unilateral Presidential action, no matter how illegal, unconstitutional and undemocratic. The attitude, increasingly, is not to do things the right way, in accordance with the Constitution and our laws, but to do the "right thing." It is an attitude of autocracy, if not monarchy. How long do we drift in these currents before discovering that the waters are hazardous for constitutional government?

On January 12, 1991, the Congress, in addition to authorizing the use of force to drive Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, took an important vote asserting its constitutional responsibilities and insisting that the President follow the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution when considering a question as serious as war. Despite the vocal opposition of the Bush White House, the House of Representatives in which I served voted 302-131 in favor of a resolution that I offered with Congressman Bennett of Florida. You may recall what happened. When Saddam Hussein of Iraq invaded Kuwait, there was fear that he would continue and then invade Saudi Arabia. The United States began positioning forces in Saudi Arabia. At the invitation of the Saudis, we brought in a sufficient force to at least discourage, if not deter, Saddam Hussein.

Over time, it became clear that the force in place was growing and the intention was just not to protect Saudi Arabia, but in fact to remove Iraqi

forces from Kuwait. At that moment, the nature of our commitment changed, and at that moment, the congressional responsibility changed, from my point of view. We were no longer in Saudi Arabia just at the invitation of the Saudis to defend; we were preparing a massive military force to, in fact, invade Kuwait and to oust the Iraqis. We knew that that would necessarily involve the loss of life, and many of us in Congress believed that it clearly fit within the four corners of Article I, section 8, that Congress should act and, in fact, we did. There was an extensive debate on the floor of the Senate, as well as the House of Representatives, and ultimately, Congress voted to authorize the use of force by the President—President Bush at the time—in order to push the Iraqis out of Kuwait.

Another important congressional action was a 1994 Senate resolution rejecting the Clinton administration's claim that the United Nations Security Council 940 constituted "authorization for the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in Haiti under the Constitution of the United States." The Senate passed this resolution by a resounding 99-0 vote. The framers never intended the Armed Forces to be employed by the Executive as a blunt instrument for enforcing U.S. foreign policy without congressional approval. Yet, in the Iraq crisis earlier this year, and in the unstable situation in Kosovo today, that is exactly what we have seen. Absent a reaffirmation by Congress of its proper constitutional war powers, we will certainly see it again. The time for this amendment is now. I will speak to the Kosovo situation toward the close of my opening statement.

Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution, the so-called war powers clause, vests in Congress this power that I have read. Other clauses of the same article I, section 8 vests in Congress the power to "define and punish piracies" and "offenses against the Law of Nations," "raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces," and "to provide for organizing," arming, and disciplining the militia, and "governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States."

Very significantly, clause 18 of this section gives Congress the power to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." This clause clearly states that it is Congress that makes the laws for the regulation of the Armed Forces, especially in matters of war.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution states:

The President shall be commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several states, when

called into the actual service of the United States."

That is all the war powers vested in the President by the Constitution. It is instructive for us to look back at the debate which gave rise to these constitutional provisions.

Comments by the framers of the Constitution clearly indicate their intent in favor of Congress in matters relating to the offensive use of military force.

James Wilson, speaking at the Pennsylvania State Convention on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, argued that the system of checks and balances built into the Constitution "will not hurry us into war; it is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man or a single body of men to involve us in such distress; for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large."

No one less than Thomas Jefferson explained that he desired Congress to be "an effectual check to the dog of war."

James Madison wrote that Congress would have the power to initiate war, though the President could act immediately "to repel sudden attacks" without congressional authorization.

Roger Sherman further delineated on the President's war powers: "The executive should be able to repel and not to commence war."

Constitutional scholar Louis Henkin of Columbia University wrote this in 1987:

There is no evidence that the framers contemplated any significant independent role—or authority—for the president as commander in chief when there was no war. . . . The president's designation as commander in chief . . . appears to have implied no substantive authority to use the Armed Forces, whether for war (unless the United States were suddenly attacked) or for peacetime purposes, except as Congress directed.

International law scholar, John Bassett Moore, wrote in 1944:

There can hardly be room for doubt that the framers of the Constitution, when they vested in Congress the power to declare war, never imagined that they were leaving it to the Executive to use the military and naval forces of the United States all over the world for the purpose of actually coercing other nations, occupying their territory, and killing their soldiers and citizens, all according to his own notions of the fitness of things, as long as he called his action something other than "war" or persisted in calling it peace.

The constitutional framework adopted by the framers for the war power is remarkably clear in its basic principles. The authority to initiate war lay with Congress. Other U.S. Presidents have affirmed this interpretation of war powers under the Constitution.

Abraham Lincoln wrote this in 1848:

This, our (Constitutional) Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions; and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

Fast forward 100 years into the 20th century, as we debated the possibility of creating a United Nations. The U.N. Charter was written against the backdrop of the disaster of the Treaty of Versailles and President Wilson's determination to make foreign policy without Congress. When President Wilson submitted that treaty to the Senate in 1919, he attached the covenant of the League of Nations. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge offered a number of reservations, specifically including a protection of the prerogative of Congress, and Congress alone, to declare war. President Wilson called this reservation "a nullification of the treaty." The issue was joined. The Senate rejected the treaty, and thereby the League of Nations, in 1919 and again in 1920.

In the midst of World War II, when the concept of another world organization began to form, care was taken not to cross the line that had doomed the League of Nations. Any commitment of U.S. forces to a world body would require prior authorization by both Houses of Congress. Debate on the Hill between the House and Senate had more to do with each body's prerogative and role than the underlying assumption. Even under the auspices of the United Nations, congressional approval was necessary before troops could be committed.

Section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act is explicit. Agreements "shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution."

Ultimately the decision was reached that both Houses of Congress—not just the Senate under its treaty authority—was necessary.

Soon after President Roosevelt's death, President Harry Truman sent a cable from the conference in Potsdam that led to the establishment of the U.N., stating that all agreements involving U.S. troop commitments in the U.N. would first have to be approved by both Houses of Congress.

President Eisenhower assured the press, in January of 1956, in an often-quoted statement, "When it comes to a matter of war, there is only one place I would go, and that is the Congress of the United States and tell them what I believe. I will never be guilty of any kind of action that can be interpreted as war until Congress, which has constitutional authority, says so. I am not going to order any troops into anything that can be interpreted as war until Congress directs it."

In the creation of NATO, Secretary of State Dean Acheson told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1949 that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization "does not mean the United States would automatically be at war if one of the other signatory nations were the victim of an armed attack. Under our Constitution the Congress alone has the power to declare war."

Then came Korea. President Truman sent U.S. troops in 1950 without ever seeking, or obtaining, congressional authority. By historical fluke, the Soviet Union was absent from the U.N. Security Council when a crucial vote was taken responding to the possibility that the Korean peninsula would be overrun. Without a Soviet veto, the U.N. moved forward, and President Truman rationalized the use of force in this "police action" to uphold the rule of law.

I recall that particularly, because my two older brothers served in the Korean war, and there was an ongoing joke about the fact that this was just a "police action." They knew better. All of the families and all of those involved knew that it was, in fact, a war.

The courts, too, have supported the constitutional prerogatives of Congress with regard to war-making, including the implied constitutional power to "authorize" war.

The Supreme Court in *Bas v. Tingy*, in 1800 said, "Congress is empowered to declare general war, or Congress may wage a limited war; limited in place, in objects, and in time. . . ."

Chief Justice Marshall, writing in *Talbot v. Seaman* in 1801: "The whole powers of war being, by the Constitution of the United States, vested in Congress, the acts of that body can alone be resorted to as guides in this inquiry."

U.S. Circuit Court, New York, *U.S. v. Smith*, 1806: "It is the exclusive province of Congress to change a state of peace into a state of war."

More recently, during the Persian Gulf episode, a case was filed in the U.S. district court in Washington. I joined with petitioners who filed this action to ask the court to spell out the power of Congress when it came to the declaration of war. The court rejected the Justice Department's contention that "the question whether an offensive action taken by American armed forces constitutes an act of war (to be initiated by a declaration of war) or an 'offensive military attack' (presumably undertaken by the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief) is not one of objective fact but involves an exercise of judgment based upon all the vagaries of foreign affairs and national security."

The court said, "This claim on behalf of the Executive is far too sweeping to be accepted by the courts. If the Executive had the sole power to determine that any particular offensive military operation, no matter how vast, does not constitute war-making but only an offensive military attack, the congressional power to declare war will be at the mercy of a semantic decision by the Executive. Such an 'interpretation' would evade the plain language of the Constitution, and it cannot stand."

Mr. President, over the last 40 or 45 years, Congress has virtually ceded its

constitutional war powers responsibilities to the President. Many of the significant instances of use of force by the Executive without congressional authorization, including the only major unauthorized war in Korea, and localized conflicts in the Dominican Republic, Grenada, and Panama, among others, occurred during this period.

I will not visit that sad and contentious chapter of American history surrounding the Vietnam war, but suffice it to say that after that war Congress made the decision, through the passage of legislation, to take a more active role in the decisionmaking process.

The 1973 War Powers Resolution, which then-Armed Services Committee Chairman John Stennis called "an important step in this Congress to assume its duty in representing the people of this Nation," unfortunately has done little to slow down the gradual assumption of war powers claimed by successive administrations or to embolden Congress to properly exercise its war powers responsibilities under the Constitution.

Even in signing the congressional authorization of the use of force against Iraq in 1991, President Bush went to great pains to emphasize his claim that he possessed constitutional authority to act. "As I made clear to congressional leaders at the outset, my request for congressional support did not, and my signing of this resolution does not, constitute any change in the long-standing position of the Executive Branch on either the President's constitutional authority to use the Armed Forces to defend vital U.S. interests, or the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution."

The Clinton administration echoed President Bush's comments and even took it one step further.

During her congressional testimony during the Iraq crisis this last February, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright spoke of "the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief to use armed forces to protect our national interests."

In a Statement of Administration policy threatening a veto of the House version of this bill if the Skaggs-Campbell amendment were included, the administration stated that, "The President must be able to act decisively to protect U.S. national security and foreign policy interests."

I do not believe that the framers of our Constitution would have ever accepted such inflated claims of executive authority, or the idea the Armed Forces should be used by the President as a device for implementing administration foreign policy, without the approval of Congress.

President Bush's comments notwithstanding, Congress made a good start in regaining its proper constitutional war powers in its thorough 1991 debate and vote to authorize the war in the

Persian Gulf. Congress affirmed at that time that its responsibilities extended far beyond merely paying the bills for Presidents' wars.

Now it is time for the Congress to take the next step. This amendment will restore the proper constitutional balance between the executive and legislative branches in deciding when or if the United States is to go to war.

Mr. President, in the time that I have served on Capitol Hill, in both the House and Senate, it has been my sad responsibility on several occasions to attend funerals in my home district, in my congressional district, for the families of those who have fallen in combat.

I can't think of a sadder occasion—one of the saddest that I can recall—than the one that involved the sending of Marines to Lebanon, putting them in harm's way, and after a terrible bombing of the barracks, the loss of life of a young man from Springfield, IL. Time and again, I thought at those sad services that there is a legitimate question the family could ask of their elected representative in Congress, and now in the U.S. Senate. Was I part of the decision that led to the war that took their son's life? Because the Constitution makes it clear that I should have been part of that decision. In so many instances, I was not; the decision was made by the President. The only course for Congress is control of the purse, and virtually nothing else. As a direct result, we lost lives without the American people speaking to the question of war through their elected Congress.

I caution my colleagues to read carefully this amendment and to realize that it does more than assert our constitutional authority to declare war. It also asserts our responsibility. Be careful for what you wish because with the passage of this amendment and the reassertion of our constitutional responsibility, we will be and should be called on more frequently to make important decisions about committing American troops.

There is one operative and very important word in this amendment. It is the word "offensive," as in offensive military operations. So the Record is eminently clear, there is no doubt in my mind nor in anything I have read that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, has the power to protect American citizens and the property of the United States. He need not come to the Congress and seek our approval when he is, in fact, defending Americans and their property. We are talking about a separate circumstance, a circumstance where instead of taking a defensive action, the President decides to take an offensive action.

I might also add that for those who say, clearly the Senator from Illinois is offering this amendment because he is concerned about some current conflict, well, yes, I am concerned. I am concerned about any conflict that involves

American lives, but that isn't what motivates me to join the gentleman from Colorado who offered this amendment in the House of Representatives. As I mentioned earlier, it was almost 7 years ago that I joined Congressman BENNETT of Florida in a similar effort. I do believe this principle is sound, and those who want to gainsay this effort should know that I have tried to stand by this principle through the time that I have been in Congress.

Is there a need for us to consider it now? I will leave that to your judgment. Consider the statements made by Robert Gelbard, special representative of the President and Secretary of State on Implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement, when he spoke before the House International Relations Committee in Washington on July 23, 1998, relative to the tragedy in Kosovo.

Mr. Gelbard said:

In NATO councils, planning for possible NATO action is nearly completed. While no decision has been made regarding the use of force, all options, including robust military intervention in Kosovo, remain on the table. NATO planning is on track and Milosevic understands that this is no idle threat. The deteriorating situation in Kosovo is a threat to regional peace and security. The potential for spillover into neighboring States remains a paramount concern. We and our allies have made clear to President Milosevic that spillover of the conflict into Albania or Macedonia will not be tolerated.

Make no mistake, if Mr. Gelbard's statement is a statement of administration policy, the administration is poised to initiate an offensive military action relative to Kosovo, an action which I believe clearly requires congressional approval. If the men and women in service to our country who are presently in Bosnia—and I believe the number is about 6,900—should be called to take offensive military action and lives are lost, from all that I have read, it is clearly in derogation of article I, section 8 of the Constitution. This President, my President, any President, has the responsibility to come to Congress to seek our approval. Of course, then the responsibility is on our shoulders to decide whether or not this is in America's national security interest.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate considering this amendment to consider the historical perspective here. For the first time since World War II, when President Franklin Roosevelt hobbled up the steps to take the podium for a Joint Session of Congress in the House of Representatives, asking for a declaration of war, we will state in clear and unequivocal terms that we are asserting our constitutional responsibility and authority when it comes to a declaration of war.

I understand that this will require more dialogue and conversation between the executive and legislative branches about our foreign policy, and

particularly about committing troops, but I do believe that is what the framers of the Constitution had in mind. Those of us who must face the families and explain to them why their daughters and sons, their husbands, their wives and friends and relatives are called on to not only serve this country, but stand in harm's way and risk their lives have to have the authority to stand before them and say we have done our part, we have played our role, we have made the judgment, the judgment which the Constitution gives to us and us alone to make.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, to add Senator FEINGOLD as an original cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me some time?

Mr. DURBIN. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I can't get started in 9 minutes on this subject.

Mr. DURBIN. I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia might be able to secure some time from the other side. I would be happy to ask, if there is anyone in the Chamber. They might be called for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the agreement was entered into. My friend knew of my interest in speaking on the amendment, and I wish I had been protected.

Mr. DURBIN. May I ask the Chair, it was my understanding that at about quarter of 7 we agreed we would debate this until 8 o'clock equally divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. That is correct. That is how time was calculated. I am sorry; I apologize to the Senator from West Virginia, whom I asked to come to the floor, and I would be glad to give him every minute remaining. I am sorry that I had gone as long as I did, because I am anxious to hear his remarks.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I don't know how much time the opponents of this amendment will require.

Mr. President, I think I will just ask for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to thank the opponents for offering 10 minutes to me, but I feel that I will just ask that my speech be printed in the RECORD.

On a matter of this gravity, I am disappointed that the Senate has entered into an agreement to speak for what would amount to about 1 hour and 15

minutes for both opponents and proponents. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Illinois is preeminently correct in what he has said about the Constitution and what he has said about the efforts toward aggrandizement on the part of this administration and most recent administration when it comes to the war powers.

We have in the Senate particularly, may I say, additional responsibilities over those of the House in this area of war powers because of the Constitution and provisions therein, and it seems to me that we ought to take a little more time when it comes to debating an amendment of this importance. This is an amendment that is calculated to protect the prerogatives of the Senate when it comes to our constitutional powers and duties, and here we are limited to 1 hour and 15 minutes.

In saying this, of course, I am complaining, but I also want to thank Mr. DURBIN and I want to thank Mr. STEVENS for their consideration and kindness in offering to give me some additional time.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before the Senator from West Virginia leaves the floor, I have just contacted the majority in an effort to postpone the vote so we can extend this debate. I certainly would like the Senator from West Virginia to have an opportunity to state his position clearly. I believe it will be a valuable addition to this debate. I will be happy to afford an equal amount of time to the other side, so there is no disadvantage created.

Before I make that unanimous consent request, I have asked the majority side if there is objection.

Mr. STEVENS. What? I object. Just a second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. If I might ask the Senator from Alaska, Senator BYRD has come to the floor to speak to this issue. I was wondering if it might be allowed by unanimous consent to extend—postpone the vote for a sufficient time so that each side could have an equal amount of time, to give the Senator from West Virginia his opportunity.

Mr. STEVENS. I say to the Senator, I have talked with Senator BYRD. We are perfectly prepared to have him continue to take time.

Under a unanimous consent agreement, at 8 o'clock we have Senators coming back to vote, and hopefully we can vote at approximately that time. I don't know how long my good friend is going to speak, but I will limit the amount of time spent in opposition. We will just make the motion to table when the time comes. We do not want to extend it now. We are going to have to be here until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning as it is, so I object to any further change in this time agreement, and I urge my good friend from West

Virginia to make his statement. He knows we will accommodate him with such time as he needs. But let's not change the time agreement yet.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of July 16, 1998, the Senate having received H.R. 4194, the provisions of the unanimous consent agreement are executed.

The provisions of the unanimous consent agreement are as follows:

That when the companion measure to S. 2168, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, is received from the House of Representatives, the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken and the text of S. 2168, as passed, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the House bill, as amended, be read for a third time and passed; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Mr. Bond, Mr. Burns, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Craig, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Harkin, and Mr. Byrd; and that the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

Ordered further, That upon passage of the House companion measure, as amended, the passage of S. 2168 be vitiated and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of July 23, 1998, having received H.R. 4328, the provisions of the unanimous consent agreement are executed.

The provisions of the unanimous consent agreement are as follows:

That when the Senate receives the House companion bill, the Senate immediately proceed to its consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 2307, as passed, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the House bill, as amended, be read for a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider the vote be laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Shelby, Domenici, Specter, Bond, Gorton, Bennett, Faircloth, Stevens, Lautenberg, Byrd, Mikulski, Reid, Kohl, Murray, and Inouye; and that the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

Ordered further, That when the Senate passes the House companion measure, as amended, the passage of S. 2307 be vitiated and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding when the Senator returns to the floor, Senator BYRD will speak. I state to the Senate, there is substantial opposition to this amendment. I am one who voted against the War Powers Act, but I think this goes too far. It is an amendment that should be considered by the Armed Services Committee and not debated at the last minute on an appropriations bill.

In the old days, we had a point of order against legislation on an appropriations bill. This is purely legislation on an appropriations bill. That point of order is not available to us now, but the concept is still there, and that is what we are trying to establish once again—the concept that we limit this to relevant amendments to the provisions of this bill that regard spending of money for our defense in the fiscal year 1999.

This is a provision that is ongoing for years. It is not related to this bill. It is not a matter that was before the Senate Appropriations Committee in any way, and it should be part of the Armed Services' consideration. There was an Armed Services bill brought before us before. It would have been perfectly proper to have that brought up at that time in connection with the Armed Services' bill. But I do not think it is proper to bring it up in this bill.

For that reason, as I said before, when the time for Senator BYRD has expired, I intend to move to table the amendment. But, as I indicated to him, I offer him the full amount of time that was allocated to this side to present his statement, plus what is left to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Could I ask for clarification of the time remaining to both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 4½ minutes. The Senator from Alaska, 32 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged to our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. It is my understanding the Senator from Illinois will

use the remainder of his time. I understand it is 4 and some-odd minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four-and-a-half minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. It is my understanding Senator BYRD, to my great regret, is not going to make his statement. Under the circumstances, I yield back the remainder of our time and ask that the time of the Senator from Illinois start at 4½ minutes before 8 o'clock, and we will vote at 8 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I just conferred with Mr. Cortese, the staff director. I am told that we have but one other Senator who has indicated an intention to debate an amendment tonight. We are working now on the remainder of the second managers' package which we should be able to present to the Senate in about 10 to 15 minutes. I ask the cloakrooms to send out notice to Senators that after presentation of that second managers' amendment, I shall move to go to third reading, unless Senators who have amendments on this list come forth to debate them.

We have a very serious situation tomorrow morning. Many Senators told me they want to go to the second funeral of our deceased friend, the officer who was killed in the line of duty. That means we cannot commence voting until 1 o'clock.

We have accepted a great many of these amendments and are prepared to accept them. If Senators want to know whether that is the case, I urge them to come and review the managers' package.

I will not indicate the name of the Senator who we think wants to debate the amendment, because he may not want to debate it. If no one comes after the motion to table the Durbin amendment to present an amendment, I shall move to go to third reading. It is a debatable motion, and we may have some debate on that. I recall my good friend from West Virginia taught me how to do that, Mr. President. So we are going to proceed along that line. I ask my friend from Hawaii if he knows of any amendments or any matter to take up at this time.

Mr. INOUE. No, we are prepared to go to third reading.

Mr. STEVENS. The managers of the bill are prepared to go to third reading, unless a Senator appears to debate an amendment. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that it extend only until 5 minutes of the hour of 8 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3465

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, since there is no one seeking to speak, to speak for 7 minutes in support of the Durbin amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Under the previous order, debate will end at 5 of the hour.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am asking only to go until 10 of the hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, I am going to support the Durbin amendment, and I admire what he is attempting to do and respect his effort. I am not, quite frankly, certain it will have its intended effect.

I strongly agree with the views expressed by my friend from Illinois, that what I call the "monarchist" view of the war power has become the prevalent view at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and it does not matter whether it is a Democratic President or a Republican President. And the original framework of the war power clause envisioned by the Founding Fathers, I think, has been greatly undermined over the last several decades.

On the question of war power, I believe the Constitution is as clear as it is plain. Article I, section 8, provides that the Congress has the power "to declare War, [and] grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal . . ." Article II, section 2, provides, "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

To be sure, the Commander in Chief ensures that the President has the sole power to direct U.S. military forces in combat. But that power—except in very few limited instances—derives totally from congressional authority. It is not the power to move from a state of peace to a state of war. It is a power, once the state of war is in play, to command the forces, but not to change the state.

Until that authority is granted, the President has no inherent power to send forces to war—except, as I said, in certain very limited circumstances, such as to repel sudden attacks or to protect the safety and security of Americans abroad.

On this point, the writings of Alexander Hamilton, a very strong defender, as the Presiding Officer knows, of Presidential power, is very instructive. In Federalist No. 69, Hamilton emphasized that the President's power as Commander in Chief would be "much inferior" to that of the British King, amounting to "nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces."

During the cold war, and during the nuclear age, the thesis arose that, at a

time when the fate of the planet itself appeared to rest on two men thousands of miles apart, Congress had little choice, or so it was claimed, but to cede tremendous authority to the Executive.

Unfortunately, despite the end of the cold war, the view that the President had this authority has continued to survive—and flourish—under Presidents of both political parties.

On the eve of the gulf war, President Bush insisted that he did not need congressional authorization to send half a million men and women into combat with Iraq. I insisted at that time we hold hearings on that subject and there be a resolution concluding whether or not he had that power.

More recently, President Clinton asserted sweeping theories about his power to deploy forces to Haiti and to begin offensive military action against Iraq.

I believe we need to remedy this constitutional imbalance. Accordingly, I have offered in the past, and I have drafted, comprehensive legislation called the Use of Force Act, which is designed to replace the War Powers Resolution.

The Durbin amendment is far shorter and more direct in its approach. And although I support it, as I said, I am skeptical that it will achieve its total desired effect. The Durbin amendment would bar the use of appropriated funds for "offensive military operations" by Armed Forces "except in accordance with Article I, section 8 of the Constitution."

I believe the Constitution already says that, that we need not redeclare that. But I think it is valuable to do it if it sends a message that we are going to be looking a whole lot closer.

In my view, the President may not use force, except in certain limited circumstances, without the authorization of the Congress, period. The war power is not limited to a formal declaration of war—of which we have had only five in our history. The Founding Fathers had little interest, it seems, in the ceremonial aspects of war. The real issue was congressional authorization of war.

As Hamilton noted in Federalist 25, the "ceremony of a formal denunciation of war has of late fallen into disuse." Obviously, the founders were not talking about a circumstance where the only circumstance that the Congress could impact on whether we use force or not is with a formal declaration of war. Even in 1789—to quote Hamilton—ceremonial declarations of war had fallen into disuse, so obviously that is not what they were talking about alone.

The conclusion that Congress has the power to authorize all uses of force is buttressed by the inclusion in the war clause of the power to grant letters of marque and reprisal. An anachronism

today, I acknowledge, letters of marque and reprisal were, though, in the 18th century, their version of limited war. Even back then, for a President to engage in limited war, he needed the authorization of the U.S. Congress. The vehicle was issuing letters of marque and reprisal.

I understand that the administration has expressed its strong opposition to this provision and is threatening to veto it. I have called the administration and indicated they are being foolish in even making that threat, with all due respect. It is merely an institutional instinct that does not surprise me, but I am somewhat surprised by the volume of the objection.

The Durbin amendment, if enacted, may have one salutary effect: It could force the President and his advisors to pause before continuing to make broad assertions of Presidential war power.

If even that result is achieved, the enactment of the Durbin amendment will be a positive development in restoring the constitutional balance.

Mr. President, I will not take the time now, but I will, at the appropriate time, reintroduce the Use of Force Act that I have in previously attempted to have passed, working with a number of constitutional scholars who have written extensively in this area.

Let me conclude in the 30 seconds I have left to again compliment the Senator from Illinois. It is time the Congress, with the changed world, reassert its rightful role in the conduct of the use of force, and, now that the world has changed, the old saw about the need for this emergency power—the Congress being less relevant in that regard—should be put to bed once and for all.

I thank him for his effort and I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Illinois still has 5 and a half minutes. But I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to put down the first of the series of the second managers' package.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3466

(Purpose: To require the Air National Guard to provide support for Coast Guard seasonal search and rescue operations at Francis S. Gabreski Airport, Hampton, New York)

Mr. STEVENS. So I send to the desk an amendment I offer on behalf of the Senator from New York, Mr. D'AMATO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. (a) The Air National Guard shall, during the period beginning on April 15, 1999, and ending on October 15, 1999, provide support at the Francis S. Gabreski Airport, Hampton, New York, for seasonal search and rescue mission requirements of the Coast Guard in the vicinity of Hampton, New York.

(b) The support provided under subsection (a) shall include access to and use of appropriate facilities at Francis S. Gabreski Airport, including runways, hangars, the operations center, and aircraft berthing and maintenance spaces.

(c)(1) The adjutant general of the National Guard of the State of New York and the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the support to be provided under subsection (a).

(2) Not later than December 1, 1998, the adjutant general and the Commandant shall jointly submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a copy of the memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1).

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be set aside to be considered along with the other managers' package at the conclusion of the vote. And I ask unanimous consent that that shall be at 8 o'clock.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3392, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there is a technical correction to amendment No. 3392. It was earlier adopted. Its citation needs to be corrected. I ask unanimous consent that it be corrected.

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

The amendment (No. 3392), as modified, is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. ____ For an additional amount for "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund," \$1,858,600,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, the defense health program appropriations and working capital funds: Provided further, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, at this time the Senator from Illinois is left. I say to my good friend, be my guest for the extra 1½ minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3465

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for his generosity. I will conclude at 8 o'clock, as we promised, and ask for a vote on this. Allow me to try to describe what is at stake, because for everybody in the gallery and those listening to the debate, this could hit home some day. It is a question about when or if the United States should ever go to war, who will make the decision. If you were called on, or one of your children was,

who will decide whether or not that person will stand in harm's way, risk their lives for their country?

I have the deepest respect and admiration for those who serve in the armed services. They have given up their lives to protect this Nation and we owe them a great debt of gratitude. What we are talking about is how this decision is made. The men who wrote this Constitution understood very clearly that if they were going to have a voice in the process, they would have to rely on the Senators and Members of Congress to make that decision on the declaration of war.

This amendment is very brief. By Senate standards, it is amazingly brief—just a few lines. But it states very clearly what I think is an important constitutional concept. First, the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of all of our Armed Forces still retains all of his power and authority to defend the United States and its citizens. He does not have to come to Congress on bended knee and beg for that authority. It is his; he is Commander in Chief. But when he crosses that line and no longer is defending us, but rather is pushing forward in an offensive capacity, saying that we are now going to invade a nation, we are now going to try to secure a certain objective or target, beyond a defensive objective, then the Constitution is clear: That is not his decision to make; it is our decision to make. Better yet, it is your decision to make—to speak to your elected Representatives in the House and Senate and to express your heartfelt feelings.

I can recall the debate over the Persian Gulf war. There was quite a division within the military, and even within Congress. But I don't think there was a finer moment in the 16 years I have served on Capitol Hill than that period of time when each Member of the U.S. Senate and the House came to the floor and took all the time necessary to speak their hearts about whether or not we should put our children in harm's way to stop this aggression by Saddam Hussein.

I can speak for myself—and I am sure for many colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike—there were sleepless nights when you knew that a vote to go forward and commit our troops in an offensive capacity was going to lead to the loss of life. It was a painful decision, but it is one that I accepted, and everybody as a Member of the House and Senate accepted as well.

I say to my colleagues in the U.S. Senate, who I hope are following this debate, that this is about whether or not the oath of office that we took is meaningful. When we swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States, I don't believe they asked us to turn to Article I, section 8 and make an amendment to take it out. No, it was included. It was part of that responsibility—an awesome responsibility.

My friend, the Senator from Alaska, has raised a procedural point. He says that this is beyond the scope of an appropriation or a spending bill. I disagree with his conclusion on that. I have seen what is considered authorizing language and much more expansive language easily adopted on the floor of the Senate and in the House time and time again. So I hope that those who vote on the amendment will vote on it on all fours, straightforward, up or down; do you agree or disagree? Do you agree with our Constitution, which says this is our responsibility in Congress to declare war? Or are you prepared to accept the drift that has gone on for half a century now, which says we will continue to give more and more power to the President to make this decision?

If you should decide this is the President's province and we are going to cede all of our constitutional authority, mark my words, you should think twice before you come to the floor of the Senate—or our colleagues in the House—and question when the President uses this authority, because if you are not prepared to say that we accept our responsibility under the Constitution, that we will stand up and decide and vote when it comes to putting our troops in harm's way, then I think you may have forsown any opportunity to come to this floor and second-guess the President—a President who uses the power that we have handed to him.

As I have said in previous moments in this debate, there is no sadder moment than going home to your State or district and facing a casket, draped with a flag, of a fallen soldier, sailor, airman or marine and then facing that family. I believe that it is our constitutional responsibility to be part of the decisionmaking that leads to military action. It will not be an easy task. It will be a tough burden, but it is exactly why we have stood for office and why we have asked to represent our States.

I hope my colleagues in the U.S. Senate will support this amendment. I believe this is straightforward and honest in its approach. I believe that as you consider the possibilities just in the weeks ahead—perhaps even while we are gone over the August recess—that there may be an effort in the Bosnian region, in Kosovo or some other place, to assert and take offensive military action. Those who have voted against this amendment tonight will not be able to say the President should have called on us first, because that is what this amendment says. This amendment says anywhere in the world where the President wants to take offensive military action—not to defend the property and the persons of America, but offensive military action—he is bound by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe my time has expired. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the text of the amendment be placed before both parties on the appropriate table.

I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Illinois and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 251 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Moynihan
Bond	Graham	Murkowski
Breaux	Gramm	Murray
Brownback	Grams	Nickles
Bryan	Grassley	Reed
Bumpers	Gregg	Reid
Burns	Hagel	Robb
Campbell	Hatch	Roberts
Chafee	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Cleland	Inhofe	Roth
Coats	Inouye	Santorum
Cochran	Jeffords	Sessions
Collins	Kempthorne	Shelby
Conrad	Kerrey	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kohl	Snowe
D'Amato	Kyl	Stevens
Daschle	Landrieu	Thomas
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thompson
Dodd	Leahy	Thurmond
Domenici	Levin	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lieberman	Warner
Enzi	Lott	Wyden

NAYS—15

Biden	Feingold	Kennedy
Bingaman	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Hollings	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchison	Specter
Durbin	Johnson	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Helms

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 3465) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to change a

vote. On the last vote, I voted "nay." I meant to vote "yea." The vote will not affect the outcome. I did not realize it was a tabling motion. I ask unanimous consent to change my vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

AMENDMENT NO. 3398, WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the Kyl amendment No. 3398, with the consent of the sponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3398) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3466 THROUGH 3475, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to announce that we have left outstanding one amendment of Senator GRAHAM which I understand may be disposed of by separate—two amendments of Senator HARKIN, and we have two outstanding amendments on this side which I hope will be cleared soon.

We have a package here ready to present. We have before the Senate—the pending amendment I believe is Senator D'AMATO's amendment on search and rescue. I add to that amendment the following amendments: the Bingaman amendment on donation of surplus dental equipment; the Bingaman amendment on furnishing of dental care to dependents; the Dodd amendment on retired pay backlog; the Harkin amendment on backlog of medals; the Harkin amendment on smoking cessation; the Frist amendment on Marine Corps lightweight maintenance enclosures; the Dorgan amendment on environmental cleanup; the DeWine amendment on drug interdiction; the Wellstone amendment on family violence.

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the managers' amendment en bloc and that the amendments be adopted en bloc and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am curious what the Dorgan amendment is—environmental. Would you briefly describe that?

Mr. STEVENS. It is \$1.4 million for a site in North Dakota as a permissive amendment for cleanup. It has been cleared on both sides, I might say to the Senator.

Mr. CHAFEE. Not totally.

Mr. STEVENS. What?

Mr. CHAFEE. Not totally cleared on both sides.

Mr. STEVENS. It is a permissive amendment. It does not mandate. It authorizes. It provides the money if they want to do it. We thought on that basis it is up to the administration to do it or not do it.

I inquire of the Senator from Florida—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments by number.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], on behalf of others, proposes en bloc amendments 3466 through 3475.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection—

Mr. STEVENS. May we have order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we have order.

If there is no objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. STEVENS. And the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

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

The amendments (Nos. 3466 through 3475) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3466

(Purpose: To require the Air National Guard to provide support for Coast Guard seasonal search and rescue operations at Francis S. Gabreski Airport, Hampton, New York)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. (a) The Air National Guard shall, during the period beginning on April 15, 1999, and ending on October 15, 1999, provide support at the Francis S. Gabreski Airport, Hampton, New York, for seasonal search and rescue mission requirements of the Coast Guard in the vicinity of Hampton, New York.

(b) The support provided under subsection (a) shall include access to and use of appropriate facilities at Francis S. Gabreski Airport, including runways, hangars, the operations center, and aircraft berthing and maintenance spaces.

(c)(1) The adjutant general of the National Guard of the State of New York and the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the support to be provided under subsection (a).

(2) Not later than December 1, 1998, the adjutant general and the Commandant shall jointly submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a copy of the memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 3467

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program to donate surplus dental equipment of the Department of Defense to Indian Health Service facilities and Federally-qualified health centers that serve rural and medically underserved populations)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may carry out a program to distribute surplus dental equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to DoD Indian Health Service facilities and to Federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(1)(2)(B))).

(b) Not later than March 15, 1999, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the program, including the actions taken under the program.

AMENDMENT NO. 3468

(Purpose: To require a report on uniformed services dental care policies, practices, and experience pertaining to the furnishing of dental services to dependents of members of the uniformed services on active duty)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Not later than March 15, 1999, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and on National Security of the House of Representatives a report on the policies, practices, and experience of the uniformed services pertaining to the furnishing of dental care to dependents of members of the uniformed services on active duty who are 18 years of age and younger.

(b) The report shall include (1) the rates of usage of various types of dental services under the health care system of the uniformed services by the dependents, set forth in categories defined by the age and the gender of the dependents and by the rank of the members of the uniformed services who are the sponsors for those dependents, (2) an assessment of the feasibility of providing the dependents with dental benefits (including initial dental visits for children) that conform with the guidelines of the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry regarding infant oral health care, and (3) an evaluation of the feasibility and potential effects of offering general anesthesia as a dental health care benefit available under TRICARE to the dependents.

AMENDMENT NO. 3469

(Purpose: To make appropriations available for actions necessary to eliminate the backlog of unpaid retired pay relating to Army service and to report to Congress)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Of the total amount appropriated for the Army, the Army Reserve, and the Army National Guard under title I, \$1,700,000 may be available for taking the actions required under this section to eliminate the backlog of unpaid retired pay and to submit a report.

(b) The Secretary of the Army may take such actions as are necessary to eliminate, by December 31, 1998, the backlog of unpaid retired pay for members and former members of the Army (including members and former members of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard).

(c) Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to Congress a report on the backlog of unpaid retired pay. The report shall include the following:

- (1) The actions taken under subsection (b).
- (2) The extent of the remaining backlog.
- (3) A discussion of any additional actions that are necessary to ensure that retired pay is paid in a timely manner.

AMENDMENT NO. 3470

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to take action to ensure the elimination of the backlog of incomplete actions on requests for replacement medals and replacement of other decorations)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense may take such actions as are necessary to ensure the elimination of the backlog of incomplete actions on requests of former members of the Armed Forces for replacement medals and replacements for other decorations that such

personnel have earned in the military service of the United States.

(b)(1) The actions taken under subsection (a) may include, except as provided in paragraph (2), allocations of additional resources to improve relevant staffing levels at the Army Reserve Personnel Command, the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and the Air Force Personnel Center, allocations of Department of Defense resources to the National Archives and Records Administration, and any additional allocations of resources that the Secretary considers necessary to carry out subsection (a).

(2) An allocation of resources may be made under paragraph (1) only if and to the extent that the allocation does not detract from the performance of other personnel service and personnel support activities within the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 3471

(Purpose: To provide tobacco cessation therapy)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Beginning no later than 60 days after enactment, effective tobacco cessation products and counseling may be provided for members of the Armed Forces (including retired members), former members of the Armed Forces entitled to retired or retainer pay, and dependents of such members and former members, who are identified as likely to benefit from such assistance in a manner that does not impose costs upon the individual.

AMENDMENT NO. 3472

(Purpose: To make available funds for procurement of light-weight maintenance enclosures (LME) for the Army and the Marine Corps)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Of the amounts appropriated by title II of this Act under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS", \$5,000,000 may be available for procurement of lightweight maintenance enclosures (LME).

(b) Of the amounts appropriated by title III of this Act under the heading "OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY", \$2,000,000 may be available for procurement of light-weight maintenance enclosures (LME).

LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURES

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I appreciate having the opportunity to offer this amendment which I hope will be accepted by both floor managers on this important Defense bill.

Mr. President, the amendment that I am offering today would provide \$5,000,000 for the Marine Corps within the Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps account, and \$2,000,000 within the Other Procurement, Army account for the Army to allow both Service branches to obtain lightweight maintenance enclosures or LMEs for deployment in forward maintenance operations in the field. More specifically, these funds will provide our soldiers and Marines the capability to forward-deploy lightweight, low cost shelter systems that are easy to operate, provide protection for field maintenance operations in difficult environments, and at a cost that is one-quarter the cost of the older model units previously utilized by the Army and Marine Corps.

The House of Representatives recognized the requirement for these Lightweight Maintenance Enclosures by authorizing the identical level of funding that I am recommending in my amendment, in the House version of the National Defense Authorization bill for fiscal year 1999 (H.R. 3616). In the House Committee report (H. Rept. 105-532), the House National Security Committee stated that the Army identified its requirement for the LMEs after the President's budget request was submitted to the Congress, and therefore authorized funding for LMEs in the House authorization bill. The House also approved a \$5,000,000 authorization for the Marine Corps to meet their requirements for LMEs as well.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Dennis Reimer, identified "Soldier Life Support" equipment, including LMEs, as being among the Army's top 10 highest unfunded priorities.

Unfortunately, despite the authorization in place in the House-passed Defense authorization bill, no appropriations have been provided in either the House or Senate versions of the Defense appropriations bills. Therefore, it is my hope that the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, and his outstanding Ranking Member, Senator INOUE, would be willing to accept this small amendment and take it to conference with the House. Let me quickly say that I would be pleased to work with the two managers of the bill to find appropriate offsets to accommodate this small but important amendment as we head toward conference following final disposition of this bill.

Finally, we are working vigorously with our counterparts in the House, including Representative VAN HILLEARY of Tennessee, and Members of the Virginia delegation, including Representative RICK BOUCHER, to hold the LME authorization levels in conference with the Senate and to, hopefully, pave the way for acceptance of this pending amendment in conference on the Defense appropriations bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would hope that the Senate would approve this amendment today. The funding that I am seeking meets a real soldier life support requirement for both the Army and the Marines. It will allow our soldiers and Marines to have a cost-effective, lightweight, forward-deployed maintenance shelter system that is easy to operate, durable and significantly less expensive than the current, older, less effective shelters and tents that we currently use in the field. For these reasons, I would ask that the Senate approve this modest amendment today.

AMENDMENT NO. 3473

(Purpose: To require the abatement of hazardous substances at Finley Air Force Station, Finley, North Dakota)

On page 10, line 15, before the period, insert the following: "Provided further, that out of

the funds available under this heading, \$300,000 may be available for the abatement of hazardous substances in housing at the Finely Air Force Station, Finely, North Dakota".

AMENDMENT NO. 3474

(Purpose: To provide additional resources for enhanced drug interdiction efforts in the Caribbean and South America)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104: Of the funds available for Drug Interdiction, up to \$8,500,000 may be made available to support restoration of enhanced counter-narcotics operations around the island of Hispaniola, for operation and maintenance for establishment of ground-based radar coverage at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base, Cuba, for procurement of 2 Schweizer observation/spray aircraft, and for upgrades for 3 UH-1H helicopter for Colombia.

AMENDMENT NO. 3475

(Purpose: To provide for enhanced protections of the confidentiality of records of family advocacy services and other professional support services relating to incidents of sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and intrafamily abuse)

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall study the policies, procedures, and practices of the military departments for protecting the confidentiality of communications between—

(1) a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces who—

(A) is a victim of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or intrafamily abuse; or

(B) has engaged in such misconduct; and

(2) a therapist, counselor, advocate, or other professional from whom the victim seeks professional services in connection with effects of such misconduct.

(b)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe in regulations the policies and procedures that the Secretary considers necessary to provide the maximum possible protections for the confidentiality of communications described in subsection (a) relating to misconduct described in that subsection.

(2) The regulations shall provide the following:

(A) Complete confidentiality of the records of the communications of dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

(B) Characterization of the records under family advocacy programs of the Department of Defense as primary medical records for purposes of the protections from disclosure that are associated with primary medical records.

(C) Facilitated transfer of records under family advocacy programs in conjunction with changes of duty stations of persons to whom the records relate in order to provide for continuity in the furnishing of professional services.

(D) Adoption of standards of confidentiality and ethical standards that are consistent with standards issued by relevant professional associations.

(3) In prescribing the regulations, the Secretary shall consider the following:

(A) Any risk that the goals of advocacy and counseling programs for helping victims recover from adverse effects of misconduct will not be attained if there is no assurance that the records of the communications (including records of counseling sessions) will be kept confidential.

(B) The extent, if any, to which a victim's safety and privacy should be factors in determinations regarding—

(i) disclosure of the victim's identity to the public or the chain of command of a member of the Armed Forces alleged to have engaged in the misconduct toward the victim; or

(ii) any other action that facilitates such a disclosure without the consent of the victim.

(C) The eligibility for care and treatment in medical facilities of the uniformed services for any person having a uniformed services identification card (including a card indicating the status of a person as a dependent of a member of the uniformed services) that is valid for that person.

(D) The appropriateness of requiring that so-called Privacy Act statements be presented as a condition for proceeding with the furnishing of treatment or other services by professionals referred to in subsection (a).

(E) The appropriateness of adopting the same standards of confidentiality and ethical standards that have been issued by such professional associations as the American Psychiatric Association and the National Association of Social Workers.

(4) The regulations may not prohibit the disclosure of information to a Federal or State agency for a law enforcement or other governmental purpose.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Attorney General in carrying out this section.

(d) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the actions taken under this section. The report shall include a discussion of the results of the study under subsection (a) and the comprehensive discussion of the regulations prescribed under subsection (b).

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Florida, Mr. GRAHAM—is he here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we please have order in the Chamber.

Mr. STEVENS. Is Mr. HARKIN here?

Mr. President, I am in error on the Leahy amendment on JSAT. That is still on the list. It has not been removed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3476

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Senator ROBB now has a sense of the Senate with regard to the Italy incident, which we are prepared to take. I yield to the Senator to present and explain his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, this amendment has been converted to a sense of the Senate. It simply recognizes an obligation of the United States to compensate the victims of the Marine Corps jet incident involving a jet aircraft flying out of Aviano. At this point, the Ambassador of the United States to Italy has already agreed that, under the Status of Forces Agreement, that the United States would pick up the 25 percent normally assigned to the host nation. We were going to try to present an arrangement where this could be worked out more expeditiously. At this point it is simply a sense of the Senate. Instead, it ought to be resolved as quickly and fairly as possible.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] proposes an amendment numbered 3476.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

Findings:

On the third of February a United States Marine Corps jet aircraft, flying a low-level training mission out of Aviano, Italy, flew below its prescribed altitude and severed the cables supporting a gondola at the Italian ski resort near Cavalese, resulting in the death of twenty civilians;

the crew of the aircraft, facing criminal charges, is entitled to a speedy trial and is being provided that and all the other protections and advantages of the U.S. system of justice;

the United States, to maintain its credibility and honor amongst its allies and all nations of the world, should make prompt reparations for an accident clearly caused by a United States military aircraft;

a high-level delegation, including the U.S. Ambassador to Italy, recently visited Cavalese and, as a result, 20 million dollars was promised to the people in Cavalese for their property damage and business losses;

without our prompt action, these families continue to suffer financial agonies, our credibility in the European community continues to suffer, and our own citizens remain puzzled and angered by our lack of accountability;

under the current arrangement we have with Italy in the context of our Status of Force Agreement (SOFA), civil claims arising from the accident at Cavalese must be brought against the Government of Italy, in accordance with the laws and regulations of Italy, as if the armed forces of Italy had been responsible for the accident;

under Italian law, every claimant for property damage, personal injury or wrongful death must file initially an administrative claim for damages with the Ministry of Defense in Rome which is expected to take 12-18 months, and, if the Ministry's offer in settlement is not acceptable, which it is not likely to be, the claimant must thereafter resort to the Italian court system, where civil cases for wrongful death are reported to take up to ten years to resolve;

while under the SOFA process, the United States—as the "sending state"—will be responsible for 75 percent of any damages awarded, and the Government of Italy—as the "receiving state"—will be responsible for 25 percent, the United States has agreed to pay all damages awarded in this case;

It is the Sense of the Congress that the United States should resolve the claims of the victims of the February 8, 1998 U.S. Marine Corps aircraft incident in Cavalese, Italy as quickly and fairly as possible.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have agreed to take this amendment. It is now a sense-of-the-Senate amendment and requires a report concerning the Italy incident.

I ask for its immediate consideration.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3476) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3477

Mr. STEVENS. Senator LEAHY's amendment on JSAT, has he sent the amendment to the desk?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes an amendment numbered 3477.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . TRAINING AND OTHER PROGRAMS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that a member of such unit has committed a gross violation of human rights, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) MONITORING.—Not more than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish procedures to ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in paragraph (a), full consideration is given to all information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in paragraph (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under paragraph (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator's indulgence. We have to finally clear this amendment. There is some confusion, I might say to my friend from Vermont, because our indication was that there was a position from the Department which opposed the amendment. The Senator's infor-

mation is the Department supports the amendment. We intend to take it to conference and confer with the Department and then confer with the Senator with regard to the final disposition of it.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Alaska is correct. This is a Xerox copy, but I do have the actual signoff from DOD on the amendment, which I will give to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. President, I note this was primarily a clarification so the Department of Defense and Department of State could be saying the same thing in this area. I understand the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii may want to discuss it further between now and conference. I will be a conferee on that, and will be happy to do so.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3477) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if the chairman will yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. STEVENS. Reluctantly, Mr. President.

Mr. DOMENICI. When you hear my remarks, you will be pleased that you did.

Mr. President, let me suggest the Appropriations Committee has come in right on the number, in terms of the budget. They have no directed spending or anything else that would seek to gimmick this budget. Some were asking, "Will you turn the other way and let us have some directed spending that breaks the caps?" I haven't been able to do that for anyone, and I am very grateful we do not have to do it on this bill. The chairman of this committee came in, and everywhere he moved, he said, "Let's meet the budget right on the money." And he did. I commend him for that.

Mr. President, I strongly support S. 2132, the Defense Appropriations bill for FY 1999. The pending bill provides \$250.5 billion in total budget authority and \$168.2 billion in new outlays for the Department of Defense and related activities. When outlays from prior years and other adjustments are taken into account, outlays total \$245.2 billion.

There are some major elements to this bill that are important for the Senate to review.

The bill is consistent with the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement.

This year the defense budget is once again confronted with a serious mismatch between the DoD/OMB and the CBO estimates of the outlays needed to execute the programs in the budget request. CBO's estimate was \$3.7 billion higher than OMB and DoD's estimate.

Because the President's proposed defense spending was right up to the discretionary spending caps adopted in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement, compensating for CBO scoring would require large reductions in manpower, procurement, or readiness, or all three. Cuts like that are simply not acceptable.

During the Senate's consideration of the congressional budget resolution in March, the Senate received an excellent suggestion from the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. We adopted a Stevens Amendment that called on CBO and OMB to resolve their differences. Several meetings occurred as a result, and under the auspices of the Budget Committee, we devised a solution. The solution has three parts:

First, Congress would legislate policies recommended by the Administration to better manage cash in DoD's Working Capital Funds. This would lower fiscal year 1999 outlays by \$1.3 billion.

Second, Congress would agree to changes proposed by the Administration in two classified accounts in the Air Force budget that would lower 1999 outlays by \$700 million.

Third, Congress would enact asset sales amounting to \$730 million.

The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee has assured me that taken together these actions help reduce the 1999 outlay shortage to manageable dimensions and help avoid the negative effect on readiness or modernization that was feared.

I strongly support this bill, and I urge its adoption. I want to compliment the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee on his very skillful handling of this important legislation and for his statesmanlike approach to some serious and troubling issues in this year's defense budget.

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

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

S. 2132, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1999: SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 1999, in millions of dollars]

	Defense	Nondefense	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:					
Budget authority	250,289	27		202	250,518

S. 2132, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1999: SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL—Continued
(Fiscal year 1999, in millions of dollars)

	Defense	Nondefense	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Outlays	244,942	27		202	245,171
Senate 302(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	250,290	27		202	250,519
Outlays	244,942	27		202	245,171
President's request:					
Budget authority	250,763	27		202	250,992
Outlays	242,863	27		202	243,092
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority					
Outlays					
Senate-reported bill compared to:					
Senate 302(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	-1				-1
Outlays					
President's request:					
Budget authority	-474				-474
Outlays	2,079				2,079
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority	250,289	27		202	250,518
Outlays	244,942	27		202	245,171

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Budget Committee chairman is too kind. We do appreciate his constant watch over the budget and our spending of the money from the Treasury.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3409

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there still is pending the Hutchison amendment, the sense of the Senate on Bosnia, am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. May I make a parliamentary inquiry? It is my understanding that is the only other amendment that is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. We still have four more beyond that to deal with. So I suggest the absence of a quorum until we find out what is going to happen with these three amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I have a number of problems with the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas that contains a series of findings, expresses the sense of Congress, and requires the President to submit a report relating to the readiness of the United States Armed Forces to execute the National Security Strategy.

I realize that the managers of the Defense Appropriations bill are up against a tight deadline to finish their bill and I want to cooperate with them. But, I do want to note for the record a few points.

I believe a number of statements in the amendment are overdrawn and I believe that the sense of Congress section of the amendment, particularly subparagraph (B), improperly singles out the Bosnia operation and badly overstates its impact on the units par-

ticipating in and supporting that operation.

Nevertheless, I believe that it would be useful to the Congress to receive a report from the President on the military readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States. Accordingly and despite the problems I have noted, I will not object to this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator has indicated he is prepared to not object to this amendment. There being no objection to the sense-of-the-Senate amendment on Bosnia of the Senator from Texas, I ask it be laid before the Senate for action. Is it the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending question.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the adoption of the sense-of-the-Senate amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3409) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CAMPBELL be included as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3431 previously been adopted.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Stewart Holmes, a fellow on Senator COCHRAN's staff, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of this defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HUTCHISON of Texas be added as a cosponsor to the Gramm amendment No. 3463 on military voting rights.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3394

(Purpose: To add \$8,200,000 for procurement of M888, 60-millimeter, high-explosive ammunition for the Marine Corps, and to offset the increase by reducing the amount for Air force war reserve materials (PE 13950) by \$8,200,000)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3394 offered by Senator SANTORUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. SANTORUM, proposes an amendment numbered 3394.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by \$8,200,000.

On page 10, line 6, reduce the first amount by \$8,200,000.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. INOUE. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3394) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I seek recognition for the purpose of engaging the manager of the bill in a colloquy.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Thank you Mr. President. I rise to update the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee on the status of the CH-47 engine upgrade program, which the committee reduced by \$27.3 million in its reported bill. The basis for the reduction was program delays.

The committee's action has called Army leadership attention to the delays in getting the FY 1997 and 1998 funds on contract. This delay was due in part to disruptions from relocating the contracting office from St. Louis to Huntsville and in part to unsuccessful, protracted efforts to use commercial pricing practices on the contract.

I understand that the strong support from the CINC's combined with the Committee's recommendations made completion of these contracts a high priority. I am pleased to report that the FY97 kit production contract was signed July 1 and that the FY97 engine conversion contract and the FY 1998 kit production contract was signed as of July 29. Further, the full rate production contracts are scheduled to be signed early in fiscal year 1999.

Fortunately, production of the engine conversion kits has been underway on a letter contract since December 1997 with actual engine upgrades now underway and on schedule at the Greer, South Carolina plant to meet the initial delivery of upgraded engines in October 1998.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank my good friend from South Carolina for the update on action since the committee markup. The committee recommendations were not meant to be pejorative but reflective of what was likely to be a fact of life delay in the program.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the chairman for that assurance. I hasten to add my support for the upgrade program, which is done in part at two separate facilities in Greer, South Carolina.

While I voted for the bill in subcommittee and full committee, I strongly urge the chairman to give careful consideration to restoring full program funding in conference based on this new information. The upgrade program is just phasing out of its low rate initial production phase with the FY 1999 funds. Maintaining the production schedule is critical to controlling costs and achieving efficiencies. The FY 1999 funding in question starts full rate production for which all the necessary Army approvals have been given.

Mr. STEVENS. I accept the Senator's point on timing of the committee mark. I point out that the House has reduced the program by \$12.7 million for other reasons. I can assure the Sen-

ator that we will do our best in conference if the contracts are signed in accordance with the schedule given to you.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Alaska. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FIRST PROGRAM

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, as the Senate continues consideration of the Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 Defense appropriations bill, I would like to take a moment to express my concerns regarding the funding and administration of the Air Force's Financial Information Resources System (FIRST) program. This is a controversial program for a number of reasons. First, legitimate questions have been raised about the necessity of this program. It is my understanding that even though all the military departments and agencies were to move toward a single system for program, budgeting and accounting (PBAS), the Air Force has not moved in that direction.

The Air Force intends for the FIRST program to perform the functions intended for PBAS, which would make the program duplicative. This issue was raised by the house National Security Committee, which zeroed out funding for the FIRST program in its version of the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Authorization Bill.

The House National Security Committee also noted in its Committee report that the Air Force has chosen to utilize the Global Combat Supply System-Air Force (GCSS-AF) contract for the program, rather than competitively bid for the program. This decision raises both fiscal and policy concerns because this would be work outside the scope of the GCSS-AF contract. The GCSS-AF contract was advertised and awarded for "base-level systems modernization." In contrast, the FIRST program involves a budget system modernization plan that would impact all Air Force functional levels: base level, wholesale level, major air command, and headquarters. Clearly, the FIRST program would exceed the scope of the GCSS-AF contract.

I should also point out that the Air Force's decision to utilize GCSS-AF for the FIRST program was made after the Air Force announced an open competition, and after eighteen companies acted in good faith and submitted qualification applications for evaluation and screening. This course reversal, and the rational behind it has not been made clear to me or others that are concerned about this decision.

Mr. President, I also believe the Air Force's decision merits close review because it's not clear to me that it would be wise for the Air Force to place a disproportionate amount of its systems modernization work all in one contract.

Finally, the entire process raises policy concerns with respect to organiza-

tional planning within the Air Force. Currently, the development and execution of corporate information management systems for combat support is, in my view, not conducted in a coordinated and integrated fashion. In other words, the way the FIRST program is being administered is a symptom of a much larger organizational issue that deserves review by Congress and the Air Force.

In short, given all the issues that I have briefly described, I believe we should withhold going forward with the FIRST program until we can sort these and any other related issues that others may have. In fact, I had intended to offer an amendment that would allow for the Defense Department to use these funds for drug interdiction programs, but I have worked with the chairman and the ranking member to find other ways to help our drug interdiction strategy.

Mr. President, we cannot understate the importance of information technology programs to the future of our armed services. Thousands of people at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and in the surrounding Miami Valley area play a leading role in the development of these programs. However, these programs have to be pursued with an eye toward fiscal soundness and effective coordination with similar systems defense-wide. I see the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the floor and I hope that he will take the issues and concerns I have raised into consideration as he proceeds to conference with the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Ohio for raising these issues with respect to the FIRST program. I have listened closely to his remarks, and he certainly has offered food for thought. I will take his comments into consideration as we move to conference, and look forward to working with him and others interested in this issue to find an appropriate solution.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his remarks, and I look forward to working with him as well.

PULSED FAST NEUTRON ANALYSIS (PFNA) CARGO INSPECTION SYSTEMS (CIS) OPERATIONAL FIELD DEMONSTRATION

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee in a colloquy regarding the Senate's action on the Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis (PFNA) program. On behalf of the many Senators on both sides of the aisle who support this initiative, I wish to thank you for agreeing to include an amendment to the FY 1999 DoD Appropriations bill that directs the Department of Defense (DoD) to immediately obligate all of the funds which Congress has mandated be

used for a fair, and rigorous operational field demonstration of the PFNA system at a major U.S. border crossing or at a major U.S. port of entry.

Mr. STEVENS. The committee has previously supported the PFNA project by adding funds to permit this new technology to be developed and tested. Like you, I am dismayed that the Department has failed to make available to PFNA the \$3 million appropriated by Congress in FY 1998 and so far has demonstrated an unwillingness to carry out the PFNA test program according to congressional intent. It is the clear expectation of this Senator, and the Committee as a whole, that the Department will place no further obstacles in the path of a meaningful PFNA field test program.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I thank the Senator from Alaska. Furthermore, I believe that the Defense Department should take whatever steps are necessary to transfer full administrative and operational responsibility for the PFNA program to the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). It is my understanding that General Barry McCaffrey, Director of ONDCP, is willing to serve as the Executive Agent for the program next year and then assume full management control as long as the funds already appropriated by Congress are used to complete the activities planned under the FY 98 program. I expect that the Secretary of Defense and the Director of ONDCP will work together to ensure this transfer of authority and funding is carried out as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank my colleague. I agree with his understanding of the situation and the Committee expects DoD to proceed with obligation of the fiscal year 1998 funds and with the transfer of future program responsibility to ONDCP.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. In the light of the recent terrorist attacks on U.S. soil, our Nation's growing problem with drug smuggling and even the proliferation for weapons of mass destruction, it would be a tragedy if we did not take full advantage of the best technologies available to meet these threats. PFNA has enjoyed extraordinary success in laboratory tests, consistently detecting the presence of contraband in sealed containers well over 90 percent of the time and with false alarm rate near zero. No other technology, including X-ray, can come close to this level of detection.

Mr. STEVENS. I am aware of these results and believe that the U.S. Customs Service is one government agency which should seriously consider deploying PFNA should the field test program yield positive results. The committee hopes that Customs Service will work closely with ONDCP to provide whatever assistance is necessary to ensure a

complete and honest evaluation of the technology.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. This would include space at a port of entry or border crossing where a test might be conducted. Once this is done, I hope that ONDCP and the Customs Service will provide the committee with a recommendation on the strategy to guide the possible future acquisition, deployment, and support of neutron interrogation systems, including PFNA, at land border crossings and ports of entry around the nation. I believe a useful assessment would provide: (1) a range of deployment options for the PFNA system; (2) a cost comparison between PFNA deployment options; and (3) an evaluation of how the employment of new and existing contraband detection technologies might be optimized to meet changing threats to U.S. security.

I will consult with my colleague from Alaska and with the chairman of the Senate Treasury, Postal Appropriations Subcommittee, on what resources might be available through that subcommittee to support a continuation of the PFNA test program and the possible procurement of multiple systems in future years.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank my colleague from North Carolina for his thorough and careful review of this matter.

SHIPBREAKING PROVISION

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I would like to engage the chairman and ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy.

The Department of Defense appropriations bill provides funds for a Navy ship disposal pilot program. I would like to clarify the Senate's intent in creating this pilot program.

I support the Navy's goal of disposing of these ships efficiently. However, by considering only short-term costs, the Navy has ignored the long term costs of worker death and injury and environmental degradation.

For example, during the scrapping of the Coral Sea in Baltimore, there were many worker injuries and fires. We don't yet know the environmental damage caused by the improper disposal of asbestos. The ship is still in the Baltimore harbor, and it will now cost millions of dollars for the Navy to dispose of the ship properly. American taxpayers would have saved a lot if we had disposed of the ship correctly the first time.

To prevent these problems, does the distinguished ranking member agree that it is the Senate's intent to encourage the Secretary of the Navy to give significant weight to the technical qualifications and past performance of the contractor in complying with federal, state and local laws and regulations for environmental and worker protection?

In addition, do you agree that in making a best value determination in granting contracts, the Secretary

should give a greater weight to technical and performance-related factors than to cost and price-related factors?

Mr. INOUE. I agree that the Navy must give more consideration to ensuring worker and environmental safety to prevent the problems we have had in the past.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator. In addition, does the distinguished chairman agree with me that this pilot program will help the Navy to develop safer, more efficient methods of disposing of unneeded vessels—and that this pilot program should not be delayed?

Mr. STEVENS. I agree that this pilot program is in the best interest of the Navy and is not contingent on any other legislative action.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the chairman and ranking member for their courtesy and assistance in this important matter.

SUPPLEMENTAL IMPACT AID PROGRAM

Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Department of Defense's Supplemental Impact Aid Program. As chairman of the Military Personnel subcommittee of the authorization committee, I included \$35 million in the FY99 Defense Authorization bill for this important program.

As many of my colleagues already know, supplemental Impact Aid funding is focused specifically on school districts that are heavily impacted by large numbers of military connected students or the effects of base realignment and closures. The DoD funds are in addition to funds appropriated to the Department of Education for all federally impacted schools. The \$35 million included in the FY99 Defense Authorization bill will be used to ensure that military impacted schools can maintain the same standards as other, non-impacted, school districts. Without these funds, these districts, quite frankly, would be hard pressed to provide adequate educational opportunities.

Mr. President, I know many of my colleagues believe that education is, and should remain, a local and state issue. I wholeheartedly agree. If there is any role for the Federal Government in funding education, however, impact aid is it. Without a Federal presence, these impacted districts would be able to provide for a quality education for their students. Because of the military presence in the districts we are discussing today, however, educational resources are severely strained. We owe it to the families of the men and women who proudly serve our country, and the families who live near an installation, to provide adequate resources to offset the military presence.

Originally, it was my intention to offer an amendment today that, if passed, would have set aside \$35 million in this appropriation bill for DoD supplemental impact aid. After consultation with Chairman STEVENS, I will not

offer the amendment. Instead, Chairman STEVENS has assured me this matter will be addressed in conference. I would like to ask the distinguished Chairman, if it is still his intention to do so?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the House passed FY99 Defense Appropriations bill contains \$35 million for impact aid for school districts impacted by excessive students from nearby defense installations. I would like to assure my friend, the Senator from Idaho, that it is my intention to give fair consideration to the House position regarding funding for impact aid during the conference to see if we can include these funds in the final conference report without negatively impacting the important operations and maintenance accounts of the Department of Defense.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Alaska, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his consideration of this important program, which is important to the good citizens of Alaska. In addition, this program is equally important to the people of Mountain Home, Idaho, home of the 366th Composite Wing.

REPORT 105-200

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I would like to direct a question to the majority manager of the Defense Appropriations bill, the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I note that the Committee on Appropriations directs the Department of Defense to make available, from existing funds, up to \$8,000,000 for a community retraining, reinvestment, and manufacturing initiative to be conducted by an academic consortia with existing programs in manufacturing and retraining. It is my understanding that the consortia referred to is the New Hampshire Network for Science, Technology and Communication, and further, that the funds should be provided to that organization to create a state wide higher education network among small independent colleges to improve and expand research and training opportunities in science, technology, and communication for undergraduate students and for community, business, and K-12 schools. Am I correct, is that not the intent of the committee?

Mr. STEVENS. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is correct. The committee intends that the funds be provided to the New Hampshire Network for Science, Technology and Communication to conduct the effort described.

ADVANCED MATERIALS INTELLIGENT PROCESSING CENTER

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise today to engage in a short colloquy with the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS.

As I understand it, the committee included \$5 million in the Research, development, Test, and Evaluation Navy account of your Fiscal Year 1999 Department of Defense Appropriations bill for continued funding of the Advanced Materials Intelligent Processing Center in Evanston, Illinois. I want to confirm that the intent of the committee was to provide this additional \$5 million to continue the activities of the Center in affiliation with the Naval Air Warfare Center in Lexington Park, Maryland, as well as other industrial and governmental partners. This continuation funding will allow the Center first to complete a state-of-the-art resin transfer molding system with all required equipment functionality, monitoring, and intelligent supervisory control, and then to transfer it to the Center's industrial and governmental partners for prove out in a production environment.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the senior Senator from Illinois for her interest in this matter. I would like to confirm that the intent of our committee's action was as she stated.

Mr. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his clarification on this important matter, and for his leadership with Senator INOUE of the Committee. I would also like to say to my colleagues that I am confident the work of the Center can help reduce the cost of our defense systems through the use of faster, cheaper, and better means of processing composite materials for military hardware. These improvements will provide substantial dividends to the American people.

ANTI-CORROSION RESEARCH AT NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to thank the Managers of this bill, Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE, for the fine job they have done on this important legislation. It has been my great pleasure to work with the Managers as a member of the Defense Subcommittee, and they do a masterful job of balancing many competing needs and interests in this bill.

Mr. President, I would like to call the Chairman's attention to one key provision in the committee report. In the Defense-Wide Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation section, the committee has included report language regarding the importance of anti-corrosion technologies to the Department of Defense. As the report says "New anti-corrosion technologies are needed to prevent corrosion, reduce corrosion-related costs, and extend the life of aircraft in a manner compatible with environmental concerns."

North Dakota State University has a long history of excellence and nationally-recognized expertise in polymers and coatings, and has received significant competitively-awarded funding to investigate new methods of fighting

corrosion. Last year DoD awarded a \$2 million competitive grant to NDSU for this purpose. Mr. President, given NDSU's expertise in this area and DoD's experience working with NDSU, does the Chairman believe NDSU would be well-qualified to compete for this work?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator DORGAN's comments. The Air Force in particular is confronted with severe coatings problems in maintenance of its aging aircraft fleet. To protect the country's investment in these aircraft, it is important that the committee provide for increased research on anti-corrosive coatings. I agree with the Senator that NDSU would be a solid candidate for these anti-corrosion research funds.

ELECTRONIC COMBAT TESTING

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee in a colloquy regarding threat emitters used to support electronic combat training by the Air Force Special Operations Command as well as testing by the Air Force and other services. These emitters replicate the surface-to-air missile threats and jammers which our combat aircraft might encounter if deployed to execute a real mission—a mission which would take them into harm's way. It is essential that these systems be available to train our first to fight, the special operations forces.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to agree and emphasize the remarks of my colleague. Unfortunately, there has been a debate over the status of these emitters which are presently at Eglin Air Force Base. Some believe the Base Closure and Realignment process mandated the relocation of these emitters. However, the BRAC also insisted that training requirements must be met. I believe these emitters should remain at Eglin to meet the warfighters training requirements until we can resolve this dispute. I believe this would be consistent with the BRAC direction.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, my colleague is correct. We cannot let ambiguity about words hinder the training and readiness of our forces. These emitters should be supported at Eglin until we can resolve these issues. I would ask the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee if he can assist us by working on this issue in the appropriations conference if we can find a solution. We will work with the Department of Defense as well as the defense authorizing committees to find a solution which can be accommodated in the defense appropriations conference.

Mr. STEVENS. I agree with my colleague from Florida. I have followed this difficult issue for some time. I firmly support the need for adequate training. And I believe that training

can best be conducted in varying environments, including the terrain and surroundings of Eglin Air Force Base. I assure my colleagues from Florida that I will do my best to work this issue with my House counterparts during conference.

PROJECT AT ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, my colleague from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE, and I would like to engage the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, and the distinguished Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Defense, Senator INOUE, in a colloquy regarding a housing project at Ellsworth Air Force Base.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Senator INOUE and I are pleased to discuss this matter with our colleagues from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their indulgence. As both of you know, the Hunt Building Corporation (HBC) constructed an 828-unit military family housing complex, known as the Centennial Housing Project, at Ellsworth Air Force Base in 1990 and 1991. Unfortunately, within a year of the completion of construction, serious and often dangerous defects were found in many of the units. It is my understanding that over half of the units in the Centennial Housing Project constructed by HBC are currently uninhabitable.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, Senator DASCHLE is correct. In fact, the extensive damage in these units includes: severe racking due to the unit's design not holding up to wind; unlevel floors, sticking windows and doors, and cracking due to badly designed and constructed rim joists; collapse of interior ceilings caused by defective garage eaves, which allow heavy snow and rain to enter some attics; sewer gas back up due to improperly vented plumbing; deck and porch supports and stairs that have separated from the units and become unlevel because caissons supporting these structures were not placed below the frost line; and other problems both with the work done and problems resulting from work required by the contract but never completed by the Corporation. Despite these serious problems, the Air Force continues to pay rent on these units.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Senator INOUE and I are aware of these severe problems.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Air Force and HBC agreed to enter into an alternative dispute resolution in an attempt to resolve the construction and liability issues associated with the defective housing in the Centennial Housing Project at Ellsworth.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. The two parties have met with a mediator appointed by

the Justice Department and have had several subsequent meetings to continue negotiating an agreement. I have been told that the next meeting between the Air Force and HBC will be next week. Although some progress has been made, it is critically important that the negotiations between the Air Force and HBC result in a timely, workable resolution that guarantees the expeditious repair of the housing units and the return of military personnel to the homes. While it is my understanding that the Department of Justice has been looking into this matter for some time and is considering litigation against HBC if no resolution can be found through the mediation process, I am hopeful that action by the Department of Justice can be avoided.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I agree with the comments made by Senator JOHNSON. I, too, am hopeful that the mediation process will soon yield an agreement. Necessary repairs to these homes simply cannot be delayed any longer. I would also like to inform the Chairman and Ranking Member that we brought this situation to the attention of the Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this year.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I appreciate this update on the situation at Ellsworth Air Force Base regarding the Centennial Housing Project.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I want to thank both the distinguished Ranking Member, Senator INOUE, and the distinguished Chairman, Senator STEVENS, for your willingness to help Senator DASCHLE and me monitor this situation, which is of critical importance to the quality of life at Ellsworth Air Force Base. We will keep you apprised of progress made through the negotiating process.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would also like to thank Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE for their assistance. This matter is extremely important to me, Senator JOHNSON and everyone at Ellsworth Air Force Base.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I thank Senator DASCHLE. I share the concern expressed by the two Senators from South Dakota that taxpayers are not getting their money's worth out of the Centennial Housing Project. You can be assured that I will assist you in your efforts to find a timely solution to this matter that will result in the repair of the housing units and the return of military personnel to the homes.

ENCOURAGING GREATER USE OF DISTANCE LEARNING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my support for the many distance learning initiatives contained in the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999. Senators INOUE and STEVENS have done an outstanding job in encouraging the Department of Defense to take full advantage of the opportunities provided by great advances

in telecommunications technology, particularly with respect to distance learning.

This bill contains funding for distance learning programs for the Marine Corps, and a new initiative for the Army National Guard. In particular, the National Guard initiative would create a distance learning network to reduce the cost of training soldiers, enhance readiness and furthering community development. The Subcommittee on Defense has demonstrated its support for these and a number of other initiatives underway.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his comments. The Subcommittee on Defense indeed supports these initiatives. Would the Senator from Hawaii agree?

Mr. INOUE. That is correct. We have attempted to encourage such initiatives wherever we could, and wherever such initiatives made sense.

Mr. CLELAND. As the Ranking Member of the Personnel Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I believe I can report that our Subcommittee is also very supportive of distance learning initiatives. We are keenly aware of the advantages of distance learning. As you know, Mr. President, many of our military personnel are expected to be available for deployment at a moment's notice. Others are deployed around the world where they do not have ready access to educational opportunities. Rapid developments in technology have enabled them to continue in their educational development, even while deployed.

The ability to continue in one's educational pursuits is a quality of life issue that is not necessarily always at the top of a soldier's list. However, many military personnel are only able to pursue higher education by leaving the military. I believe the maintenance of a viable distance learning program for higher education could be a useful retention mechanism to keep highly motivated individuals in the service.

Mr. STEVENS. If the Senator would yield, the Senator raises an interesting point. I would be interested in learning of some of the types of initiatives that are under way that may prove useful in retaining personnel in the military.

Mr. CLELAND. I thank the Senator. I am particularly proud of one such program which is managed by the Georgia College and State University. The Distance Education Unit and the Department of Government there were recently awarded a contract by the Navy to provide two graduate courses aboard the USS Carl Vinson which is deployed in the Pacific Ocean. The courses use two-way video and audio which links educators at the school with students on board the Carl Vinson. We all knew that aircraft carriers were small cities, but this Senator was pleasantly surprised to see that sailors could take graduate level courses while at sea.

Mr. INOUE. I am aware of the Carl Vinson project. It is certainly a promising concept, but are we providing any educational opportunities for service personnel nearing retirement or leaving the military due to the draw down of the military?

Mr. CLELAND. That is a very good question. I am told that more than 50 percent of military personnel reentering civilian life either change or lose their jobs in the first year after leaving the military. Given this, I believe we should consider providing opportunities for job training and placement for active-duty service members nearing separation or retirement from service without regard to their duty locations.

Clayton College and State University has developed a program that could serve as a worthwhile demonstration project to demonstrate how technology can be utilized to provide pre-separation training for civilian jobs to military personnel. The program would provide training via the Internet and other technology to active-duty personnel at their duty locations for specific, existing job opportunities which would be available upon their separation from the military. The program would then link these personnel to these specific jobs ensuring that when they leave the military, employment is available.

I am not immediately aware of any initiatives underway that would offer similar opportunities. It is my view that we should encourage the Department of Defense to explore such initiatives, perhaps in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. INOUE. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. He makes a good point, and I hope the Department of Defense will take a look at such initiatives in the future.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank Senator CLELAND for his remarks. He is a good friend of America's men and women in uniform.

Mr. CLELAND. I thank my colleagues for their leadership and for allowing me to speak on this matter.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to voice my opposition to the fiscal year 1999 Department of Defense appropriations bill.

Once again, we have loaded up this bill with unnecessary, extravagant, and flat-out wasteful items. In a time when we are cutting programs and fighting for a true balanced budget, we cannot afford to insulate any department from scrutiny as we seek to reduce the Federal debt. Unfortunately, the DoD budget remains immune to any and all attempts at responsible spending.

Mr. President, I offered an amendment to this bill that aimed to invest fully in the best bargain in the Defense Department. According to a National Guard study, the average cost to train and equip an active duty soldier is

\$73,000 per year, while it costs \$17,000 per year to train and equip a National Guard soldier. The cost of maintaining Army National Guard units is just 23 percent of the cost of maintaining Active Army units.

It failed, however, but that should not come as a surprise. DoD and a complicit Congress have never been known as a frugal or practical when it comes to defense spending. From \$436 hammers to \$640 toilet seats to \$2 billion bombers that don't work and the department doesn't seem to want to use, we have a storied history of wasting our tax dollars. I presented an opportunity to spend defense dollars on something that works and is worthwhile, but the lobby for the wasteful and unnecessary Super Hornet prevailed.

Speaking of which, the bill appropriates \$2.9 billion for the procurement of 30 Navy F/A-18E/F Super Hornets.

The current Hornet program has been proven reliable and cost-effective. Why do we want to replace the Hornet with a bloated, cost-prohibitive aircraft that offers marginal benefits over a reliable fighter?

This bill also contradicts the House's overwhelming recommendation on Super Hornet procurement. Twice, once in their authorization bill and again in their appropriations bill, the House, by margins of nearly 300 members, voted to procure 27 Super Hornets in fiscal year 1999.

The House correctly notes that the Navy asks for an inexplicable procurement increase from fiscal year 1998; that the Navy's low rate initial production schedule is not consistent with its procurement objective of 548 aircraft; and that the wing drop problem has not been resolved.

Mr. President, it seems we have thrown rationality out the window when it comes to this plane. Judging by the Super Hornet's past performance, I'm sure we'll be hearing more about it soon.

Finally, Mr. President, authors of the bill have again loaded it up with projects and hundreds of millions of dollars the Pentagon didn't even ask for. Just to give my colleagues a taste of these extravagant morsels, the bill adds: \$78.5 million for 8 additional UH-60 helicopters; \$30.0 million for JAVELIN anti-tank missiles; \$208.3 million for Marine Corps procurement priorities; \$50 million for advance procurement of the LHD-8 amphibious ship, which is a program DoD didn't even want to fund next year; \$65.7 million for Humvee vehicles; \$90 million for C-135 aircraft; and \$40 million for F-15 Eagles.

Further, there is \$1.8 billion in additional funds for the deployment of U.S. troops in Bosnia that are designated as "emergency" funds. The Bosnia mission is no longer an emergency. It is a long-term commitment for the United

States military, and we should pay for it on budget.

Mr. President, this is shameful. We have a duty to act responsibly with our constituents tax dollars. Instead of looking after our constituents, we continue to pick their pockets.

We have to make smart choices, Mr. President. A truly balanced federal budget is in sight for the first time in three decades. But we are not going to be able to maintain a balanced budget, let alone start bringing down the federal debt, so long as we continue to commit to programs and force structures that are so blatantly unaffordable. We must continue to fight for further spending reductions until we achieve the most effective and cost efficient military which serves our national security interests.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

PROSTATE CANCER RESEARCH

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to support the Department of Defense's research in prostate cancer. I know that this program has no greater champion than the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have fought for women's health initiatives. Women's health is one of my highest priorities and it always will be. However, I also strongly support efforts to improve the health of men. One such effort that I believe deserves our attention is prostate cancer research.

In my home state of Maryland alone, 3,500 men receive the ominous diagnosis of prostate cancer each year. Nationwide, the number soars to over 200,000. Even more frightening, 42,000 American men lose their lives to this ruthless killer annually. This means that every 15 minutes, 1 man somewhere in our country dies from prostate cancer, and during the same time span, 5 more men are newly diagnosed with the disease.

I am very pleased that the frequency of prostate cancer screening has increased over the past five years. These efforts have led to an overall decrease in the prostate cancer death rate. The importance of early detection through regular screening cannot be overstated. When prostate cancer is detected early, survival rates are over 90%. But, when detected late, prostate cancer kills 70% of its victims. The increased emphasis on the use of current screening techniques has certainly been a step in the right direction. However, we can, and must, do better for the men of our country. How? Through improvement of diagnostic screening and imaging technology, we can make detection of prostate cancer easier and more efficient. We've done it before—mammograms have made screening for breast cancer a much more reliable process. We must do the same for prostate cancer.

Last year, Congress provided \$40 million to the Department of Defense for prostate cancer research. Overall, \$130 million in government-funded prostate cancer research was performed, compared with \$650 million for breast cancer. Of course, we all recognize the importance of fighting breast cancer. It is a major threat to the women of our nation and the fight to find new and better prevention methods must continue. I think it is time we started fighting prostate cancer with the same tenacity.

In this year's Defense Appropriations bill we have provided \$40 million for prostate cancer research. In addition to funds for peer review prostate cancer research, we have provided funding to the Walter Reed Army Medical Center for research on prostate cancer diagnostic imaging. This research is extremely important, as it could pave the way to better, faster, and more reliable screening and diagnosis.

One in every ten American men will develop prostate cancer at some point during his life. We need to target sufficient resources for research into the causes, treatment and cure of prostate cancer.

I hope that when the Defense Appropriations bill is in Conference, we will increase funding for prostate cancer research. Increased funding is necessary to give our scientists and researchers the tools they need to combat this deadly disease.

We are blessed with great medical scientists who are scattered across our country at universities, medical schools, and government research agencies. They are an incredible resource. I believe that we owe it to ourselves, to our children, and to the American people to ensure that these great men and women have the support they need to continue their efforts to bring the people of our nation a better, healthier tomorrow.

DOD IMPACT AID

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to express my concern about the lack of funding within the Senate's Department of Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999 for schools that have been heavily impacted by their proximity to military installations.

Fortunately, the House bill does include \$35 million for this purpose, and I want to put my colleagues on notice that I will be working through my position on the House-Senate conference committee to see that this funding is preserved.

This extra assistance is needed by schools on or near our military bases because their tax base is eroded by the large amount of federal land taken off the tax rolls. In addition, military personnel often are not required to pay local taxes, which support the schools, even if they have children enrolled in those schools. The DOD funding would

be aimed at those schools most in need of the extra aid—school districts whose student population is made up of at least 20 percent military children.

This funding is sufficiently important to the quality of life of military personnel and their families that both the House and Senate fiscal year 1999 Defense Authorization bills authorize \$35 million for this purpose. It is my strong hope that the Congress will see fit to include this funding in the final version of the Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, during the deliberations over the fiscal year 1999 Defense Authorization bill, I offered an amendment to increase spending for our nation's veterans medical needs. The amendment, offered on June 25th and numbered as 2982 would have allowed the transfer of \$329 million from the defense budget to support the VA medical budget. The amendment would have transferred funds so as to avoid harming the readiness of the Armed Forces and the quality of life of military personnel and their families.

The amendment's description was incomplete as to the listing of cosponsors and I would like to correct the record at this time. Along with Senator WELLSTONE of Minnesota, Senator BINGAMAN of New Mexico, also a long-time champion of veterans, should have been included as a cosponsor.

Although the amendment did not receive the support of a majority of my colleagues, I appreciate the cosponsorship by Senator BINGAMAN and Senator WELLSTONE. I also appreciate the support of the 35 other Senators who voted in favor of increasing VA medical funding.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I tell the Senate, there are now three amendments that are not disposed of, to my knowledge: the Graham amendment on space and two Harkin amendments. I call on those Senators to ask what they intend to do.

Mr. HARKIN. One amendment; I have one amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. I will be happy to eliminate one of the two.

Mr. President, again, I call on the Senators involved to inform us if they going to proceed with the amendment.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Florida is going to make a motion concerning the space amendment. I ask someone to inquire about that amendment.

May I inquire of the Senator from Iowa, does he intend to proceed with his amendment?

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

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

ADAK NAVAL FACILITY AT ADAK, ALASKA

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows, we have been working for some time with the Natives of the Aleut Corporation, the Navy and the Department of the Interior on an effective plan for the reuse of Adak Naval Base, and I thank the Chairman for the inclusion of funding to help resolve remaining environmental problems with the facilities at Adak.

The Aleut Corporation, one of Alaska's 12 Native regional corporations, is the only entity that has expressed an interest in assuming the closed base, and has proposed a land exchange involving the Navy and the Department of the Interior. The Senate Energy committee, as you know, is considering and has held a hearing on S. 1488, which would authorize an exchange of property that would promote the reuse of Adak and improve the Aleutian refuge through incorporation of Aleut Corporation inholdings. This legislation is designed to ratify an agreement that will very shortly be executed by the Aleut Corporation and the Departments of the Navy and the Interior.

Mr. STEVENS. I am familiar with that legislation and fully support its adoption. In closing out its operations and responsibilities on Adak I understand the Navy wishes to transfer from Navy ownership as much as the base as possible; this includes both facilities that have foreseeable reuse and those that do not. Many of the moth-balled buildings on Adak were constructed before restrictions were imposed on the use of asbestos and lead paint. The environmental conditions at Adak, to which anyone who has visited there can attest, take a hard and quick toll on buildings and other facilities, especially those that are unused and not maintained. The Committee has included \$15 million to resolve potential environmental hazards from deteriorating facilities. This funding will help to protect those who move to Adak to participate in its economic revitalization.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. With the expectation that all the parties to the Adak exchange will sign an agreement within the next few weeks, it is also my hope that the Conference Committee on S. 2312 would consider the inclusion of the language ratifying the agreement.

Mr. STEVENS. If all parties to the exchange are supportive, I would be open to the possibility of having the Conference consider that language.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL ADVANCED TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS CENTER

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

I was disappointed that the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee did not include funding for the National Advanced Telecommunications and Applications Center in the Research Triangle Park in North Carolina. I ask the chairman whether this is an indication that the subcommittee disapproves spending for this project or if it is merely because sufficient funds were unavailable?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from North Carolina will be pleased to know that the subcommittee believes that this project is very worthy, but we did not directly provide funding in FY 1999.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Therefore, may I assume that the chairman would support a reprogramming request from any branch of the Department of Defense if that branch found that unavoidable delays in its other programs made funding available for the NATAC?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I thank the chairman. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. I understand the Senator from Iowa will ask to be recognized, and I urge Members of the Senate to stay around. In my opinion, we are very close to final passage. We are very close to final passage. I expect final passage within 20 minutes. I might not get my expectations, right?

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3478

(Purpose: Express sense of Senate regarding payroll tax relief)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on behalf of Senator KERREY and Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator BREAUX, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. KERREY, for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN and Mr. BREAUX, proposes an amendment numbered 3478.

Mr. STEVENS. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PAYROLL TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The payroll tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) is the biggest, most regressive tax paid by working families.

(2) The payroll tax constitutes a 15.3 percent tax burden on the wages and self-employment income of each American, with 12.4 percent of the payroll tax used to pay social security benefits to current beneficiaries and 2.9 percent used to pay the medicare benefits of current beneficiaries.

(3) The amount of wages and self-employment income subject to the social security portion of the payroll tax is capped at \$68,400. Therefore, the lower a family's income, the more they pay in payroll tax as a percentage of income. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that for those families who pay payroll taxes, 80 percent pay more in payroll taxes than in income taxes.

(4) In 1996, the median household income was \$35,492, and a family earning that amount and taking standard deductions and exemptions paid \$2,719 in Federal income tax, but lost \$5,430 in income to the payroll tax.

(5) Ownership of wealth is essential for everyone to have a shot at the American dream, but the payroll tax is the principal burden to savings and wealth creation for working families.

(6) Since 1983, the payroll tax has been higher than necessary to pay current benefits.

(7) Since most of the payroll tax receipts are deposited in the social security trust funds, which masks the real amount of Government borrowing, those whom the payroll tax hits hardest, working families, have shouldered a disproportionate share of the Federal budget deficit reduction and, therefore, a disproportionate share of the creation of the Federal budget surplus.

(8) Over the next 10 years, the Federal Government will generate a budget surplus of \$1,550,000,000,000, and all but \$32,000,000,000 of that surplus will be generated by excess payroll taxes.

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

(1) if Congress decides to provide tax relief, reducing the burden of payroll taxes should be a top priority; and

(2) Congress and the President should work to reduce this payroll tax burden on American families.

Mr. KERREY. I am delighted to be joined by Senators MOYNIHAN and BREAUX in offering this important Sense of the Senate on reducing the payroll tax burden. This Sense of the Senate is simple: the payroll tax is the biggest, most regressive tax that working families in this country face. According to the CBO, 80 percent of American families pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes.

Here's what that means. The average household income in 1996 was \$35,492. That family, taking the standard deductions and exemptions, paid \$2,719 in Federal income tax. But they paid a

whopping \$5,430 in payroll taxes—double what they paid in income taxes!

What this Sense of the Senate says is that if we talk about relieving the tax burden on American's families, we ought to look first at the payroll tax burden. After all, of the over \$1.5 trillion surplus we expect to generate over the next ten years, all but \$32 billion is being generated through payroll taxes. If anyone is going to get tax relief in this country, it ought to be the working people responsible for that surplus. I urge my colleagues to support this Sense of the Senate.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, my colleague Senator KERREY, with whom I am pleased to cosponsor this Sense of the Senate resolution, has it exactly right. The payroll tax is regressive. The statistic he quoted bears repeating. Among families that pay payroll taxes 80 percent pay more in payroll taxes than in income taxes.

If—and I say if—we are going to have a tax cut look no further than the payroll tax. Albert Hunt, writing in today's Wall Street Journal, agrees, noting that for most families it is "the most onerous levy. . ."

Even excluding interest income, the Social Security Trust Funds will generate \$698 billion of surpluses over the next 10 years. That is just about enough to finance the 2 percentage point reduction in the payroll tax that Senator KERREY and I have proposed in our comprehensive Social Security rescue plan.

In contrast, the operating budget will only have a \$32 billion surplus over the next 10 years—and no significant surplus until 2006.

Finally, maybe we shouldn't be considering any tax cuts. Those surpluses can easily evaporate, even in the absence of a recession. Growth of one percent for the next two or three years—rather than the 2 percent projected by CBO—just about wipes out surpluses for the next several years.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original co-sponsor of the Sense of the Senate offered by Senator KERREY and accepted tonight by unanimous consent regarding payroll tax relief.

We keep hearing the good news about surpluses but of the \$1.55 trillion surplus over the next decade, all but \$32 billion comes from the social security trust fund—from payroll taxes paid by working Americans on their wages—taxes that American workers paid to insure the viability of their Social Security benefits.

Of families who pay payroll taxes, 80 percent pay more in payroll taxes than in income taxes. The payroll tax is the most regressive tax in America, disproportionately burdening low income families. Remember that almost 50 percent of households in this country earn under \$35,000 per year and most of this income is from wages which are subject

to the payroll tax. Given these facts, the payroll tax cut is clearly the tax cut this Congress should be discussing.

And we should be discussing it along with the reforms necessary to fix Social Security for all Americans for all time. I know there are many Senators here who share my sentiments. I served with Senator GREGG on a bipartisan commission that thoroughly studied this issue and we have recommended a comprehensive reform package. Senator KERREY and Senator MOYNIHAN have been working on a bill. Others in this bodies are also working on social security reforms. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues in a bipartisan effort to not only reduce taxes but to shore up social security and create wealth for working Americans.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3478) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I state for the record, according to my understanding, the only amendment we have not disposed of that was listed on the two lists is the amendment that Senator HARKIN is about ready to discuss.

Does any Senator have another amendment?

Mr. President—I repeat the request—does any Senator have another amendment?

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senator from Iowa will speak in a minute. And no Senator has raised any amendment to be considered; so, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that no more amendments be in order to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I further ask unanimous consent that following the statement of the Senator from Iowa, we shall immediately go to third reading.

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

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey also be recognized for 10 minutes prior to the vote.

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

Mr. STEVENS. 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. HARKIN. 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. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk that basically would equalize the treatment that the Budget Committee gave to the defense side of the ledger, would equalize that with the nondefense side of the ledger.

Now, let me try to explain it as best I can. A couple of years ago in a situation involving Social Security here on the Senate floor, the Parliamentarian of the Senate ruled in a way that gave the chairman of the Budget Committee the authority to decide whether or not scoring would be done under the CBO estimates and rules or under OMB.

This year, using that authority, the chairman of the Budget Committee sent a letter dated April 27, 1998, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS. This letter, among other things, basically said—and I will quote from the letter:

Staff have also identified \$2.0 billion in potential policy outlays scorekeeping adjustments. If the Administration's own policy initiatives are legislated for the DWCF, I will exercise my authority to score the legislation recognizing the administration's outlay estimates.

What that means, in "bureaucratic" is that the chairman of the Budget Committee decided to use his authority to use the administration's policy initiatives—read that to be OMB—to adjust the outlay figures for the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

What did that add up to? We looked at it and those adjustments added up to \$2.2 billion—\$2.2 billion under OMB. Then the Budget Committee identified another \$737 million in asset sales to come up with \$2.9 billion additional for the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

But I am looking at the \$2.2 billion. Forget about the other. The \$2.2 billion came about because the chairman of the Budget Committee decided to use the administration's own policy initia-

tives and use the administration's outlay estimates from OMB. Mr. President, what that means is that the Budget Committee chairman has the authority because of a ruling by the Parliamentarian of this body that he can decide whether to use OMB or CBO estimates for outlay purposes.

I think it is appropriate to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter from the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, to Senator STEVENS, dated April 27, 1998.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, April 27, 1998.

HON. TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am reporting to you on your amendment to S. Con. Res. 86, the Senate-passed Budget Resolution, concerning defense and non-defense outlay scoring. Over the recent recess, representatives of the Department of Defense (DoD), the Office of Management and the Budget (OMB), and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) have met and discussed these issues. As a result, we have identified from \$2.6 billion to \$2.9 billion in outlay reductions based on asset sales and proposed policy changes in the President's 1999 DoD budget request, including: (1) management initiatives for the Defense Working Capital Funds (DWCF) and, (2) alterations in classified activities in two Air Force accounts.

These identified outlay scoring adjustments for policies enumerated here do not prejudice other technical adjustments that might be considered with this year's reported defense authorizations or appropriations bills.

If legislation provides for defense asset sales subject to appropriations, appropriate savings will be scored. I understand the assets currently being considered would generate between \$0.6 billion and \$0.9 billion in negative outlays. The precise amount would, of course, depend on the text provisions reported to the Senate.

Staff have also identified \$2.0 billion in potential policy outlay scorekeeping adjustments. If the Administration's own policy initiatives are legislated for the DWCF, I will exercise my authority to score the legislation recognizing the Administration's outlay estimates. For the classified policy initiatives in intelligence community activities, I will respect your judgment that the proposed policy initiatives will have the downward impact on outlays asserted by the Department of Defense and that the legislation reported to the Senate would not reverse or materially alter this impact, and will, therefore, score the outlays for reported legislation appropriately.

The disagreements between CBO, OMB and DoD on outlay estimates for the President's defense budget are not new. I believe Congress must insist on the most accurate projects from both the executive branch and our own estimators. Accordingly, I believe we should work together to achieve the following results.

1. Prompt submission of the annual joint report to Congress required by 10 U.S.C. 226 concerning CBO and OMB scoring of outlays on December 15 of each year;

2. The routine and timely transmission by CBO of its scoring of defense budget requests and relevant legislation to the appropriate representatives of DoD's Office of the Comptroller and OMB;

3. An analysis by CBO and the Administration, submitted as a part of their fiscal year 2000 Presidential budget presentations, of the actual outlays and rates that occurred for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense with: (a) the outlays and outlay rates originally estimated by CBO and the Administration, respectively, for the fiscal year 1998 Department of Defense budget when that budget was originally presented to Congress, and (b) any revised outlays and outlay rates estimated for the final appropriations legislation, pursuant to Section 251 of the Balanced Budget Enforcement and Deficit Control Act, for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1998, including supplementals, transfers, rescissions, and any other adjustments;

4. An analysis by CBO and the Administration, submitted as a part of their fiscal year 2000 Presidential budget presentations, of the outlays and outlay rates currently estimated to be appropriate for fiscal year 1999 for the Department of Defense with: (a) the outlays and outlay rates originally estimated by CBO and the Administration for the fiscal year 1999 Department of Defense budget when that budget was originally presented to Congress, and (b) any revised outlays and outlay rates estimated for the final appropriations legislation, pursuant to Section 251 of the Balanced Budget Enforcement and Deficit Control Act, to date, for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1999, including supplementals, transfers, rescissions, and any other adjustments;

5. A timely explanation by DoD of (a) any policy initiatives in the fiscal year 2000 DoD budget that, in DoD's judgement, CBO did not recognize in the latter's scoring of the fiscal year 2000 DoD budget, (b) DoD's analysis of how such policy initiatives will affect outlays in fiscal year 2000 and subsequent years, and (c) how DoD intends to implement the proposed policy initiatives.

Pursuant to your amendment we are also looking into the issue of non-defense outlays scoring and will report back to you shortly.

I look forward to working with you on this year's DoD appropriation and on action to ensure we have the most accurate estimate possible for defense expenditures in future years.

With best regards,

PETE V. DOMENICI,

Chairman.

Mr. HARKIN. Now, why am I taking the time here late at night to talk about this? Because we are about to go out on a break. We are going to go out for the month of August. In the first week of September when we come back, the chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, the largest of the nondefense appropriations subcommittees—and that is my colleague and my friend, Senator SPECTER from Pennsylvania—will be calling us together to mark up the non-defense portion of the appropriations bill.

Right now, the allocation that was given to our subcommittee with respect to outlays is almost \$300 million below a freeze from last year—\$300 million below a freeze from last year.

The House, using those figures, marked up a bill, and the only way they marked it up was by completely eliminating all of the funding for the summer jobs program and all of the funding for the heating assistance for the elderly and poor—the LIHEAP program. They just eliminated all of that, and then they came in with the allocations that they had.

What my amendment basically says is that the chairman of the Budget Committee ought to apply the same rationale, the same decision, on using OMB estimates for nondefense as he did for defense. We need the outlays that this amendment will give us to fund programs important to Members on both sides of the aisle. This is not a Democrat amendment.

Now, we have heard many calls on the other side of the aisle to get more funding for IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. We have had more calls from the other side of the aisle to fund more programs for the National Institutes of Health. We have heard calls on this side of the aisle for more funding for Head Start, for low-income heating energy assistance programs for the elderly and the working poor. This cuts across both sides of this aisle. Those are just a few of the programs that will be drastically cut if we don't have the figures that could be given to us by the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Now, I will point out one thing. Recently, the Senators here voted on a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It passed 99-0—I don't know who was missing, but it passed 99-0—a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that would raise NIH funding by \$2 billion next year. That increase alone would require over \$600 million in outlays. And I just said that our allocation puts us \$300 million below a freeze.

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

Mr. HARKIN. I am delighted to yield to my friend and chairman.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague. When the distinguished Senator from Iowa points out that the vote was 99-0, is the Senator aware that when we sought the transfer, that it was turned down 57-41?

Mr. HARKIN. I am aware that the Senator from Pennsylvania, I think, within a week after that, offered an amendment—

Mr. SPECTER. An amendment on which the Senator from Iowa joined this Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARKIN. I proudly did so.

Mr. SPECTER. I believe the Senator from Iowa raises a valid point on having the same scoring for the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education as for the Department of Defense. I am optimistic that in working with the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee there are ways that we can re-

solve these differences on policy grounds. The Senator from Iowa and I have worked very closely for many years now, when the Senator from Iowa was chairman and I was ranking—in reverse. We will move ahead with our markup in the subcommittee on September 1, the day after we get back. The chairman has agreed to have the markup on September 3 to bring this complex bill to the floor at an early date. I have taken the preliminary step in a very small meeting with Secretary Shalala of Health and Human Services and Secretary Riley of Education and Secretary Herman of Labor, to try to ascertain their real priorities so that we can try to move this bill ahead and get it passed.

I think the Senator from Iowa is performing a real service in highlighting the necessity for similar scoring so we can have additional funds. I think we will get there. I thank my colleague for his yielding and for his cooperation this year and through the years.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my chairman for his kind words. We have worked collaboratively. I could not ask for a better chairman than Senator SPECTER. We have worked closely together. We have talked privately about this and, quite frankly, I believe we are going to be able to work this out. That is why I will, at the appropriate time, withdraw my amendment, because I do believe we are going to be able to work this out with the chairman of the Budget Committee and with the chairman of the Labor-HHS appropriations subcommittee. I believe we will be able to work this out in a manner that will be, I hope, conducive to getting the money that we need immediately—just the basic requirements that we want for the National Institutes of Health, that we want for LIHEAP, and a lot of the other programs that so many Members support here. I wanted to raise this issue because I think it is vitally important that we use the same set of scoring for both defense and non-defense.

So, Mr. President, with the assurances of my chairman that we will be able to get this thing worked out, I just wanted to refer to one thing on the chart. With the reallocation, with the amount of money we would get from the rescoring, we would have \$770 million. That would get us the money that we need for NIH. That would get us the money that we need for LIHEAP and for the other programs—Head Start and others—that we need, which Senators support here.

Mr. President, again, I raise this issue because it is vitally important. I don't know how many other Senators want to speak on this issue. But I would be willing to yield the floor at this time for any other Senators who might want to speak on the issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, first, I want to hear the response of the Senator from New Mexico, because in a private conversation we just had here there was an assurance that I would like to hear publicly made and then I will be able to respond.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if the Senator will give me 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes of the time I have to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I believe one of the most difficult bills to appropriate and stay within the caps and the allocations under the Balanced Budget Act is the bill that the distinguished Senator, Senator HARKIN, is referring to. It is difficult every single year. It will be difficult this year; he knows it and I know it.

I want to make sure that everybody understands that the Senator from New Mexico did not adopt OMB numbers in arriving at the corrections that were made in the amounts of money available for the Defense appropriations bill. We will be very glad to show Senators precisely what we did. In fact, I am going to insert a statement into the RECORD—I won't give it—showing that we actually made policy adjustments that permitted the changes in the expectation of expenditures, and then on top of that we allowed for the sale of assets that were a certainty, and we counted those sales in terms of receipts that could be spent in this bill.

What I am going to say to Senator SPECTER, chairman of the committee—and I told him this already—is that the staff and I are going to work with them, and we intend to do everything in our power to adjust the numbers so that they get the benefit of any policy changes that are justifiably on the side of OMB's different numbers. If that yields more money to spend, we are going to do that, and we are going to try our best. Let me repeat that we did not use OMB's numbers; we used OMB policy adjustments in a very confused procurement account, and they convinced us that in the policy that they were going to adopt, there would be more expenditures than we had expected—or less, whichever the case may be that yields more money to spend.

I also want to say to the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education that they chose last year to forward-fund a lot of their accounts. I am not critical. What they did is, they said, on a number of big accounts, we will not fund them for the whole year. We will fund them at the end of the year, thus, getting charged for only a small amount of money. Now, I can't help it that the chickens are now come home to roost. The money is now being spent in

this year, and we don't even have to appropriate; we already spent it. I can't fix that on every bill.

So, Mr. President, let me just say to the Senate, the bill, which Senator SPECTER will chair and Senator HARKIN is ranking member on, is the most difficult bill we have. And this Senator, in my responsibility to the Senate, will do everything I can to see that the numbers are accurate and that we maximize the amount of outlays. It is outlays they need; they don't need any budget authority. I will do that as soon as practicable, and our staff and theirs will start working as soon as they want us to.

The amendment and its author do not accurately characterize what has been done respecting outlays for the National Defense budget function.

There has been no arbitrary adjustment of CBO's scoring of defense outlays as some characterize.

Instead, the following actions have been taken:

The DoD Authorization bill contains legislation to reduce outlays in DoD's Working Capital funds by \$1.3 billion.

The DoD Authorization bill also implements policies that would reduce outlays in two Air Force accounts in classified programs by \$700 million.

The DoD Appropriations bill we are debating today contains a new Pentagon Renovation Fund; there has been a scoring adjustment for this new fund to bring its outlays in line with typical military construction outlay rates, rather than the higher overall rates that CBO would otherwise attribute to this spending. This adjustment amounts to about \$190 million.

That's the totality of any outlay scoring adjustments in this appropriations bill. There are no other adjustments to CBO scoring. I believe it is important to realize that for the adjustments that have been made, in each case there is a specific legislative and/or policy provision that is key to the adjustment, and each legislative provision should have a material impact on outlays.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEVENS. The remaining speaker is the Senator from New Jersey, is that correct?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished chairman that I am going to be very brief, in view of what has just been said. I trust the chairman of the Budget Committee. There is some time available, is there not, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Very quickly, I am pleased to hear the assurances. First, I commend the Senator from Iowa for bringing this to our attention because we were both of the same mind. Even as I read the letter sent to

Senator STEVENS and Senator THURMOND, to me, it looked like we were going to be put in a position where defense was going to be particularly well treated, and nondefense was going to be left out. But we have had an interesting colloquy here, a dialog, and I trust the chairman of the Budget Committee. I work with him all the time and have great respect for him.

When he gives us an assurance that there will be no distinction, or no difference between the treatment given to defense and nondefense, I don't have to go a lot further. We have heard it. We have heard it directly from the chairman. We have heard it in this public forum.

Mr. President, I yield the time I have in the interest of moving this along.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, under the agreement the amendments, if they are not called up, just go away. We do not offer them all. But the Senator is at liberty to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. Was it called up?

Mr. STEVENS. It was not called up. Mr. HARKIN. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to H.R. 4103, all after the enacting clause is stricken, the text of S. 2132, as amended, is inserted in lieu thereof.

The House bill is considered read a third time.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that we stop there for just one moment for leaders to have a chance to talk about this bill just briefly.

I want to make a statement to the Senate. I often make mistakes. I have not made one as great as the one I made tonight when I interrupted the Senator from West Virginia. I had no intention of interrupting him. I know he intended to make his speech. I assured him that he would have the time to make the speech that he wished. We had entered into an agreement concerning a time limit on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

I deeply regret the misunderstanding that occurred. I know my good friend from West Virginia has a long and serious speech to make about the war powers and the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Illinois concerning the power of Congress to declare war.

I admire and respect him greatly, and I sincerely regret that incident.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will momentarily proceed to passage of the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

But I can't let this moment escape without first commending the chairman, Senator STEVENS, and his ranking member, Senator INOUE, for the unbelievable speed in which they have been able to handle this appropriations bill and bring it to a close.

They are absolutely the best when it comes to knowing this legislation, and perhaps all legislation. I think they probably have set a record. But I think they did it in a way that was sensitive to all Senators' needs. And it took a lot of cooperation on both sides of the aisle.

So I thank Senator STEVENS. He set an example for all of us to follow. And the better part of wisdom was for me to get out of the way and let him do his job. He did a great job. I thank him, and I know that all Senators extend their thanks to him, and congratulations.

Having said that, the Senate still must consider two additional items before I can announce the voting situation for the rest of the evening.

Those items are the Emergency Farm Financial Relief Act, and legislation coming from the House relative to H-1B, the Nonmigrant Immigrant Program.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send an adjournment resolution to the desk calling for a conditional adjournment for the August recess, and ask that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 114) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 114

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in consonance with section 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Friday, July 31, 1998, Saturday, August 1, 1998, or Sunday, August 2, 1998, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, August 31 or Tuesday, September 1, 1998, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, August 7, 1998, it stand adjourned

until noon on Wednesday, September 9, 1998, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

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

EMERGENCY FARM FINANCIAL RELIEF ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Agriculture Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2344, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk reported as follows:

A bill (S. 2344) to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to provide for the advance payment, in full, of the fiscal year 1999 payments otherwise required under production flexibility contracts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thought the majority leader and I were working on this. I am a little bit surprised he has chosen to call it up right now. We can object. But I would prefer that we continue to see if we can't resolve this matter. We have been cooperating all night.

I guess I expected a little more reciprocity on the other side. I am disappointed that I was surprised in this manner, and at this hour under these circumstances it is uncalled for.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think the Senator would like to withhold that last comment about it being uncalled for. I don't do this lightly.

Mr. DASCHLE. I was not informed this was going to happen.

Mr. LOTT. I did it for a reason.

Mr. President, if I could respond to the Senator's comments, this is not a controversial issue. This is an issue that I am sure that all agriculture Members would very much like for us to get resolved. There is no budget impact. All it does is say that this allows farmers suffering from drought, El Nino, fire, and other natural disasters to begin considering and receiving emergency transition payments that they are entitled to under the Freedom to Farm Act. As a matter of fact, I understand that it will allow them to get these benefits in October rather than having to wait until January. I did it for a reason.

If we don't get it resolved before we get to a final vote, then objections

later on tonight would make it impossible for us to get any consideration.

If the Senator would indicate to me that there is some idea that we could get this agreed to tonight, I would be glad to work with him like I always do. But the timing was such that we have to do it now in order to get it considered, or it could be objected to after Senators have gone, and we would not get it completed.

I am trying to complete action so that we can go through a long list of Executive Calendar nominations, so that we could complete some more of them tomorrow. If we don't do these two issues now, they are basically gone until September.

I thought that—I understood there was an objection, but that we had worked through that, and that we would not have any problem in getting this cleared.

I had talked to Senators on your side of the aisle that have agriculture interests that indicated they would not object to this.

If there is some problem that we could resolve right quick, I would be glad to withhold. But we need to try to get this resolved, because it is something that is very important timewise to the Department of Agriculture and to the farmers that have been affected by drought.

We have worked this year on both sides of the aisle on the agriculture appropriations bill to get considerations for farmers that have been impacted by these disasters. This is just one way to do that.

Since there is no cost factor involved, it just gives authority for this to be moved forward.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object again, I was consumed, I guess, in assisting the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in working down the amendments. We have been working on that tirelessly all day. The majority leader and I have worked throughout the day on a number of issues. Not once did he raise this issue with me. That explanation would have been welcomed, would have been appreciated 5 minutes ago, a half hour ago, 2 hours ago. But he surprises me at this hour after we cooperated all week on an array of issues working over these appropriations bills amendment after amendment. And I guess it is very, very disappointing to me.

I ask unanimous consent that an amendment that would provide \$500 million in indemnity payments to farmers and that was passed unanimously on the Senate floor during the debate on the agricultural appropriations bill be attached to the bill that is now under consideration, and for which the majority has asked unanimous consent.

Would he accept that addition to the bill? Because, if he would, I am sure

then that we could accommodate the majority leader and those who wish to pass this, as it was a surprise to the rest of us.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this comes as no surprise to Senators interested in agriculture on either side of the aisle. In fact, I did bring this subject up to Senator DASCHLE earlier today, standing right there.

By the way, I have been working on amendments and Executive Calendar items while we have been having these last few votes. I have been talking to Senators on both sides of the aisle about nominations. I talked to Senator DORGAN who I know confers with Senator DASCHLE all the time about this particular unanimous consent request within the hour.

I don't believe there is anybody on either side of the aisle surprised by this.

Mr. DASCHLE. I am one.

Mr. LOTT. As a matter of fact, we just discussed it a moment ago.

If the Senator wants to object, he can go ahead and object. I think the implication here is that there is some sinister effort here. And it is certainly not true. This is something that is very noncontroversial. I don't know of any problem with it. I can't imagine why any Senator would object to it.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. With regard to his unanimous consent request, I have no idea of the ramifications of the unanimous consent request he just asked. I don't know what is involved there. We already passed the agriculture appropriations bill. There was action taken on that particular item.

I would not be able to agree to that at this point without checking with Senators that have been involved in that legislation with that amendment.

So there is no need in holding up the Senate any further. If the Senator wants to object, he can do so.

I am going to also ask unanimous consent that he go ahead and move on the H-1B issue which has been worked out previously in conference by both sides of the Capitol by both parties. This is an issue that we need to get resolved.

I thought that we had a reasonable resolution of the issue.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, the basic reason I think this is so important is that the other body, the House, is going to pass this very same bill, and all it is, is one of the many steps that we need to consider and hopefully pass in regard to growing problems we are experiencing in farm country.

There was a great deal of press last week about the intention of the House to provide something called "advanced transition payments." All that does is provide the farmer an opportunity for a voluntarily decision which he can make as to whether or not he can accept next year's transition payments this year.

It means a considerable amount of money. And if we are able to pass the Farm Savings Account that Senator GRASSLEY has introduced, it will be of tremendous cash flow assistance.

I thought it was not controversial. Since the House is going to pass it next week, since the House is out of session, it made a lot of sense, it seemed to me, and many others, for us to deem it passed, or to pass it.

Farmers would then have, under the banner of consistency and predictability, the knowledge that they would have this as a tool.

Now, I can't tell you what we are going to do in September with the \$500 million that was referred to by the distinguished Democratic leader. That is a place hold, and it is sitting there, and as we go through the situation of judging what is happening with adverse weather all around the country—in Texas, Oklahoma, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and the Northern Plains certainly—perhaps that number will change. We can take a look at it at that particular point.

As a matter of fact, I was just going to give to all the distinguished Senators from the Dakotas a proposal that I have had in regard to crop insurance and see maybe if the \$500 million could be increased somewhat and funneled through crop insurance to answer these indemnity payment questions that have been raised.

But for goodness' sake, to object to this at this particular time—to give farmers the advance news that this is, as a matter of fact, on the table, that they can expect this, that they have some consistency, some idea of what is coming—I think is very untoward.

More to the point, I think it has been agreed to in a tremendous bipartisan effort in the House and, I had thought, in this as well.

Now, I understand that people perhaps don't get the word on each and every occasion, but I cannot imagine anybody objecting to this knowing full well in September we will get to the \$500 million that the distinguished Senator has mentioned. I would certainly urge that we not object to this, we give the farmers a very clear signal, and we get on with the business.

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator respond to a question?

Mr. ROBERTS. I would be delighted to respond if I can.

Mr. LOTT. I believe the Senator from Kansas has been working on this issue. He knew we were trying to get it cleared tonight. I made a specific call

to him to contact Senators on both sides of the aisle and discuss this issue. I assumed that he was doing that. I had the impression that it had been—any holds or objections had been cleared.

Did it come as surprise to the Senator? Does the Senator think it came as a surprise?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am always pleased, if I can respond to the majority leader, to be Garcia and run the trap lines for anything that could be proposed by the Senator and the distinguished leader of the minority. I have checked with a great many Senators. I thought it was pretty much common knowledge. I have checked with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Ag Appropriations, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, checked with Senator DORGAN, checked with Senator CONRAD, and checked with others. I could go down the list. But I just did not anticipate that there would be an objection, and so consequently—or, more especially, when the very subject that Senator DASCHLE indicated is already in the Agriculture appropriations bill.

As a matter of fact, I think if we fund it now, you could make the argument that later down the road, in regard to disaster assistance, there would not be any more forthcoming. I apologize if it is my fault, if in fact I was supposed to run the trap line and I didn't run all the traps. I am sorry, but I just did not anticipate that this would be this much of a problem.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we can play these games all night long, and there are a lot of people who are tired. This isn't the way to end what I thought was a fairly productive week.

We are not going to object. Let's just quit playing these kinds of games. Let's just get on with it. Let's pass it. But let's all be aware of what we have done.

You and I have a good relationship. We ought to keep it that way. I don't like being dealt with this way. I will accept it this time, but I wish we would work in the manner in which we have been working all week.

This is a very serious, important issue. There are a lot of political ramifications, and we can play the political game. The fact is that there are a lot of people out there who want some help. This is going to be a little help. I wish we could pass the indemnity payment tonight. I don't see why we could not. The fact is that we would pass it unanimously, and that would be new money, \$500 million in new money. I wish we could do that just as easily as we are going to agree to pass this thing that isn't going to mean that much. But we will pass it.

But I must say, we shouldn't be doing it this way. I have been here all night. I haven't left the floor. Somebody could have come to me to say, look, we

want to do this. Instead, what has happened is that this was sprung on me.

Now, you don't have to apologize. Nobody has to apologize. It just isn't the way we ought to do business.

So, Mr. President, we don't object.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact the Senator did not object.

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object—I will reserve the right to object. Is this unanimous consent on advancing AMTA payments? Is that what is before the body right now?

Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. What is the unanimous consent before the Senate right now?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could respond, it is unanimous consent that the Agriculture Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2344, which is a bill that allows farmers who are suffering from the drought to begin receiving emergency transition payments that they are entitled to in October instead of having to wait until January.

Mr. HARKIN. I would ask the proponents, I would ask the majority leader then, is this the unanimous consent that would reopen the 1996 farm bill? Because the farm bill stipulates that a farmer could get half of the payment if he wanted to in December or January and could get the other half the next September.

That was in the farm bill. As I understand it, this then changes what the farm bill provides. Is that correct?

Mr. LOTT. It says, as I understand it, that they would get the same amount they would get either way. They would just get it earlier in the year instead of later in the year so they could begin to deal with the problems that they have had to face as a result of disasters.

Mr. HARKIN. Further reserving the right to object then, this then would undo some of the provisions that were in the 1996 farm bill, because it changes the dates and circumstances under which the farmer could get the AMTA payment, as it is called.

I understand that some people want to do that and they want to reopen the farm bill. That is fine. But I would remind my colleagues that a couple of weeks ago we offered an amendment to take the caps off the commodity loan rates. For a typical Iowa farmer with 500 acres of corn that amendment would have put about \$20,000 of additional income in the farmer's pocket this fall. Not only does this bill involve significantly less money for that farmer, but it only advances money that he is already going to get anyway. As far as increasing income to the farmer, this bill doesn't do a darned thing.

What we need to do is to get the indemnity payments through that Senator DASCHLE is talking about, \$500 million. There are a lot of farmers out there who are hurting very badly. I have to tell you, there is a crisis in ag-

riculture today. Farmers have been devastated by bad weather, by crop disease in the Upper Midwest, and especially in the Dakotas.

We can pass the \$500 million for indemnity payments tonight. Why don't we pass that measure by unanimous consent right now to get that \$500 million in indemnity payments out to farmers immediately? Why can't we do that?

I ask the majority leader, why can't we pass that?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this is a bill that has been offered. It provides help now. I know no Senator would want to delay that help that they were going to get anyway. We just get it earlier. This is a bill that is going to pass the House next Monday, probably unanimously, which would provide some more immediate help to these farmers.

There is no effort to play games here. This is an effort to provide some help to the farmers who need it as soon as they can possibly get it. That is all there is to it. The idea we are playing games here—I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I had the privilege of working with Senator CONRAD on crafting the indemnity payment. We cooperated with Senator COCHRAN in getting it in the agriculture bill. We are going to go to conference right soon. We think that will be in the new fiscal year. You talk about immediacy of payment? We hope that will be available by late this year to deal with some of these agricultural problems.

But I must say, it has not been shaped to my satisfaction. Senator CONRAD and I have talked about how we would work within the conference to make sure that it is a legitimate approach toward a true disaster environment. This is a broader approach that deals with more farmers.

The definition under which Senator CONRAD and I shaped that—he being the primary author—dealt with double, back-to-back disasters. It is narrower by scope. We may want to adjust that some. I would not think tonight we would want to just accept it as it was originally crafted with its narrowness. The problem is already much larger today than when we passed it, by character of the drought and heat in Texas and in other States. It is already broader. We will want to look at that again.

It is not that I am objecting. I am saying I think we will be working together in the conference of the Ag apps to make that a viable approach as we originally thought it ought to be.

Mr. LOTT. Let me ask Senator CRAIG, if he would respond, do you think this bill, which is very limited, with no budget impact, would, at any rate, still provide some help quicker to the farmers who had been affected by these disasters?

Mr. CRAIG. There is no question it does. Is it something new? No. Is it advanced? You bet it is. When the crops dried out in the field and the banker wants you to pay your bills and you can pay them sooner than later, then it is a big help. This is not opening up Freedom to Farm. This is advancing a payment that is already built within that structure. That is why there is the budget impact about which the majority leader spoke.

I hope we can work together to resolve this, as we thought we had, so that this can move forward this week to deal with the problems that are very current in our agricultural sector.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous consent request.

Mr. CONRAD. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object—but I do object to what has occurred here, in terms of the way we are dealing with each other.

When I worked to put together an indemnity plan, I went to Members on the other side and I consulted with everyone. On this matter, there was no consultation.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President—did we not have conversations with Senators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. No, no, I have reserved the right to object. I just say this: My name was raised as having been consulted; I haven't been consulted. I was not consulted. So, when my name is raised on the floor of this body and it has been said publicly that I was consulted, that is not the case. In fact, I heard a rumor that this was occurring and went to another Member.

I am just saying, in terms of the way we treat each other here, this is not quite the way it ought to be done. I would hope we would truly work together to advance the interests of our farmers who, in many parts of our country, are, indeed, financially troubled.

There is no question this proposal is of some help. It is no new money, but it is of some assistance.

But I couldn't be silent when it is suggested people came and consulted with us. That did not happen. The Democratic leader is precisely right; there was no consultation, at least with this Senator.

Mr. LOTT. We are late in the hour. I see a number of Senators from farm States who would like to speak, perhaps, on this.

Senator HUTCHISON, I know her State of Texas has been affected by the drought. Is this a matter that would be helpful in your State of Texas?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, if we let the perfect be the enemy of the good, we are going to let a lot of people

down who are in desperation right now. This is a good bill. I think the debate can be legitimately waged, but, please, at this late hour, as we are leaving for a month, do not fail to let us have this relief. These farmers can get credit if they can get that payment moved up. It is no new money. But they need this help. This will help my State, which is the most drastically affected at this point with this drought.

I urge you, for whatever other reasons it may not have been handled right, let this unanimous consent go through. It will be to everyone's benefit who has a stake here. Let's work out the other problems when we can. We are going into a month recess.

Mr. LOTT. Let me say again, Mr. President, when you get to the end of a period of time like this, when you are fixing to go on a recess for an extended period of time, there are a lot of bills, there are a lot of issues we are dealing with, a lot of nominations we are trying to clear.

I am either going to have to do it now or later tonight or tomorrow, when everybody else is gone. We wouldn't have been able to get this cleared, probably, tomorrow. But by doing it now, I think everybody will realize that this is something that will help. It is not that controversial, and we can get it done and we can move on to the recess and feel like we did something here that will be helpful. We will have other opportunities before the year is out to provide more help as we go through the conference.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I know there are a lot of Senators on their feet, but in an effort to try to be fair before I move for regular order, I am going to withhold so the Senator from North Dakota can comment and then the Senator from Georgia, and then I will ask for the regular order.

Mr. DORGAN. I do not intend to object. I have no quarrel with this provision that is being proposed tonight.

Mr. LOTT. Didn't I call the Senator and ask if there was a problem?

Mr. DORGAN. You did call within the last hour or so. I indicated to you there was no problem with this provision, and I do not object to this provision.

But I do want to make the point that the Senate has debated and passed an emergency provision calling for \$500 million of indemnity payments. That is the only new money available. It is the only new money around in the appropriations process. If it is completed by October 1, then perhaps we may get money into the pockets of some farmers. We have seen prices collapse even further in recent weeks. It may get money into the hands of some farmers, perhaps in October—unlikely—perhaps November, maybe December.

My proposition is that to the extent that we have already debated this sub-

ject, the Senate, by 99 to nothing, has said we have an emergency in farm country. They have already passed a \$500 million indemnity payment program. It makes eminent good sense to me that we would be able to pass that indemnity program this evening and move it to the House. Does the House want to deal with it? I don't know. But they won't have an opportunity to deal with it in any timely way if we don't proceed.

I have no objection at all to what the Senator is requesting. I simply ask that he consider, and we consider, taking the \$500 million we have already decided upon and see if we can't move that to the hands of family farmers, many of whom are desperately strapped for cash.

As soon as the Senator has completed getting his unanimous consent and as soon as I am able to get the floor, I intend to ask unanimous consent the Senate will proceed to the bill providing the \$500 million of agriculture indemnity payments, which was agreed to as an amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill, and the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

If someone objects to that, fine. But I hope they would not object to it. We will not object to this. I think this may help. I hope you will not object to that, because I know it will help. It would help in a more timely way than will be the case if we wait until after recess, and farmers have to wait until November or December. Perhaps we can help farmers to get some help from that provision earlier.

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I have just returned from a disaster area in our State. It is the most emotional difficulty, I believe, with which I have ever dealt. And I have dealt with a 1000-year flood and a 500-year flood. Back-to-back crises like this are enormous.

I heard the exchange between the majority and minority leaders. I understand the tensions of the day. I appreciate the minority leader, in deference to the issue involved, removing his right to object. I appreciate that.

That removal of an objection will lead to the movement and option of farmers, in many States, to relieve their cash flow problem. They have an equity problem. The proposal that the minority leader has mentioned, about the \$500 million, and others, is something for the broader issue. There are many issues we are going to have to bring to the table to deal with this crisis. That is one idea. It is probably not near enough. It wouldn't take care of Georgia and South Carolina, much less Alabama and Texas and the Midwestern States.

We do have a major issue in front of us dealing with food and fiber and the

Nation's security. I hope we could proceed this evening with that which does not require new funds and it is simply a logistical and administrative decision that will move money more rapidly.

I say to the leader, I appreciate the chance to speak on this. Again, I thank the minority leader for removing his objection.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read the third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statement relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2344) was considered read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2344

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 "Emergency Farm Financial Relief Act".

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 PAYMENT UNDER PRODUCTION FLEXIBILITY CONTRACTS.

Section 112(d) of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7212(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.—Notwithstanding the requirements for making an annual contract payment specified in paragraphs (1) and (2), at the option of the owner or producer, the Secretary shall pay the full amount (or such portion as the owner or producer may specify) of the contract payment required to be paid for fiscal year 1999 at such time or times during that fiscal year as the owner or producer may specify."

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives the House bill relative to H-1B, the text of which I send to the desk, the bill be deemed agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table. I further ask that if the text of the House-passed bill is not identical to the text just sent to the desk, then the House bill will be appropriately referred.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, there are objections on our side.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe we are ready to go to final passage of the defense bill.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask we proceed with the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 4103, as amended, pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 252 Leg.)

YEAS—97

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Reed
Brownback	Hagel	Reid
Bryan	Harkin	Robb
Bumpers	Hatch	Roberts
Burns	Hollings	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hutchinson	Roth
Campbell	Hutchison	Santorum
Chafee	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cleland	Inouye	Sessions
Coats	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
D'Amato	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wyden
Durbin	Lieberman	
Enzi	Lott	

NAYS—2

Feingold Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Helms

The bill (H.R. 4103), as amended, was passed.

(The text of the bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DORGAN, conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, S. 2132 is indefinitely postponed.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 2344

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, as I indicated to the majority leader, it is my intent to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the bill which

provides \$500 million in agricultural indemnity payments which was agreed to as an amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill, and the bill be read the third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mr. GREGG. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I heard on the other side of the aisle a chorus of "I object." I am not quite sure why.

I was on a show this morning, WCCO Radio, in Minnesota. It is hard to explain to farmers why we can't take the action right now on the indemnity payment, the \$500 million. We passed it. The correction would be made later on, but we can get assistance to farmers right now.

Why can't we send this over to the House? I say to my colleagues.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. CRAIG. I helped craft that indemnity payment. It is very important we do work with the House. Senator CONRAD, I, and others, deserve to go to conference. Senator DORGAN was a part of that.

I can understand a rush to immediacy. That is in the next fiscal cycle. I think it is important we deal with it in a fair and balanced way. As it is written, already the circumstances of agriculture have changed significantly enough. We deserve to look at it in a broader spectrum.

We, the Senate, tonight acted to bring some immediacy to the difficulty you are expressing. There may be more to be done in the coming weeks as this whole difficulty with production agriculture increases across our country.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let the RECORD show I am speaking for myself, but let the RECORD show that there was no objection to moving forward on advance payments for this "freedom to fail" bill, which is just an admission what an awful piece of legislation it was on our side. In addition, we could have gotten a \$500 million indemnity payment out to farmers.

People are asking, when are we going to see this assistance? People are thinking about a lifetime of 2 months or 3 months.

I hear this discussion that we need to take a broader view, it needs to go over to the House, and we need to work it in conference committee, and we haven't had a chance to meet yet in conference committee. Do you know how ridiculous that sounds to the people whom we represent?

Mr. President, I will just say I don't think it is just that simple. Obviously, I am not going to change the course of events tonight.

My colleague from Iowa came out here earlier and spoke about this.

First, the minority leader asked whether or not we also could have unanimous consent to get this indemnity payment out to the countryside, out to families in rural America. Then the Senator from Iowa spoke about it. Then the Senator from North Dakota comes to the floor, after we have agreed to go forward—fast forward the advance payments was just fine with this Freedom to Farm bill. And now we come out and the Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that we get the \$500 million—when did we pass that? I ask my colleagues.

Mr. DORGAN. Almost a month ago.

Mr. WELLSTONE. A month ago. We get this out now, over to the House of Representatives; they take action this week or next week; and then we get the assistance out to farmers.

And what I hear on this side is this chorus of "No," and then everyone leaves. With all due respect, it is not that simple. I want the farmers in Minnesota and I want the farmers across the country to know that there was an effort made tonight to get some additional help to people above and beyond these advance payments, which will help only a little.

It is a desperate situation. Many people are going to go under over the next several months. There was an effort tonight to get \$500 million passed, over to the House, and out to farmers all across the country, especially in those areas that have been hardest hit. And my colleagues on the other side said no. And they are gone.

I will be willing to yield in 1 second. I would like to speak a little bit more about this for another 3 minutes. It is not that simple. I will just say to my colleagues on the other side, I see that it is late at night, but I will just say to them, it is not as simple as saying no. You said no to a proposal, to an effort to get assistance to people now. We could have done it. We have done it.

I think the RECORD should be very clear. I want every single farm family in northwest Minnesota that is in desperate shape to know that this proposal was turned down by the Republican Party—unwilling to do it. We were more than willing to help out a little bit with moving forward on the advance payments. No reciprocation or cooperation on the other side in getting the \$500 million out to people right now.

I don't think it will be very easy to explain to people why we are waiting another month. I don't know whether we should have even left. It is sort of interesting to me, a bitter irony. Now we are gone. We probably shouldn't have gone. We probably shouldn't be going into recess.

How do you say to people, well, it will be in a conference committee and we haven't quite got that together and we just didn't want to do it tonight because there are some things that I am

not satisfied with as a Senator and I would like to work on that longer?

The future is now for people. Time is not neutral. We could have passed something which would have provided \$500 million to farmer families that are in real trouble, and we didn't do it. I am embarrassed that we are going into recess. I am embarrassed that the U.S. Senate blocked this. I am embarrassed, specifically, that my Republican colleagues blocked it.

I didn't get a chance to talk earlier because the majority leader tried to move things along, said he would recognize two Senators, and the Senator from Georgia was the last Senator. So now I get to speak. I think it is just outrageous.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I simply wanted to make the point that the reason I asked the unanimous consent request really has nothing to do with the request by others to advance the Agriculture Marketing Assistance Act, or AMTA payments as they are called, under the Freedom to Farm bill. I didn't object to that. If that will help a producer here and there, that is good. Anything that helps gets assistance into the pockets of family farmers, I am for that. So I didn't object to that. I told folks this evening I wouldn't object to that.

But, this is not new money at all. This is just a payment that they are supposed to get later on. Now, they might get this payment earlier or at least they will have the option to get it earlier.

I was thinking about the farmer who testified yesterday at our farm policy hearing. This was young fellow from South Dakota who testified. When he talked about putting the crop in this spring, he could barely continue. His chin was quivering, and he had tears in his eyes. He talked about having to find something on his farm to sell in order to get the money together to put in his crop. Then things went bad for him and he was out of money again. He had to sell some of the feed for his cattle that he put aside for this winter. He didn't have any money. He talks about the need to feed his kids, the need to provide for his family. He could barely continue because he was talking about something that is much more than a business. It is a way of life. This was life, and his dream. I had a call from a guy in Sarles, ND. You could hear the pain in his voice. Everything that he has, everything that he owns, everything that he aspires to, everything that he has fought and worked for in his family is on the line. He said, "You know, I'm going to harvest my barley and I'm going to have to take it right to the elevator. Prices have crashed, I am not going to get anything for it. I don't have a choice. I have to pay back

my lender, and feed my family." The pain was so evident in his voice. He was asking, "What can I do? Is there help someplace?"

The point of both of these producers is that they didn't cause these conditions. They didn't cause the Asian financial crisis that has caused our exports to start to slow down and prices collapse. They didn't cause the crop diseases that have devastated these crops. They didn't cause the price collapse of wheat and barley. It is not their fault. The question for this country is whether we are going to have any family farmers left. And, does anybody care about that?

This Senate did something that I thought was the right thing to do. We passed an indemnity program of \$500 million. Frankly, that is going to have to increase substantially. Since that time, in the last several weeks, we have learned that the Texas cotton crop is gone, with over \$2 billion in damage. In Louisiana and Oklahoma, the agricultural economies are devastated. So the \$500 million is going to have to be increased. The point is, while I think advancing the Freedom to Farm payments is fine, I think we can do more by deciding to take the \$500 million we have already agreed upon and advance that and move that out.

The earliest farmers are going to get these indemnity payments would be perhaps November or December. Tonight, we could have taken that \$500 million and made it available. We could have sent it to the House, and let them pass it. Next week, or the week after, the Department of Agriculture could have begun to try to deal with this deepening farm crisis. This isn't an ordinary crisis. I have mentioned before that we have so many auction sales of family farms in North Dakota that they were calling auctioneers out of retirement to handle the sales. You can go to those sales and see these little tykes wearing their britches and cowboy hats with hair in their eyes, wondering why mom and dad have to sell the farm, and why their life is going to change. You can see the husband and wife with tears in their eyes, watching people bid on their machinery. Most of the equipment is old because they can't afford the new machinery. You can see the pain being suffered out in the great plains.

I am disappointed tonight. I wish we could have done what we have already decided to do. We should make \$500 million available now. We should do it sooner rather than later. We will come back in September and have another significant debate. Advancing the Freedom to Farm payment is fine. It may help some producers. If it does, I am for that. But we must do more. This Congress must decide that family farmers matter. This isn't just about dollars and cents, or about economic theory.

With all that is going on in agriculture, including unfair trade, unfair competition, a choked market, monopolies up and down and sideways, and everywhere, we are losing something very important. We are losing family farmers. Then all the yard lights will be turned off on these farms. You will fly from California to Maine and you won't see family farms because agri-factories don't have yard lights. They plow as far as you can plow for 10 hours, and they plow back. There will be nobody living out in the country. That seed bed of family values that existed and that nurtures us from small towns to America's cities, and which has always refreshed this country will be gone. Then somebody will scratch their head and say: What happened to our country? What will have happened is that this Congress didn't understand, as some other countries do, that family farmers make a difference in our national life. It is not just dollars and cents. It is a lot more than some economic calculation made by those who give us a bunch of constipated theories about agriculture. This is everyday living by farm families that just ask for an even chance to make a decent living. Yet they are confronted in every direction by monopolies, price collapse, disease, and then by a Government that says they want to pull the rug out from under them on price supports.

What if the Government tried to do that on the minimum wage? They would say, "Let's reduce the minimum wage to \$1 an hour and call it freedom to work." It's the same thing. The fact is, we must come back here in September and have a real debate about real policies that will give family farmers in this country a real opportunity to make a decent living. They are the economic all stars in this country. Make no mistake about it. This country will make a serious mistake if it turns its back to the economic opportunity that ought to be offered to the family farmers in this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, perhaps it is healthy that we had a discussion on the farm crisis started again tonight. It is unfortunate the way it came up because, typically, those of us who represent farm country have tried to work together. That did not happen tonight. That is unfortunate. There is no great harm done. In fact, we passed something that will be modestly helpful, although it represents no new money.

Mr. President, the reason there is such a high level of feeling about what is happening in farm country is because we face an unmitigated disaster. In North Dakota, farm income declined 98 percent from 1996 to 1997. The result

is a massive number of auction sales, and the result is that the Secretary of Agriculture came to North Dakota and his crisis response team said that we are in danger of losing 30 percent of our farmers in the next 2 years. That is a disaster of staggering proportion.

Of course, it is not limited to North Dakota because we have the lowest prices for wheat and barley in 50 years. Those prices continue to crash. I just received a phone call from a farmer back home in North Dakota, who heard this debate occurring and he said, "Don't they know down there that just shuffling payments is not going to solve the problem? Don't they know that this kind of shell game is not what is needed? What is needed are additional resources to fight what is an international trade war. Don't they know that Europe spends 10 times more supporting their producers than we do supporting ours? Don't they know Europe is spending 100 times more than we are supporting exports? Don't they understand the result is not only the lowest prices in 50 years, but in addition to that, disasters that are not being addressed?"

The disaster in North Dakota is the outbreak of a disease called scab, a fungus that is loose in the fields, which cost us a third of the crop last year. That combination of the lowest prices in 50 years and losing a third of the crop to this horrible disease, scab, has meant devastation to farm income. As I indicated, there has been a 98 percent reduction in farm income from 1996 to 1997, with literally thousands of farmers being forced off the land this year, and many more coming next year. One of the major agricultural lenders in my State called me and told me, "Senator, there is something radically wrong with this country's farm policy. If a State like North Dakota, which is one of the breadbasket States of our country, is in a farm depression, then there is something radically wrong with the farm policy."

Mr. President, I just want to conclude by saying that we do face low prices in North Dakota. It is not just in North Dakota because now it is spreading to other States as well. They are being hit by the low prices, but they are also being hit by these disaster conditions. In different parts of the country, it is different kinds of weather disasters. In Oklahoma and Texas, it is overly dry conditions, a drought. It's the same thing in Louisiana. In our part of the country, it is overly wet conditions that led to this outbreak of the fungus called scab. In other parts of the country, it has been hurricanes.

The combined result is a farm crisis worse than anything we have seen since I have been in public life. I have been in public life now for over 20 years.

Mr. President, I hope when we return that we are ready to aggressively ad-

dress this problem. What we did tonight will help. It is not new money. It just moves money forward. That will be of some assistance. But it in no way solves the problem. We have a crisis of staggering dimensions, and it requires our full response.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we are now in the closing process for the evening, and we have several matters to be considered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

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

MEDIA CAMPAIGN HELPS INFORM CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON ENCRYPTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the continuing efforts of Americans for Computer Privacy (ACP), a broad-based advocacy coalition, to energize the discussion now taking place in Washington on encryption. ACP has a role since they represent industry, private citizens and interest groups from all sides of the political spectrum. The computer industry believes, as do many members in both the House and Senate, that it is time to reform America's outdated encryption regime. Last week, an important step was taken when a multimedia campaign was launched to raise Congressional and public awareness on the encryption issue. This campaign includes television commercials, print media, and an online banner component with such statements as, "would you give the government the keys to your safety deposit box or home." In the past few days, television commercials highlighting the need for encryption reform have appeared during Good Morning America, the Today show, Hardball, and Cross Fire.

Mr. President, ACP has an impressive membership which includes such organizations as the Law Enforcement Alliance of America, the Louisiana Sheriff's Association, American Small Business Alliance, Americans for Tax Reform, Electronic Commerce Forum, Information Technology Industry Council, the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Com-

merce, and over sixty technology companies. It's bipartisan advisory panel includes several intelligence and law enforcement experts such as former National Security Advisor Richard Allen, former NSA Deputy Director William Crowell, former CIA Director John Deutch, former FBI Director William Webster, and former San Jose Police Chief Joseph McNamara. This array adds credibility to their message.

As you are well aware, encryption plays a significant role in our daily lives. This technology scrambles and unscrambles computer text to keep private communications from being read by unauthorized individuals such as hackers, thieves, and other criminals. Encryption protects private citizens credit card numbers when they buy something over the Internet, ensures that only authorized medical personnel can read a patients' medical records stored on a hospital database, shields tax information that we send to the IRS, and safeguards personal letters that we E-mail to loved ones. Encryption means that American companies can protect confidential employee information, such as salary and performance data; valuable trade secrets and competitive bidding information; and critical target market data.

Encryption also benefits America's security by protecting our nation's critical infrastructures, like the power grid, telecommunications infrastructure, financial networks, air traffic control operations, and emergency response systems. Strong encryption thwarts infiltration attempts by computer hackers and terrorists who have destructive, life threatening intent.

Yes, this is an issue that truly affects all Americans.

By allowing a public policy that limits encryption to continue, we risk sending more potential U.S. business overseas. This approach only serves to harm America's economic and national security interest by encouraging criminals to purchase foreign made products now widely available with unlimited encryption strength. By contrast, the broad development and use of American encryption products should be advantageous to our law enforcement and intelligence communities.

I must say that I am deeply troubled by the comments made by Commerce Under Secretary William Reinsch, head of the Bureau of Export Administration, in response to ACP's efforts. Apparently, Under Secretary Reinsch doubts that this initiative will work—that industry and privacy advocates are wasting their money. I disagree. This media campaign is rightfully educating the public about the importance of encryption in our every day lives. These advertisements make clear that encryption technology preserves our First Amendment right to freedom of speech and our Fourth Amendment freedom against unreasonable search

and seizure. They illustrate that we need strong security to keep all Americans safe from infrastructure attack. And they explain that Americans and computer users everywhere must feel confident in the knowledge that their private information will remain private. Clearly, the development and use and strong encryption is critical if Internet commerce is going to grow to its full potential and sustain the economic engine that is driving this country into the 21st century.

I believe this advertising campaign is yet another indication of industry's willingness and desire to find a reasonable solution to the encryption issue. Industry and privacy groups, for example, have been working in earnest with Administration officials for several months. In May, a proposed interim solution to the encryption issue was offered. The Administration responded that it would take five to six months to review the proposal. This reaction in conjunction with Under Secretary Reinsch's recent comments, lead many in Congress, from both sides of the aisle, to conclude that the Administration, despite what it has been saying publicly, does not want to see a balanced resolution before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. President, I think it is also important to reiterate that the Administration's restrictions against U.S. encryption exports and its proposals to control domestic use just cannot work. Innovation in the high tech industry is relentless and ubiquitous. The government cannot stop it. It is for this reason that industry is trying to persuade the Administration that innovation is the solution to this issue, not the enemy. Two weeks ago, a coalition of thirteen companies proposed "private doorbells", a technology solution that would provide law enforcement with court approved access to computer messages. Clearly, industry leaders want to help officials capture criminals and terrorists. I believe the ideas they have put forward are reasonable and responsible. On the other hand, I do not believe the Administration's response has been forthcoming. Encryption policy can be modernized with the stroke of a pen, but the Administration has shown little willingness. Thus, industry takes appropriate action by implementing a media campaign.

While encryption is a complex and divisive information technology issue, this media initiative reinforces the need for legislation to bring America's encryption policy into the 21st century. The national security and law enforcement communities have legitimate concerns that must be considered. I believe that the best way to deal with these concerns is to pass during this Congress legislation that strikes a balance on encryption. Legislation that would help keep private and corporate communications away from

hackers, terrorists and other criminals, provide a level playing field for U.S. encryption manufacturers, and ensure Constitutional protections for all Americans. A number of my colleagues have been pushing for this type of reform for years and several competing encryption bills have been offered in both the House and Senate during this session.

Mr. President, as you may recall, I engaged in a colloquy with my colleagues last week which reinforced the need for Congress to act during this session to break the impasse. This is a difficult issue, not easily explained or understood, but it is a crucial one. Momentum has been built in both the House and Senate toward finding a workable solution. Congress must seize upon these efforts and pass a consensus encryption bill now or risk starting all over during the next session. Congress has come too far on this issue to go back to the beginning.

Americans need a sound and reasonable encryption policy that protects public safety, reinforces security, promotes digital privacy, and encourages online commerce and economic growth. Without the development and use of powerful encryption, we may bear the consequences of the next hacker's attack on the Pentagon's information network, a terrorist attack on the city's power supply, or a thief's attack on the international financial markets.

With over \$60 billion and over 200,000 jobs at stake by the year 2000, the House and Senate cannot continue to hope that the Administration will reach an amicable solution that satisfies the needs of all parties. I strongly encourage my colleagues to report out a balanced encryption bill that Congress can act on before the end of this session. Before it is too late.

INSTALLATION OF WILLIAM B. GREENWOOD AS PRESIDENT OF THE INDEPENDENT INSURANCE AGENTS OF AMERICA

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I rise today to commend a fellow Kentuckian and my friend, William B. Greenwood of Central City, who will be installed as president of the nation's largest insurance association—the Independent Insurance Agents of America (IIAA)—next month in Boston. Bill is president of C.A. Lawton Insurance, an independent insurance agency located in Central City.

Bill's career as an independent insurance agent has been marked with outstanding dedication to his clients, his community, IIAA, the State association—the Independent Insurance Agents of Kentucky—his colleagues and his profession.

At the state level, Bill served as president of the Independent Insurance Agents of Kentucky in 1983, and was named the Kentucky association's In-

surer of the Year in 1986. He was Kentucky's representative to IIAA's National Board of State Directors for seven years beginning in 1985.

Bill also has been very active with IIAA. He served as chairman of its Communications and Membership Committees as well as chairman of the Future One Communications Task Force. Bill was elected to IIAA's Executive Committee in 1992 and since then he has exhibited a spirit of dedication and concern for his 300,000 independent agent colleagues around the country.

Bill's selfless attitude also extends to his involvement in numerous Central City-area community activities. He received the 1989 Kentucky Chamber of Commerce Volunteer of the Year Award. He is on the Boards of Directors for the Leadership Kentucky Foundation, Kentucky Audubon Council Boy Scouts of America, and Central City, Main Street, Inc.

In the past, Bill served on the Board of Directors of the Muhlenberg Community Theater, the Everly Brothers Foundation, and the Central City Main Street and Redy Downtown Development Corporation. Also, Bill is past president of the Central City Chamber of Commerce and the Central City Lions Club.

Bill's professional endeavors outside IIAA extend to serving on the board of directors and serving as president of the First United Holding Company, which owns Central City's First National Bank.

I have complete confidence that Bill will serve with distinction and provide strong leadership as president of the Independent Insurance Agents of America. I wish him and his lovely wife, Leslie, all the best as IIAA President and First Lady over the next year.

UTAH ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the noteworthy efforts of the Utah Assistive Technology Program, which has helped empower individuals with disabilities, allowing them to live more rewarding, productive, and independent lives.

An estimated 216,100 Utahns of all ages—approximately 10 percent of our state's population—live with a disabling condition. Assistive technology provides a means whereby these individuals can live and work in virtually all areas of society. Stated plainly, assistive technology not only improves the quality of life for individuals with disabilities but also enables the rest of us to have the benefit of their contributions.

The term "assistive technology" encompasses all devices that improve the functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities. Such devices can be as simple as a wheelchair or as high-

tech as an electronic Liberator, a technological apparatus that makes communication possible for disabled individuals who are not able to speak. Organizations such as the Utah Assistive Technology Program provide services that assist disabled individuals in the selection and acquisition of these products.

With the help of assistive technology, children have received a more meaningful and challenging education; adults have undertaken rewarding careers; and senior citizens have continued to live independently in their own homes.

The Tech Act, as it is known, passed by Congress in 1988, has proven invaluable to the realization of these goals. Under this act, Utah has established an impressive assistive technology program. According to my fellow Utahn, Ms. Corey Rowley, chairperson of the National Council on Independent Living Assistive Technology Task Force, the effectiveness of the Utah Assistive Technology Program lies in its ability to initiate and coordinate projects with all relevant Utah agencies—an integrated effort that transcends any one piece of federal legislation.

Prominent among its achievements is the creation of the Utah Center for Assistive Technology in Salt Lake City—a statewide service center that provides invaluable assessments and demonstrations of applicable assistive technology devices to consumers. This center also provides people with informative guidance concerning available resources to acquire these services. While federal funds from the Tech Act were crucial to the center's creation, it is now fully funded by the state. This is an excellent example of how Utah has been able to leverage a small amount of federal funding.

Mr. President, we must make sure that the Tech Act is reauthorized. While this act has already enhanced the lives of many Americans, a great need still exists. We must do more. It seems clear that the need for assistive technology in the coming years will increase as America's population ages. Moreover, we must take full advantage of scientific and technological advances that can be applied to persons with disabilities.

Congress will have the opportunity this year to continue a modest federal effort to empower individuals with disabilities to learn, to work, and to prosper. I hope that all my colleagues will support this program.

HONORING THE WRIGHTS ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, families are the cornerstone of America. Individuals from strong families contribute to the society. In an era when nearly half of all couples married today

will see their union dissolve into divorce, I believe it is both instructive and important to honor those who have taken the commitment of "till death us do part" seriously, demonstrating successfully the timeless principles of love, honor, and fidelity. These characteristics make our country strong.

For these important reasons, I rise today to honor Lonnie and Regina Wright of Goshen, Arkansas, who on August 4, 1998, will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary. My wife, Janet, and I look forward to the day we can celebrate a similar milestone. The Wrights' commitment to the principles and values of their marriage deserves to be saluted and recognized.

RECOGNITION OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to extend appreciation to Arsalan Iftikhar for his service as an intern in my office during the Spring of 1998. Arsalan set the highest standard of excellence on a project undertaken by my Operations Team.

Since I was elected in 1994, my staff and I have made an oath of service, commitment, and dedication. We dedicate ourselves to quality service. America's future will be determined by the character and productivity of our people. In this respect, we seek to lead by our example. We strive to lead with humility and honesty, and to work with energy and spirit. Our standard of productivity is accuracy, courtesy, efficiency, integrity, validity, and timeliness.

Arsalan has not only achieved this standard, he set a new standard on the project he was given. He exemplified a competitive level of work while maintaining a cooperative spirit. His performance truly was inspiring to my entire office. It is with much appreciation that I recognize Arsalan's contribution to me and my staff in our effort to fulfill our office pledge and to serve all people by whose consent we govern.

RECOGNITION OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to extend appreciation to Heather Oellermann for her service as an intern in my office during the Spring of 1998. Heather set the highest standard of excellence on a project undertaken by my Operations Team.

Since I was elected in 1994, my staff and I have made an oath of service, commitment, and dedication. We dedicate ourselves to quality service. America's future will be determined by the character and productivity of our people. In this respect, we seek to lead by our example. We strive to lead with humility and honesty, and to work with energy and spirit. Our standard of productivity is accuracy, courtesy, efficiency, integrity, validity, and timeliness.

Heather has not only achieved this standard, she set a new standard on the project she was given. She exemplified a competitive level of work while maintaining a cooperative spirit. Her performance truly was inspiring to my entire office. It is with much appreciation that I recognize Heather's contribution to me and my staff in our effort to fulfill our office pledge and to serve all people by whose consent we govern.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT LEGISLATION

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Senator COATS, the Chairman of the Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Children and Families, for the excellent work he has done in drafting legislation to reauthorize the Community Services Block Grant, which recently passed in the Senate. The CSBG program is intended to fight poverty and alleviate its effects on people and their communities. Through these block grants, federal money is given to the states and local communities to create programs that help low-income people secure employment, get an adequate education, make better use of their available income, obtain and maintain adequate housing, and ultimately achieve self-sufficiency.

These block grants free states and local communities of federal red tape and give them the flexibility they desire to initiate programs that meet the needs of people who need help. As a former governor, I learned that state and local governments are far more effective in serving local communities than Washington's bureaucracy.

Further, Community Services Block Grants provide opportunities for the government to partner with the non-governmental sector to provide a variety of services to the poor. I am grateful that Senator COATS has led a bipartisan effort to include within this reauthorization bill language that can expand the opportunities for charitable and faith-based organizations to serve their communities with CSBG funds. The provisions included will help faith-based organizations to maintain their religious character and integrity when providing social services with government funds.

For years, America's charities and churches have been transforming shattered lives by addressing the deeper needs of people—by instilling hope and values which help change behavior and attitudes. As a matter of sound public policy, we in Congress need to find ways to allow these successful organizations to unleash the cultural remedy that our society so desperately needs. Senator COATS' legislation reauthorizing the Community Services Block Grant will help to further this goal.

The language in this bill regarding charitable and faith-based providers is

similar to my Charitable Choice provision contained in the welfare reform law which we passed two years ago, but it does contain some differences. For non-governmental organizations wishing to participate in both the Community Service Block Grant and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families programs, the differences between the two provisions may cause some confusion and lead to additional administrative burdens.

This situation demonstrates the need to pass legislation that applies the same Charitable Choice language to all federally funded social service programs in which the government is authorized to use nongovernmental organizations to provide services to beneficiaries. Under my Charitable Choice Expansion Act, which I introduced in May of this year, uniform protections and guidelines would apply to faith-based entities using federal dollars to provide housing, substance abuse prevention and treatment, juvenile services, seniors services, abstinence education, and child welfare services, as well as services under the Community Development Block Grant, the Social Services Block Grant, and of course, the Community Services Block Grant. One uniform Charitable Choice provision will certainly make it easier for both the government and faith-based organizations to work together more efficiently to help our nation's needy.

Again, I thank Senator COATS and all the members of the Labor Committee, as well as their staff, for their hard work on this legislation, and I commend them for their decision to include provisions that invite the greater participation of charitable and faith-based providers in the Community Services Block Grant program. I hope that we in the Senate will continue working together to pursue legislative proposals that encourage successful non-governmental organizations to expand their life-transforming programs to serve our nation's poor and needy.

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. BIDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

It is a truism that despite the end of the Cold War, we live in a dangerous world. The ultimate danger we face, perhaps, is that nuclear weapons will be obtained—or even used—by unstable countries or terrorist groups.

We must undertake a range of activities to reduce that danger. There is no magic bullet. No single program or initiative will rid the world of the threat of nuclear cataclysm at the hands of a new or unstable nuclear power.

Rather, we need a coherent strategy with many elements—a strategy designed to reduce both the supply of nu-

clear weapons technology to would-be nuclear powers and the regional tensions that fuel their demand for those weapons.

I would like to spend a few minutes today talking about one piece of that strategy that this body can implement: We can and should give our advice and consent to ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. And we should do that promptly.

In her speech on the 35th anniversary of John F. Kennedy's American University speech, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright called for U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. Noting the recent Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests, she said that ratification was needed "now, more than ever."

Senator SPECTER and I have also called for ratification now, both in floor statements and by drafting a resolution calling for expeditious Senate consideration of the Test-Ban Treaty.

Why is the Test-Ban so crucial? Because it is directly related to the global bargain that is the heart of the global nonproliferation regime. Other countries will give up their ambition to acquire nuclear weapons, but only if the declared nuclear powers honestly seek to end their nuclear advantage. We have to keep up our side of the bargain—and that means ratifying and adhering to the comprehensive test ban—or the non-nuclear weapons states will not feel bound to theirs.

One lesson of this decade's nuclear developments in India, Pakistan, Iraq and North Korea is that very basic nuclear weapon design information is no longer a tightly held secret. The technology required to produce nuclear weapons remains expensive and complex, but it is well within the reach of literally scores of countries.

To keep countries from producing what scores of them could produce, you need more than pressure or sanctions. You must constantly maintain their consent to remain non-nuclear weapons states.

Ideally, we would maintain that consent by removing the security concerns that propel countries to seek nuclear weapons. But that is terribly difficult, be it in Kashmir or the Middle East, in the Balkans or the Korean Peninsula or the Taiwan Straits.

In the world of today and of the foreseeable future, peace does not reign. Nuclear non-proliferation will not prevail in this world either, unless we convince states that nuclear weapons are not the key to survival, to status or to power.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is not merely emblematic of the nuclear powers' commitment to the non-nuclear weapons states. It also will put a cap on the development of new classes of nuclear weapons by the nuclear powers.

The test-ban treaty will also limit the ability of any non-nuclear weapons

state to develop sophisticated nuclear weapons or to gain confidence in more primitive nuclear weapons if it were to illegally acquire or produce them. If you can't test your weapon, you are very unlikely to rely upon it as an instrument of war.

These are important reassurances to the non-nuclear nations of the world. They are why those countries agreed to fore swear all nuclear tests and to accept intrusive on-site inspection if a suspicion arose that they might have tested a nuclear device.

Will the Test-Ban Treaty also gradually reduce a country's confidence in the reliability of its nuclear weapons over the next 30 or 50 years, as some of its opponents assert? If so, that is actually reassuring to the non-nuclear weapons states, for it gives them hope of the eventual realization of that "cessation of the nuclear arms race" encouraged by Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. So even the cloud that most frightens test-ban opponents has a silver lining: it helps keep the rest of the world on board the non-proliferation bandwagon.

Now it is true, Mr. President, that some countries have never accepted the world non-proliferation bargain. The so-called "threshold states" of India, Pakistan and Israel all viewed nuclear weapons as essential to their national security, and India denounced the Non-Proliferation Treaty because it did not require immediate nuclear disarmament.

Still other countries, like Iran, Iraq and North Korea, signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty but maintained covert nuclear weapons programs.

But the vast majority of the world's states, including many prospective nuclear powers, have gone along with this bargain. And it is vital to our national security that we maintain their adherence to the world non-proliferation regime. They must not become "threshold states," let alone actually test nuclear weapons.

So, how will we maintain the adherence of the world's non-nuclear weapons states to the nuclear proliferation regime? The Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests are a direct challenge to that regime. The regime—and the countries who support it—can only meet that challenge if the United States leads the way.

On one level, we are already doing that. We have imposed severe sanctions on both India and Pakistan, and both of their economies are at risk. We have adjusted our sanctions to limit their effect upon innocent populations, and we are working to give the President the flexibility to lift them in return for serious steps by India and Pakistan toward capping their arms race and addressing their differences.

On the world-wide level, however, our record is mixed. Some countries have joined us in imposing sanctions on

India and Pakistan. We have also been joined in strong statements by countries ranging from Japan to Russia and China.

Statements and resolutions by the G-8, the Organization of American States, the Conference on Disarmament, and the United Nations Security Council have rightly condemned India and Pakistan's nuclear tests and called upon them to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to refrain from actual deployment of their weapons, to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty and to move toward a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

But the world is acutely aware of our failure to persuade more countries to impose sanctions, and also of our own failure, so far, to ratify the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty. Until we ratify this Treaty, the nuclear hardliners in India and Pakistan will be able to cite U.S. hypocrisy as one more reason to reject the nuclear non-proliferation regime. And until we ratify the Treaty, the rest of the world will find it easier to reject U.S. calls for diplomatic and economic measures to pressure India and Pakistan.

We must keep our part of that non-proliferation bargain, if we are to maintain U.S. leadership on non-proliferation, keep the rest of the world on board, and influence India and Pakistan. The truth is that we have little choice.

If we fail to keep faith with the non-nuclear states because we cannot even ratify the Test-Ban Treaty, then we will also fail to keep them from developing nuclear weapons of their own. And in that case, Mr. President, we might as well prepare for a world of at least 15 or 20 nuclear weapon states, rather than the 5 or 7 or 8 we have today. That is the stark reality we face.

THE FATE OF THE TEST-BAN TREATY

But we need not fail, Mr. President. The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is a very sensible treaty that is clearly in our national interest. It binds the rest of the world to refrain from nuclear testing, just as we have bound our own government for the last 6 years.

The Test-Ban Treaty forces us to rely upon so-called "stockpile stewardship" to maintain the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons, but we are in a better position economically and scientifically to do that than is any other country in the world.

Treaty verification will require our attention and our resources, but those are resources that we would have to spend anyway in order to monitor world-wide nuclear weapons programs.

Indeed, the International Monitoring System under the Treaty may save us money, as we will pay only a quarter of those costs for monitoring resources that otherwise we might well have to finance in full.

But we do have a problem. We have been unable to hold hearings on this treaty in the Foreign Relations Committee, even though committees with lesser roles have held them. And the Majority Leader has said that he will not bring this treaty to the floor.

Why is that, Mr. President? I know that my good friends the chairman and the majority leader have raised arguments against the Treaty, but they seem curiously unwilling to make those arguments in the context of a proper committee or floor debate on a resolution of ratification.

Could they be afraid of losing? Could they be afraid that, once the pros and cons are laid out with a resolution of ratification before us, two thirds of this body will support ratification? Perhaps; I know that I think the Treaty can readily get that support.

For the arguments in favor of ratification look pretty strong. The conditions that the President has asked us to attach to a resolution of ratification will assure that we maintain our weapons and the ability to test them, and that he will consider every year whether we must withdraw from the Treaty and resume testing to maintain nuclear deterrence.

I also know, Mr. President, that the American people overwhelmingly support ratification of the Test-Ban Treaty. A nation-wide poll in mid-May, after the Indian tests, found 73 percent in favor of ratification and only 16 percent against it. Later polls in 5 states—with 7 Republican senators—found support for the Treaty ranging from 79 percent to 86 percent.

The May poll also found that the American people knew there was a risk that other countries would try to cheat, so the public is not supporting ratification because they wear rose-colored glasses. The people are pretty level-headed on this issue, as on so many others. They know that no treaty is perfect. They also know that this Treaty, on balance, is good for America.

So perhaps those who block the Senate from fulfilling its Constitutional duty regarding this Treaty are doing that because they know the people overwhelmingly support this Treaty, and they know that ratification would pass.

Perhaps they just don't like arms control treaties. Perhaps they would rather rely only upon American military might, including nuclear weapons tests. Perhaps they want a nation-wide ballistic missile defense and figure that then it won't matter how many countries have nuclear weapons. Perhaps they figure our weapons will keep us safe, even if we let the rest of the world fall into the abyss of nuclear war.

I don't share that view, Mr. President. I believe we can keep non-proliferation on track. I believe that we can maintain nuclear deterrence with-

out engaging in nuclear testing, and that the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty is a small price for keeping the non-nuclear states with us on an issue where the fate of the world is truly at stake.

I cannot force a resolution of ratification on this Treaty through the Foreign Relations Committee and onto the floor of this body.

But the American people want us to ratify this Treaty. They are absolutely right to want that. I will remind my colleagues—however often I must—of their duty under the U.S. Constitution and to our national security. I will make sure that the American people know who stands with them in that vital quest.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and I have drafted a resolution calling for expeditious consideration of this Treaty. So far, we have been joined by 34 of our colleagues as co-sponsors of that resolution.

We know that many others support us quietly, Mr. President, but hesitate to part company with their leaders. We are confident, however, that as more of them reflect on what is at stake, and on the need for continued U.S. leadership in nuclear non-proliferation, they will realize that they will do their leaders a favor by helping the Senate to do what is so clearly in the national interest.

The Senate will give its advice and consent to ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. The only question is when.

The world is a dangerous place, Mr. President, and we must not underestimate the challenges our country faces. But the spirit of America lies in our ability to rise to those challenges and overcome them. The immediate challenge of non-proliferation is to bring forth a resolution of ratification on a useful treaty, Mr. President. We should show more of that American spirit in our approach to that task.

THE IMPORTANCE OF IMF FUNDING

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, no less an authority than Alan Greenspan recently pronounced our economy in the best shape he has seen in his professional life.

Unemployment, inflation, and interest rates are low; incomes, investment, and optimism remain high.

Clearly, Mr. President, now is the time to worry.

Now is the time to worry, Mr. President, because these are exactly the circumstances that breed overconfidence and complacency. Pride, Mr. President, goeth before the fall.

Mr. President, we enjoy this excellent economic performance because we have got our own house in order—we have gone through a painful period of restructuring that has made our economy more efficient, and we have taken

the tough steps to balance our federal budget.

So our factories and businesses are operating efficiently, our workers are earning more, and our sound government finances are helping to keep interest rates down. What could go wrong?

Well, what if the markets for this new, more productive economy were not there? What if international investors pull their money out of some of our major trading partners? What if those countries stop buying our products and services? What if they can't pay back their loans, and American investments there lose money instead of sending profits back home?

Unfortunately, that is just what is happening now, and instead of acting quickly to limit the threat of these developments, the majority in the House of Representatives has chosen to play a dangerous game of chicken with international financial markets.

Mr. President, the Senate went on record in March, by an overwhelming vote of 84 to 16, in favor of full funding of U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund. But those funds were dropped by the House in Conference.

I am pleased to see that Chairman STEVENS, who, along with my colleague Senator HAGEL on the Foreign Relations Committee has shown real leadership on this issue, has taken a second crack at the problem by including this funding on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. Unfortunately, we will not act on that bill until after the August recess.

But just last week, the House pulled its version of the Foreign Ops bill from further consideration because of their internal squabbling over funding for the IMF.

I fear that those squabbles may mask an even more cynical motive—to hold the IMF, and by extension global financial stability, hostage to increase their bargaining leverage on unrelated issues at the end of the legislative session this fall.

Mr. President, I want to stress what is at stake while the majority in the House dithers. The financial crisis that began a year ago in Asia has not gone away—it continues to fester, and threatens to spread. Indeed, with the resources of the IMF already stretched thin, we may be entering the most critical phase of this threat to the global economy.

If the worst case happens, Mr. President, we will have no place to hide, no matter how well things have been going for us lately. Just look at the risks.

Japan is the keystone of the Asian economy—it could pull that already fragile region into a real depression if current trends are not quickly and dramatically reversed. That's why the recent elections there were so important,

and why international investors are watching closely to see if Japan has the political muscle to overhaul its financial system and restore growth at the same time. That is a lot to ask, and much hangs on the outcome, including the health of important markets for American exports throughout Asia.

Mr. President, in May our trade deficit soared to \$15.8 billion, as exports to Asia dropped by 21 percent compared to a year ago. Still, our friends in the House suggest that we wait until the fall to see if things get worse.

Russia presents an additional threat to our economic and security interests. Despite the announcement of a new IMF package, the Moscow stock market index has dropped 24 percent. An economically foundering Russia, facing political collapse, opens a Pandora's box of issues for stability in Europe and around the world.

On top of all this, other countries, including South Africa, Ukraine, and Malaysia, are lined up in the IMF's waiting room.

But because of the severity of the Asian crisis, the IMF's resources are so low that international investors must now have real fear that it will not be able to provide further support to its current clients, or support any additional countries now on the brink. This will add uncertainty to an already shaky situation, and can only make further panic more likely.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Senator SARBANES, recently warned those who think we can do without the IMF that they are "playing with fire." He's right.

They have decided, for short-term political reasons—some as small as their own fight over the Speaker's job—that they are willing to fiddle while the international economy burns. The IMF is not a perfect institution, Mr. President, but right now it is the only fire insurance we have got.

By delaying indefinitely the funding for the IMF, these gamblers are taking deadly risks with our own economy, an economy that has taken years of sacrifice to restore to health. They are squandering our ability to lead economically and politically in a time of international crisis in exchange for some short-term political gains.

It is time to cease this recklessness, Mr. President. It's time to provide the IMF with the funds it needs, and remove short-sighted bickering and self-serving calculations in the U.S. Congress from the list of threats to our own economy.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting three withdrawals and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it request the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 872. An act to establish rules governing product liability actions against raw materials and bulk component suppliers to medical device manufacturers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3506. An act to award a congressional gold medal to Gerald R. and Betty Ford.

H.R. 3982. An act to designate the Federal building located at 310 New Bern Avenue in Raleigh, North Carolina, as the "Terry Sanford Federal Building".

H.R. 4194. An act making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution commending the Armed Forces for their efforts, leadership, and success in providing equality of treatment and opportunity for their military and civilian personnel without regard to race, color, religion, or natural origin.

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a clinic to be conducted by the United States Luge Association.

The message further announced that the Houses agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4059) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of the Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4060) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. OBEY, as

the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

At 10:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4237. An act to amend the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 to revise the revenues and activities covered under such Act, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3982. An act to designate the Federal building located at 310 New Bern Avenue in Raleigh, North Carolina, as the "Terry Sanford Federal Building"; to the Committee on Environmental and Public Works.

The following concurrent resolutions were read and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution commending the Armed Forces for their efforts, leadership, and success in providing equality of treatment and opportunity for their military and civilian personnel without regard to race, color, religion, or natural origin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a clinic to be conducted by the United States Luge Association; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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-6287. A communication from the Associate Managing Director for Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules to Adopt Regulations for Automatic Vehicle Monitoring Systems" (Docket 93-61) received on July 29, 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6288. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit of the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Conversion to the Euro" (RIN1545-AW34) received on July 29, 1998; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6289. A communication from the Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Kentucky Regulatory Program" (Docket KY-217-FOR) received on July 29, 1998; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6290. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Endowment's annual report for fiscal year 1997; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-6291. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, De-

partment of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certification of a proposed Technical Assistance Agreement for the export of defense services to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (DTC-71-98); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6292. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Additions to the Entity List: Russian Entities" (RIN0694-AB60) received on July 29, 1998; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6293. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exports to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro); Imposition of Foreign Policy Controls" (RIN0694-AB69) received on July 29, 1998; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6294. A communication from the Employee Benefits Manager, AgFirst Farm Credit Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statements of the Bank's Retirement Plan and Employee Thrift Plan for calendar year 1997; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 442: A bill to establish a national policy against State and local government interference with interstate commerce on the Internet or interactive computer services, and to exercise Congressional jurisdiction over interstate commerce by establishing a moratorium on the imposition of exactions that would interfere with the free flow of commerce via the Internet, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105-276).

By Mr. D'AMATO, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2375: An original bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1997, to strengthen prohibitions on international bribery and other corrupt practices, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105-277).

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2279: A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize the programs of the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105-278).

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Appropriations: Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 1999" (Rept. No. 105-279).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 3528: A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the use of alternative dispute resolution processes in United States district courts, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 193: A resolution designating December 13, 1998, as "National Children's Memorial Day".

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1031: A bill to protect Federal law enforcement officers who intervene in certain situations to protect life or prevent bodily injury.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 51: A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Potomac Highlands Airport Authority Compact entered into between the States of Maryland and West Virginia.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. D'AMATO, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

Rebecca M. Blank, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that she be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. HATCH, from Committee on the Judiciary:

Rebecca R. Palmeyer, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Nora M. Manella, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Jeanne E. Scott, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois.

David R. Herndon, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

Carl J. Barbier, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Gerald Bruce Lee, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Patricia A. Seitz, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Howard Hikaru Tagomori, of Hawaii, to be United States Marshal for the District of Hawaii for the term of four years.

Paul M. Warner, of Utah, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2371. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual capital gains tax rates and to provide tax incentives for farmers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2372. A bill to provide for a pilot loan guarantee program to address Year 2000 problems of small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2373. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the use of alternative dispute resolution processes in United States district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 2374. A bill to provide additional funding for repair of the Korean War Veterans Memorial; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 2375. An original bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, to strengthen prohibitions on international bribery and other corrupt practices, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

S. 2376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for land sales for conservation purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. D'AMATO, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2377. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to limit the concentration of sulfur in gasoline used in motor vehicles; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 2378. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of payment under the Medicare program for pap smear laboratory tests; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2379. A bill to establish a program to establish and sustain viable rural and remote communities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2380. A bill to require the written consent of a parent of an unemancipated minor prior to the provision of contraceptive drugs or devices to such a minor, or the referral of such minor for abortion services, under any Federally funded program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2381. A bill to provide that no electric utility shall be required to enter into a new contract or obligation to purchase or to sell electricity or capacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2382. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow certain community-based organizations and health care providers to determine that a child is presumptively eligible for medical assistance under a State plan under that title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 2383. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to reform the provisions relating to child labor; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself and Mr. FAIRCLOTH):

S. 2384. A bill entitled "Year 2000 Enhance Cooperation Solution"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2385. A bill to establish the San Rafael Swell National Heritage Area and the San Rafael National Conservation Area in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2386. A bill to provide that a charitable contribution deduction shall be allowed for that portion of the cost breast cancer research stamp which is in excess of the cost of a regular first-class stamp; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 2387. A bill to confer and confirm Presidential authority to use force abroad, to set forth procedures governing the exercise of that authority, and thereby to facilitate cooperation between the President and Congress in decisions concerning the use or deployment of United States Armed Forces abroad in situations of actual or potential hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DORGAN:

S. 2388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion for gain from the sale of farmland which is similar to the exclusion from gain on the sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 2389. A bill to strengthen the rights of workers to associate, organize and strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. BROWNBAC (for himself and Mr. HELMS):

S. 2390. A bill to permit ships built in foreign countries to engage in coastwise in the transport of certain products; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S. 2391. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to initiate an investigation under section 702 of the Tariff Act of 1930 of methyl tertiary butyl ether imported from Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. ROBB) (by request):

S. 2392. A bill to encourage the disclosure and exchange of information about computer processing problems and related matters in connection with the transition to the Year 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary. I16

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2393. A bill to protect the sovereign right of the State of Alaska and prevent the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior from assuming management of Alaska's fish and game resources; read the first time.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN) (by request):

S. 2394. A bill to amend section 334 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act to clarify the rules of origin with respect to certain textile products; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DODD, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. KOHL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 260. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that October 11, 1998, should be designated as "National Children's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNBAC:

S. Res. 261. A resolution requiring the privatization of the Senate barber and beauty shops and the Senate restaurants; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. Res. 262. A resolution to state the sense of the Senate that the government of the United States should place priority on formulating a comprehensive and strategic policy of engaging and cooperating with Japan in advancing science and technology for the benefit of both nations as well as the rest of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. Res. 263. A resolution to authorize the payment of the expenses of representatives of the Senate attending the funeral of a Senator; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOTT:

S. Con. Res. 114. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. Con. Res. 115. A concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of copies of the publication entitled "The United States Capital" as a Senate document; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. THOMAS)):

S. 2371. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual capital gains tax rates and to provide tax incentives for farmers; to the Committee on Finance.

FAMILY INVESTMENT AND RURAL SAVINGS TAX ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today several of us from rural States and the leadership of the Senate take a step to help America's farmers as representatives of States with major agricultural economies. All of us introducing this legislation agree that farmers are facing some difficult times.

While we must do what we can to make sure that farmers survive for the short term, the key to the agricultural

economic situation is long-term solutions. While we can't eliminate every risk and we can't control every factor that governs the success of the family farm, there are initiatives that we can pursue that will help smooth out some of the bumps that are in the road.

That is why today several of us are introducing the FIRST Act, the Family Investment and Rural Savings Tax Act of 1998. As I said at the outset, there are some genuine problems in the ag community. Some parts of the country are experiencing problems that are worse than we are seeing in my own State of Iowa. We can offer reforms that address short-term and long-term needs.

To address short-term needs and help give farmers that extra support that some will need to get through this year, I have joined with several of my colleagues in supporting legislation that will speed up transition payments, payments that would be made during 1999 and could, upon election by individual farmers, be taken in 1998. In my State of Iowa, that will bring 36 cents per bushel into the farmer's income in 1998 that would otherwise not be there.

But the focus of this legislation which I am speaking about today, the FIRST Act, is to address long-term need, because what I just described to you, advancing the transition payments, is obviously a short-term solution.

What we are saying is that we must ensure economic stability for everyone first through the transition proposition I described, and then we must help our farmers plan for the future.

This measure takes a three-prong approach to assist farmers and families through tax reform.

The first section of our bill reduces the capital gains tax rate for individuals from 20 percent to 15 percent. This will spur growth, entrepreneurship and help farmers make the most of their capital assets. It will also encourage movement of capital investment from one generation to the other to help young farmers get started.

This language builds on the capital gains tax reform that we made in last year's Tax Relief Act.

Secondly, the FIRST Act includes my legislation that creates savings accounts for farmers. This initiative would allow farmers to make contributions to tax-deferred accounts. These Grassley savings accounts, as I call them, will give farmers a tool to control their lives. This savings account legislation will encourage farmers to save during good years to help cushion the fall from the inevitable bad years. The accounts will give farmers even greater freedom in their business decisions rather than giving the Government more authority over farmers and their lives.

As a working farmer myself, and an American, I know that we want to con-

trol our own destiny. We want to manage our own business. We want to make those decisions that are connected with being a good business operator. We do not want to have to wait for the bureaucrats at the USDA in Washington, DC, in that bureaucracy to tell us how many acres of corn and how many acres of soybeans that we can plant. This allows, through the balancing out of income, the leveling out of the peaks and valleys from one year to another, because in farming, it seems to be all boom or all bust. This farmers' savings account that I suggest will give farmers an opportunity to do that.

Finally, our tax legislation allows for the permanent extension of income averaging. Income averaging helps farmers because when prices are low and when farmers' income goes down, their tax burden will also be lowered. This helps farmers prepare for the especially volatile nature of their income.

This is a tough time for a lot of farmers. I know there is a great deal of anxiety among farmers about what the future might bring. This proposal will help them to know that we in Congress recognize the particular difficulties they face in trying to plan for the future. I, along with other Members who have worked on this bill, believe that our initiatives will provide farmers with additional financial insurance they need to help face the future.

The initiatives of this legislation have been endorsed by virtually every major agricultural organization. These organizations know that these measures are what farmers need to have more confidence and security in the future.

I am very pleased to see the majority leader, TRENT LOTT, the Senator from Mississippi, taking a strong stand in favor of this. I thank my colleagues who have worked with me on this legislation. We all agree that passing this measure as soon as possible is one of the best things that we can do for our farmers in our States and across the country.

This legislation is a long-term solution. It helps our farmers and our families survive and to keep control of their own decisions, so that we can let Washington make decisions for Washington but let farmers make decisions for themselves.

The bottom line, Mr. President, is right now we are facing a variety of troubling circumstances: an economic crisis in southeast Asia, a drought combined with the hot weather in Texas today, fires in Florida, too much wheat coming across the Canadian border, unfairly, to drive down the price of wheat in North Dakota, and the prospect of having bumper crops this year and big carryovers from last year. These are things that are beyond the control of the family farmer.

Because we in family farming assume the responsibility—each one of us—of

feeding, on average, 126 other people, we must keep the family farms strong as a matter of national policy, as a matter of good economics. We do that not because of nostalgia for family farmers but because when there is a good supply of food, the urban populations of this country are going to feel more secure and more certain about the future.

We want to continually remind people, though, through actions of this Congress that we in the Congress know that food grows on farms, it does not grow in supermarkets. If there were not farmers producing, if there were not the labor and processing people, if there were not truckers and trains taking the food from the farm to the city, we would not have the high quality of food we have, we would not have the quantity of food we have, we would not have the stability that we have in our cities, we would not have the quality of life that we have beyond food for the American people. Let's not forget that food as a percentage of disposable income at about 11 percent is cheaper for the American consumer than any consumer anywhere else in the world.

This legislation that we are all introducing is in support of maintaining that sort of environment for the people of America, and also as we export food for people around the world. We are committed to it, but also as a Congress we are committed to maintaining the family farm as well. So I introduce this bill for Senator LOTT, myself, Senator HAGEL, Senator ROBERTS, Senator BURNS, Senator CRAIG, Senator SHELBY, and Senator SESSIONS. I thank my colleagues for their hard work and support.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HAGEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise to support, as an original cosponsor, the Family Investment and Rural Savings Tax Act of 1998. I thank the majority leader, Senator LOTT, for working with many of us to make tax relief for farmers and ranchers a very top priority this year.

Mr. President, I am not a farmer. When I want advice about agricultural issues, I ask farmers, I ask ranchers. About a month ago, the Senators offering this bill, and several others concerned about the problems facing rural America, agriculture today, right now, sat down with every major farm and commodity group in America. These representatives of American agriculture—real agriculture—told us the same thing I hear repeatedly from ranchers and farmers across my State of Nebraska: "We do not want to go back to the failed Government supply and demand policies of the past." That is clear. They told us very clearly that there are three things—three things—

Congress can do to help America's farmers and ranchers: One, open up more export markets; two, tax relief; and, three, reduce Government regulation. This, after all, Mr. President, was indeed the promise of the 1996 Freedom to Farm Act.

Those of us on the floor today and our colleagues have been working very hard over the last few months to open more markets overseas, especially in the area of dealing with unilateral sanctions. And we are going to keep pushing aggressively for important export tools, important for all of America, not just American agriculture, important tools like fast track, and reform and complete funding for the IMF.

This bill we are introducing today goes to the second point. It will provide real and meaningful tax relief, tax relief to America's agricultural producers. It will provide farmers and ranchers with the tools they need in managing the unique financial situations that they alone face on their farms and ranches.

This bill has three provisions, which Senator GRASSLEY has just outlined accurately and succinctly: One, the farm and ranch risk management accounts; two, the permanent extension of income averaging for farmers; and, three, reduction of capital gains rates not just for American agriculture but for all of America.

Mr. President, I have said over the last 2 years I would like to see the capital gains tax completely eliminated. But that is a debate for another day. However, this bill is a major step in the right direction. This bill will mean lower taxes for our farmers and ranchers and many Americans. It is the right thing to do.

I hope a majority of my colleagues will join us in support of this bill, an important bill for America, an important bill for our farmers and ranchers.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise for just a moment to thank the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Iowa for their leadership on this agricultural issue that we have before us. I join as an original cosponsor to the effort.

It seems to me that clearly there are two areas that have to be pursued. The Senator from Nebraska talked about one, and that is seeking to reopen and to strengthen these foreign markets that are there that are critical to agricultural production.

One of the areas, of course, in this matter is unilateral sanctions, of which some action has already been taken in the case of Pakistan and India. We need to do more of that. The other, of course, is to do something domestically. I agree entirely that we should not try to return to the managed agriculture that we had before, but to continue to move towards market agriculture in which our produc-

tion is based on demand. But it is a difficult transition. And that, coupled with the Asian crisis, coupled with the fact that, particularly in the northern tier and in the south, we have had drought, we have had floods, we have had freezes—we have had a series of difficult things that lend to the difficulty of agriculture.

So I am pleased that the Congress has taken some steps. I think this idea of moving forward with the transition payments is a good idea.

Certainly we can do that for farmers. Then if we can provide a farmer savings account which will allow them to have these payments, in advance, without being taxed until they are used, is a good one.

Certainly, as the Senator from Nebraska has indicated, I, too, favor the idea of reducing and, indeed, eventually eliminating the capital gains taxes. I just want to say I support this very much.

There perhaps are other activities that we can undertake that will be helpful, but we do need to get started. I think this is a good beginning. I want to say again that I appreciate the leadership of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Nebraska.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I, too, have come to the floor this morning to thank you, and certainly the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Wyoming, who has been involved with us, along with our leader, TRENT LOTT, Senator BURNS of Montana, Senator ROBERTS, and myself in looking at the current agricultural situation in this country, which is very concerning to all of us as commodity prices plummet in the face of what could be record harvests and as foreign markets diminish because of the Asian crisis and world competition.

As a result of that, we have come together to look at tools that we could bring to American agriculture, production agriculture, farmers and ranchers, that would assist them now and into the future to build stability there and allow them not only to invest but to save during years of profit in a way that is unique for American agricultural.

In 1986, when this Congress made sweeping tax reform, they eliminated income averaging. I was in the House at that time and I opposed that legislation. I remember an economist from the University of Virginia saying that it would take a decade or more, but there would come a time when all of us in Congress would begin to see the problems that a denial of income averaging would do to production agriculture; that slowly but surely the ability to divert income during cyclical market patterns would, in effect, weaken production agriculture at the farm

and ranch level to a point that they could not sustain themselves during these cyclical patterns. Bankruptcies would occur; family operations that had been in business for two or three generations would begin to fail.

We are at that point. We have been at that point for several years. I remember the words of that economist in a hearing before one of the House committees echoing, saying, "Don't do this. This is the wrong approach." In those days, though, I wasn't, but others in Congress were anxious to crank up the money and spend it here in Washington and return it in farm products, recycle it, skim off the 15 or 20 percent that it oftentimes takes to run a government operation, and then somehow appear to be magnanimous by returning it in some form of farm program.

That day is over. We ought to be looking at the tools that we can offer production agriculture of the kind that is now before the Senate in the legislation that we call the Family Investment and Rural Savings Act, not only looking at a permanency income averaging, but looking at real estate depreciation, recapturing, and a variety of tools that we think will be extremely valuable to production agriculture at a time when they are in very real need.

Also, the transition payments' extension that we have talked about moving forward to give some immediate cash to production agriculture, that is appropriate under the Freedom to Farm transitions in which we are currently involved, becomes increasingly valuable.

I join today and applaud those who have worked on this issue, to bring it immediately, and I hope that we clearly can move it in this Congress, to give farmers and ranchers today those tools—be it drought or be it a very wet year or be it the collapse of foreign markets. Prices in some of our commodity areas today are at a 20-plus year low, yet, of course, the tractor and the combine purchased is at an all-time high.

I do applaud those who have worked with us in bringing this legislation to the floor, and I thank the chairman for the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Presiding Officer and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my friends and colleagues in introducing the Family Investment and Rural Savings Tax (FIRST) Act. I would especially like to thank our Leader, Senator LOTT, for his strong commitment to this effort. His dedication and interest in these important issues should underscore how serious we are about providing tax relief and improvements for farmers and

ranchers before the 105th Congress adjourns.

America's producers are currently experiencing a troubling time. Thanks in large part to the Asian economic crisis and the Administration's inability to open up new markets for U.S. farm products, commodity prices across the board have fallen to dangerously low levels. Low prices, combined with isolated weather-related problems in some regions of the country on one hand and election-year posturing on the other, have prompted some of our Democratic colleagues to call for a return to the failed agriculture policies of the past. They support loan programs that price the United States out of the world market. They support a return to the system whereby the U.S. Government is in the grain business. And they support a return to command-and-control agriculture whereby producers are required to limit their production in a foolish and futile attempt to try to bolster commodity prices. These policies did not work for 50 years and they will not work now.

The FIRST Act is designed to address the real needs of producers today. The FIRST Act provides tax relief for every farmer and rancher in the United States. Specifically, income averaging—which was an important component of the 1996 tax bill—would become permanent, the capital gains tax brackets would be cut by 25 percent across the board and a new Farm and Ranch Risk Management Account would be established to allow producers to manage the volatile shifts in farm income from one year to another.

I specifically want to address the capital gains tax cut and the FARRM accounts. The capital gains tax represents one of the most burdensome, expensive provisions of the U.S. Tax Code for America's farmers and ranchers and for America's families. Production agriculture is a capital-intensive business. Without equipment and inputs—expensive equipment and inputs—you simply can't survive in the incredibly competitive agriculture world. Therefore, because of the tremendous costs of depreciating that expensive equipment, the capital gains tax hits farmers and ranchers especially hard. In addition, today the Congress encourages middle-income families to save for their future in part to take pressure off of the Social Security system. However, we continue to allow capital gains taxes to hit America's families twice. Investors' money is taxed both as income when they get their paycheck and as capital gain when they make a smart investment. That's a strange and counterproductive way to encourage personal responsibility and savings for the future. As a result, I am very grateful to our Majority Leader for including the "Crown Jewel" of his tax and Speaker GINGRICH's tax bill in the FIRST Act today

and I look forward to working with the Leader to pass meaningful tax relief before the Senate adjourns.

I also want to address the creation of the new FARRM Accounts. While Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I was charged with producing the 1996 farm bill. As we were producing that legislation, I wanted very badly to create what I called a "farmer IRA." Basically, the farmer IRA would be a rainy day account whereby if a farmer or rancher had a good year, he could invest part of his profits in a tax-deferred account. Then, when a bad year hits, he could withdraw that money to offset the downturn. That's exactly what the FARRM Accounts would do. Producers will be able to invest up to 20 percent of their Schedule F (farm) income in any interest-bearing account. They may withdraw that money at any time during a five-year period. If passed, FARRM Accounts will correct the huge problem in our existing Tax Code that encourages producers to buy a new tractor or combine at the end of the year in order to reduce taxable income instead of saving for the future. Again, I wanted to do this during the farm bill but we ran out of time. I'm very pleased that the Congress may finally get the opportunity to provide the flexibility and tax relief producers so desperately need.

I want to thank my colleagues again for their leadership in this area and I look forward to working with them and the rest of the Senate to pass this important legislation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy 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. 2371

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Family Investment and Rural Savings Tax Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—REDUCTION IN INDIVIDUAL CAPITAL GAINS TAX RATES

Sec. 101. Reduction in individual capital gains tax rates.

TITLE II—TAX INCENTIVES FOR FARMERS

Sec. 201. Farm and ranch risk management accounts.

Sec. 202. Permanent extension of income averaging for farmers.

TITLE I—REDUCTION IN INDIVIDUAL CAPITAL GAINS TAX RATES

SEC. 101. REDUCTION IN INDIVIDUAL CAPITAL GAINS TAX RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

"(h) MAXIMUM CAPITAL GAINS RATE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If a taxpayer has a net capital gain for any taxable year, the tax im-

posed by this section for such taxable year shall not exceed the sum of—

"(A) a tax computed at the rates and in the same manner as if this subsection had not been enacted on taxable income reduced by the net capital gain.

"(B) 7.5 percent of so much of the net capital gain (or, if less, taxable income) as does not exceed the excess (if any) of—

"(i) the amount of taxable income which would (without regard to this paragraph) be taxed at a rate below 28 percent, over

"(ii) the taxable income reduced by the net capital gain, and

"(C) 15 percent of the amount of taxable income in excess of the sum of the amounts on which tax is determined under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

"(2) NET CAPITAL GAIN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT AS INVESTMENT INCOME.—For purposes of this subsection, the net capital gain for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount which the taxpayer takes into account as investment income under section 163(d)(4)(B)(iii)."

(b) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—Paragraph (3) of section 55(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(3) MAXIMUM RATE OF TAX ON NET CAPITAL GAIN OF NONCORPORATE TAXPAYERS.—The amount determined under the first sentence of paragraph (1)(A)(i) shall not exceed the sum of—

"(A) the amount determined under such first sentence computed at the rates and in the same manner as if this paragraph had not been enacted on the taxable excess reduced by the net capital gain,

"(B) 7.5 percent of so much of the net capital gain (or, if less, taxable excess) as does not exceed the amount on which a tax is determined under section 1(h)(1)(B), and

"(C) 15 percent of the amount of taxable excess in excess of the sum of the amounts on which tax is determined under subparagraphs (A) and (B)."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 1445(e) of such Code is amended by striking "20 percent" and inserting "15 percent".

(2) The second sentence of section 7518(g)(6)(A) of such Code, and the second sentence of section 607(h)(6)(A) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, are each amended by striking "20 percent" and inserting "15 percent".

(3) Section 311 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 is amended by striking subsection (e).

(4) Paragraph (7) of section 57(a) of such Code (as amended by the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(5) Paragraphs (11) and (12) of section 1223, and section 1235(a), of such Code (as amended by the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998) are each amended by striking "18 months" each place it appears and inserting "1 year".

(d) TRANSITIONAL RULES FOR TAXABLE YEARS WHICH INCLUDE JUNE 24, 1998.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 1 of such Code (as amended by the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(14) SPECIAL RULES FOR TAXABLE YEARS WHICH INCLUDE JUNE 24, 1998.—For purposes of applying this subsection in the case of a taxable year which includes June 24, 1998—

"(A) Gains or losses properly taken into account for the period on or after such date shall be disregarded in applying paragraph (5)(A)(i), subclauses (I) and (II) of paragraph

(5)(A)(ii), paragraph (5)(B), paragraph (6), and paragraph (7)(A).

"(B) The amount determined under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall be the sum of—

"(i) 7.5 percent of the amount which would be determined under such subparagraph if the amount of gain taken into account under such subparagraph did not exceed the net capital gain taking into account only gain or loss properly taken into account for the portion of the taxable year on or after such date, plus

"(ii) 10 percent of the excess of the amount determined under such subparagraph (determined without regard to this paragraph) over the amount determined under clause (i).

"(C) The amount determined under subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) shall be the sum of—

"(i) 15 percent of the amount which would be determined under such subparagraph if the adjusted net capital gain did not exceed the net capital gain taking into account only gain or loss properly taken into account for the portion of the taxable year on or after such date, plus

"(ii) 20 percent of the excess of the amount determined under such subparagraph (determined without regard to this paragraph) over the amount determined under clause (i).

"(D) Rules similar to the rules of paragraph (13)(C) shall apply."

(2) **ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.**—Paragraph (3) of section 55(b) of such Code (as amended by the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "For purposes of applying this paragraph for a taxable year which includes June 24, 1998, rules similar to the rules of section 1(h)(14) shall apply."

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning on or after June 24, 1998.

(2) **TRANSITIONAL RULES FOR TAXABLE YEARS WHICH INCLUDE JUNE 24, 1998.**—The amendments made by subsection (d) shall apply to taxable years beginning before such date and ending on or after June 24, 1998.

(3) **WITHHOLDING.**—The amendment made by subsection (c)(1) shall apply only to amounts paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) **CERTAIN CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—The amendments made by subsection (c)(5) shall take effect on June 24, 1998.

TITLE II—TAX INCENTIVES FOR FARMERS

SEC. 201. FARM AND RANCH RISK MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subpart C of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to taxable year for which deductions taken) is amended by inserting after section 468B the following new section:

"SEC. 468C. FARM AND RANCH RISK MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS.

"(a) **DEDUCTION ALLOWED.**—In the case of an individual engaged in an eligible farming business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for any taxable year the amount paid in cash by the taxpayer during the taxable year to a Farm and Ranch Risk Management Account (hereinafter referred to as the 'FARRM Account').

"(b) **LIMITATION.**—The amount which a taxpayer may pay into the FARRM Account for any taxable year shall not exceed 20 percent of so much of the taxable income of the taxpayer (determined without regard to this section) which is attributable (determined in

the manner applicable under section 1301) to any eligible farming business.

"(c) **ELIGIBLE FARMING BUSINESS.**—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible farming business' means any farming business (as defined in section 263A(e)(4)) which is not a passive activity (within the meaning of section 469(c)) of the taxpayer.

"(d) **FARRM ACCOUNT.**—For purposes of this section—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term 'FARRM Account' means a trust created or organized in the United States for the exclusive benefit of the taxpayer, but only if the written governing instrument creating the trust meets the following requirements:

"(A) No contribution will be accepted for any taxable year in excess of the amount allowed as a deduction under subsection (a) for such year.

"(B) The trustee is a bank (as defined in section 408(n)) or another person who demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the manner in which such person will administer the trust will be consistent with the requirements of this section.

"(C) The assets of the trust consist entirely of cash or of obligations which have adequate stated interest (as defined in section 1274(c)(2)) and which pay such interest not less often than annually.

"(D) All income of the trust is distributed currently to the grantor.

"(E) The assets of the trust will not be commingled with other property except in a common trust fund or common investment fund.

"(2) **ACCOUNT TAXED AS GRANTOR TRUST.**—The grantor of a FARRM Account shall be treated for purposes of this title as the owner of such Account and shall be subject to tax thereon in accordance with subpart E of part I of subchapter J of this chapter (relating to grantors and others treated as substantial owners).

"(e) **INCLUSION OF AMOUNTS DISTRIBUTED.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), there shall be includible in the gross income of the taxpayer for any taxable year—

"(A) any amount distributed from a FARRM Account of the taxpayer during such taxable year, and

"(B) any deemed distribution under—

"(i) subsection (f)(1) (relating to deposits not distributed within 5 years),

"(ii) subsection (f)(2) (relating to cessation in eligible farming business), and

"(iii) subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (f)(3) (relating to prohibited transactions and pledging account as security).

"(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Paragraph (1)(A) shall not apply to—

"(A) any distribution to the extent attributable to income of the Account, and

"(B) the distribution of any contribution paid during a taxable year to a FARRM Account to the extent that such contribution exceeds the limitation applicable under subsection (b) if requirements similar to the requirements of section 408(d)(4) are met.

For purposes of subparagraph (A), distributions shall be treated as first attributable to income and then to other amounts.

"(3) **EXCLUSION FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAX.**—Amounts included in gross income under this subsection shall not be included in determining net earnings from self-employment under section 1402.

"(f) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

"(1) **TAX ON DEPOSITS IN ACCOUNT WHICH ARE NOT DISTRIBUTED WITHIN 5 YEARS.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If, at the close of any taxable year, there is a nonqualified balance in any FARRM Account—

"(i) there shall be deemed distributed from such Account during such taxable year an amount equal to such balance, and

"(ii) the taxpayer's tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year shall be increased by 10 percent of such deemed distribution.

The preceding sentence shall not apply if an amount equal to such nonqualified balance is distributed from such Account to the taxpayer before the due date (including extensions) for filing the return of tax imposed by this chapter for such year (or, if earlier, the date the taxpayer files such return for such year).

"(B) **NONQUALIFIED BALANCE.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'nonqualified balance' means any balance in the Account on the last day of the taxable year which is attributable to amounts deposited in such Account before the 4th preceding taxable year.

"(C) **ORDERING RULE.**—For purposes of this paragraph, distributions from a FARRM Account shall be treated as made from deposits in the order in which such deposits were made, beginning with the earliest deposits. For purposes of the preceding sentence, income of such an Account shall be treated as a deposit made on the date such income is received by the Account.

"(2) **CESSATION IN ELIGIBLE FARMING BUSINESS.**—At the close of the first disqualification period after a period for which the taxpayer was engaged in an eligible farming business, there shall be deemed distributed from the FARRM Account (if any) of the taxpayer an amount equal to the balance in such Account at the close of such disqualification period. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'disqualification period' means any period of 2 consecutive taxable years for which the taxpayer is not engaged in an eligible farming business.

"(3) **CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.**—Rules similar to the following rules shall apply for purposes of this section:

"(A) Section 408(e)(2) (relating to loss of exemption of account where individual engages in prohibited transaction).

"(B) Section 408(e)(4) (relating to effect of pledging account as security).

"(C) Section 408(g) (relating to community property laws).

"(D) Section 408(h) (relating to custodial accounts).

"(4) **TIME WHEN PAYMENTS DEEMED MADE.**—For purposes of this section, a taxpayer shall be deemed to have made a payment to a FARRM Account on the last day of a taxable year if such payment is made on account of such taxable year and is made within 3½ months after the close of such taxable year.

"(5) **INDIVIDUAL.**—For purposes of this section, the term 'individual' shall not include an estate or trust.

"(g) **REPORTS.**—The trustee of a FARRM Account shall make such reports regarding such Account to the Secretary and to the person for whose benefit the Account is maintained with respect to contributions, distributions, and such other matters as the Secretary may require under regulations. The reports required by this subsection shall be filed at such time and in such manner and furnished to such persons at such time and in such manner as may be required by those regulations."

(b) **DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.**—Subsection (a) of section 62 of such Code (defining adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (17) the following new paragraph:

"(18) CONTRIBUTIONS TO FARM AND RANCH RISK MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS.—The deduction allowed by section 468C(a)."

(c) TAX ON EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 4973 of such Code (relating to tax on certain excess contributions) is amended by striking "or" at the end of paragraph (3), by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) a FARRM Account (within the meaning of section 468C(d)), or".

(2) Section 4973 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS TO FARRM ACCOUNTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of a FARRM Account (within the meaning of section 468C(d)), the term "excess contributions" means the amount by which the amount contributed for the taxable year to the Account exceeds the amount which may be contributed to the Account under section 468C(b) for such taxable year. For purposes of this subsection, any contribution which is distributed out of the FARRM Account in a distribution to which section 468C(e)(2)(B) applies shall be treated as an amount not contributed."

(3) The section heading for section 4973 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4973. EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS TO CERTAIN ACCOUNTS, ANNUITIES, ETC."

(4) The table of sections for chapter 43 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 4973 and inserting the following new item:

"Sec. 4973. Excess contributions to certain accounts, annuities, etc."

(d) TAX ON PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.—

(1) Subsection (c) of section 4975 of such Code (relating to prohibited transactions) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR FARRM ACCOUNTS.—A person for whose benefit a FARRM Account (within the meaning of section 468C(d)) is established shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this section with respect to any transaction concerning such Account (which would otherwise be taxable under this section) if, with respect to such transaction, the account ceases to be a FARRM Account by reason of the application of section 468C(f)(3)(A) to such Account."

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 4975(e) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) a FARRM Account described in section 468C(d)."

(e) FAILURE TO PROVIDE REPORTS ON FARRM ACCOUNTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 6693(a) of such Code (relating to failure to provide reports on certain tax-favored accounts or annuities) is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) section 468C(g) (relating to FARRM Accounts)."

(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart C of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 468B the following new item:

"Sec. 468C. Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts."

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable

years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF INCOME AVERAGING FOR FARMERS.

Section 933(c) of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 is amended by striking "and before January 1, 2001".

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today along with Senators LOTT, CRAIG, GRASSLEY, HAGEL, ROBERTS, SESSIONS, SHELBY, and THOMAS to introduce the Family Investment and Rural Savings Tax (FIRST) Act of 1998.

Mr. President, today's family farms are in jeopardy. This bill will help all Americans as well as our nation's farming families.

The bill consists of two titles—the first will reduce the top individual capital gains tax rate from 20% to 15% and reduces the capital gains tax rate for individuals with lower incomes from 10% to 7.5%.

Title two of the bill consists of two separate measures which work hand in hand: First, the bill will allow farmers to open their own tax deferred savings accounts. These accounts would provide farmers and ranchers an opportunity to set aside income in high-income years and withdraw the money in low-income years. The money is taxed only when it is withdrawn and can be deferred for up to five years.

In 1995, 2.2 million taxpayers, qualified as farmers under IRS definitions, would have been eligible to use these accounts. Only 725,000 of those filed a net income while 1.5 million filed a net loss.

Now that could mean one of two things: (1) fewer and fewer farmers are able to stay in the black or; (2) more and more farmers are going out of business. We cannot continue to treat our farmers and ranchers as second class citizens in our tax code.

The second part of this title contains language that I introduced earlier this year. This language would allow farmers to use average their income over three years and make that tool permanent in the tax code. This bill will give American farmers a fair tool to offset the unpredictable nature of their business.

The question is who will benefit most from income averaging and farm savings accounts. This is the best part—this legislation will allow farmers to delay payment of their taxes by reducing their overall income and spreading it out over a number of years.

However, based on the tax rate schedule, this bill would favor farmers in the lower tax bracket. If a farmer could use these tools to reduce their tax burden from one year to the next, it is very conceivable that taxpayer would pay only 15% on his income compared to 28%. That is a significant savings.

This bill leaves the business decisions in the hands of farmers, not the government. Farmers can decide whether to defer income and when to withdraw funds to supplement operations.

Farmers and ranchers labor seven days a week, from dawn until dusk, to provide our nation with the world's best produce, dairy products and meats. Farming is a difficult business requiring calloused hands and rarely a profitable financial reward. This profession is not getting any easier. Today, we are seeing more and more of our family farms swallowed up by the corporate farms.

Farming has always been a family affair. Rural communities rely on the family farm for their own economic sustenance. Although family farms are traditionally passed on from father to son—it is becoming more and more difficult as the economics of farming are becoming more and more complicated. Further tightening of the belt on these folks can only mean the eventual loss of the family farm.

Montana's farmers take pride in their harvests. You could call today's farmer the ultimate environmentalist. They know how to take care of the land and ensure that future harvests will be plentiful. As land managers, farmers understand the importance of proper land stewardship.

Those colleagues of mine who grew up on a farm or ranch would certainly understand the frustration of this business. Farmers and ranchers don't receive an annual salary. They cannot rely on income that may not be there at the end of the year and they certainly cannot count on a monthly paycheck. This is a crucial time for family farms and tax relief can mean the difference between keeping the family farm for future generations or losing it.

With the recent passage of the Farm Bill, farmers are more than ever impacted by market forces and in the farming business, those market forces can be very unpredictable.

Market forces in farming are very unique—drought, flooding, infestation and disease all play a vital role in a farmer's bottom line. And it's not often when the elements of mother nature allow for a profitable harvest.

At best, most farmers are lucky to break even more than two years in a row. One year may be a windfall, while the next may mean bankruptcy. Farmers and ranchers are forced to make large capital investments in machinery, livestock and improvements to their properties.

Agricultural markets are rarely predictable. Farmers, more than any other sector of our economy are likely to experience substantial fluctuations in income.

We also need to address the issue of the estate tax. This is a death blow to a family farm that has been passed down through the generations. A family farm in Montana is not really referred to as an estate. We call it home, we call it work, and we call it our lives, but we don't call it an estate.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and urge you also to support future bills such as estate tax relief legislation to encourage America's farming family of a safe and secure future.

I have letters in support of this bill signed by numerous agriculture groups as well as a letter from the National Federation of Independent Businesses (NFIB). I ask unanimous consent to have both of these letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

July 23, 1998.

Hon. CONRAD BURNS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BURNS: Farming and ranching is a high risk endeavor. Problems due to this year's adverse weather and low prices provide a vivid illustration of the difficulties that can be caused by nature and markets.

The tax code can and should help producers deal with financial uncertainties unique to agriculture. Agricultural organizations have recommended estate tax relief, permanent income averaging for farmers, the full deductibility of health insurance premiums for the self-employed and the creation of farm and ranch risk management accounts (FARRM).

We applaud you for introducing legislation that encompasses the creation of FARRM accounts and makes income averaging a permanent part of the tax code. FARRM accounts will help producers by providing incentives to save during good times for times that are not. Income averaging will help producers by allowing them to manage their volatile incomes for financial planning.

A reduction in capital gains tax rates is also part of your legislation. Because farming and ranching is a capital intensive business, capital gains taxes have a huge impact on agriculture. Lower capital gains tax rates will help producers by making it easier for them to invest in their businesses and make the best use of their capital assets.

We support your legislation and pledge our help to secure its passage into law.

Agricultural Retailers Association.
Alabama Farmers Federation.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Horse Council.
American Nursery and Landscape Association.
American Sheep Industry Association.
American Soybean Association.
American Sugarbeet Growers Association.
Communicating for Agriculture.
Farm Credit Council.
The Fertilizer Institute.
National Association of State Departments of Agriculture.
National Association of Wheat Growers.
National Barley Growers Association.
National Cattlemen's Beef Association.
National Corn Growers Association.
National Cotton Council of America.
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
National Grain Sorghum Producers Association.
National Grange.
National Pork Producers Council.
National Sunflower Association.
North Carolina Peanut Growers Association.
United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.
USA Rice Federation.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS—THE VOICE OF SMALL BUSINESS,

July 29, 1998.

Hon. CONRAD BURNS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BURNS: I am writing to commend you for introducing legislation, "The Family Investment and Rural Savings Tax (FIRST) Act of 1998, that will provide needed tax relief to small businesses and farms.

Among other provisions, this legislation would reduce and simplify the current capital gains tax for the many small business owners who file as individuals. Small businesses face unique difficulties trying to obtain capital, including lack of access to the securities market and difficulty in getting bank loans. They often must get their capital from the business itself, family members or associates. Small businesses, therefore, need capital gains relief that will promote investment by both investors and business owners themselves.

The FIRST Act also contains needed relief to help farmers and ranchers by allowing eligible ones to make contributions to tax deferred accounts and by restoring income averaging. We very much support extending income averaging to small businesses, as well, and hope that Congress will consider this soon.

We applaud your efforts to reduce the tax burden on small businesses, farmers and ranchers, and look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

DAN DANNER,
Vice President,
Federal Governmental Relations.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2372. A bill to provide for a pilot loan guarantee program to address Year 2000 problems of small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

SMALL BUSINESS YEAR 2000 READINESS ACT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Small Business Year 2000 Readiness Act along with my colleagues Senators BENNETT and SNOWE. This bill provides small businesses with the resources necessary to repair Year 2000 computer problems. This legislation is an important step toward avoiding the widespread failure of small businesses.

The problem, as many Senators are aware, is that certain computers and processors in automated systems will fail because such systems will not recognize the Year 2000. My colleague Senator BENNETT, who is the Chairman of the Senate Special Year 2000 Technology Problem Committee and is co-sponsoring this bill, is very well versed in this problem and has been active in getting the word out to industries and to agencies of the federal government of the drastic consequences that may result from the Y2K problem.

Recently, the Committee on Small Business, which I chair, held hearings on the effect the Y2K problem will have on small businesses. The outlook is not good. The Committee received testimony that the companies most at risk

from Y2K failures are small and medium-sized industries, not larger companies. The major reasons for this anomaly is that many small companies have not begun to realize how much of a problem Y2K failures will be and may not have the access to capital to cure such problems before they cause disastrous effects.

A study on Small Business and the Y2K Problem sponsored by Wells Fargo Bank and the NFIB found that an estimated four and three-quarter million small employers are exposed to the Y2K problem. This equals approximately 82 percent of all small businesses that have at least two employees. Such exposure to the Y2K problem will have devastating effects on our economy generally. As the result of communications with small businesses, computer manufacturers, consultants and groups, the Small Business Committee has found there is significant likelihood that the Y2K issue will cause many small businesses to close, playing a large role in Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan's prediction of a 40 percent chance for recession at the beginning of the new millennium.

The Committee received information indicating that approximately 330,000 small businesses will shut down due to the Y2K problem and an even larger number will be severely crippled. Such failures will affect not only the employees and owners of such small businesses, but also the creditors, suppliers and customers of such failed small businesses. Lenders, including banks and non-bank lenders, that have extended credit to small businesses will face significant losses if small businesses either go out of business or have a sustained period in which they cannot operate.

It must be remembered that the Y2K problem is not a problem for only those businesses that have large computer networks or mainframes. A small business is at risk if it uses any computers in its business, if it has customized software, if it is conducting e-commerce, if it accepts credit card payments, if it uses a service bureau for its payroll, if it depends on a data bank for information, if it has automated equipment for communicating with its sales or service force of if it has automated manufacturing equipment.

A good example of how small businesses are dramatically affected by the Y2K problem is the experience of John Healy, the owner of Coventry Spares Ltd. in Holliston, Massachusetts, as reported in INC Magazine. Coventry Spares is a distributor of vintage motorcycle parts. Like many small business owners, Mr. Healy's business depends on trailing technology purchased over the years, including a 286 computer, with software that is 14 years old and an operating system that is six or seven versions out of date. Mr. Healy uses this computer equipment,

among other matters, for handling the company's payroll, ordering, inventory control, product lookup and maintaining a database of customers and subscribers to a vintage motorcycle magazine he publishes. The system handles 85 percent of his business and, without it working properly, Mr. Healy stated that "I'd be a dead duck in the water." Unlike many small business owners, however, Mr. Healy is aware of the Y2K problem and tested his equipment to see if his equipment could handle the Year 2000. His tests confirmed his fear—the equipment and software could not process the year 2000 date and would not work properly after December 21, 1999. Therefore, Mr. Healy will have to expand over \$20,000 to keep his business afloat. The experience of Mr. Healy has been and will continue to be repeated across the country as small businesses realize the impact the Y2K problem will have on their business.

The Gartner Group, an international computer consulting firm, has conducted studies showing small businesses are way behind—the worst of all sectors studied—where they need to be in order to avoid significant failures due to non-Y2K compliance. It estimates that only 15 percent of all businesses with under 200 employees have even begun to inventory the automated systems that may be affected by this computer glitch. That means that 85 percent of small businesses have not even begun the initial task of determining how much of a problem they may have or taken steps to ensure that their businesses are not impaired by this problem.

Given the effects a substantial number of small business failures will have on our nation's economy, it is imperative that Congress take steps to ensure that small businesses are aware of the Y2K problem and have access to capital to fix such problems. Moreover, it is imperative that Congress take such steps before the problem occurs, not after it has already happened. Therefore, today I am introducing the Small Business Year 2000 Readiness Act.

This Act will serve the dual purpose of providing small businesses with the means to continue operating successfully after January 1, 2000, and making lenders and small firms more aware of the dangers that lie ahead. The Act requires the Small Business Administration to establish a limited-term loan program whereby SBA would guarantee 50 percent of the principal amount of a loan made by a private lender to assist small businesses in correcting Year 2000 computer problems. The loan amount would be capped at \$50,000. The guarantee limit and loan amount will limit the exposure of the government and ensure that eligible lenders retain sufficient risk so that they make sound underwriting decisions.

The Y2K loan program guidelines will be based on the guidelines SBA has al-

ready established governing its FASTRACK pilot program. Lenders originating loans under the Y2K loan program would be permitted to process and document loans using the same internal procedures they would on loans of a similar type and size not governed by a government guarantee. Otherwise, the loans are subject to the same requirements as all other loans made under the (7)(a) loan program.

Under the loan program, each lender designated as a Preferred Lender or Certified Lender by SBA would be eligible to participate in the Y2K loan program. This would include approximately 1,000 lenders that have received special authority from the SBA to originate loans under SBA's existing 7(a) loan program. The Year 2000 loan program would sunset after October 31, 2001.

To assure that the loan program is made available to those small businesses that need it, the legislation requires SBA to inform all lenders eligible to participate in the program of the loan program's availability. It is intended that these lenders, in their own self-interest, will contact their small business customers to ensure that they are Y2K complaint and inform them of the loan program if they are not.

The Small Business Year 2000 Readiness Act is a necessary step to ensure that the economic health of this country is not marred by a substantial number of small business failures following January 1, 2000, and that small businesses continue to be the fastest growing segment of our economy in the Year 2000 and beyond.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full 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. 2372

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 "Small Business Year 2000 Readiness Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the failure of many computer programs to recognize the Year 2000 will have extreme negative financial consequences in the Year 2000 and in subsequent years for both large and small businesses;

(2) small businesses are well behind larger businesses in implementing corrective changes to their automated systems—85 percent of businesses with 200 employees or less have not commenced inventorying the changes they must make to their automated systems to avoid Year 2000 problems;

(3) many small businesses do not have access to capital to fix mission critical automated systems; and

(4) the failure of a large number of small businesses will have a highly detrimental effect on the economy in the Year 2000 and in subsequent years.

SEC. 3. YEAR 2000 COMPUTER PROBLEM LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(27) YEAR 2000 COMPUTER PROBLEM PILOT PROGRAM.—

"(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'eligible lender' means any lender designated by the Administration as eligible to participate in—

"(I) the Preferred Lenders Program authorized by the proviso in section 5(b)(7); or

"(II) the Certified Lenders Program authorized in paragraph (19); and

"(ii) the term 'Year 2000 computer problem' means, with respect to information technology, any problem that prevents the information technology from accurately processing, calculating, comparing, or sequencing date or time data—

"(I) from, into, or between—

"(aa) the 20th or 21st centuries; or

"(bb) the years 1999 and 2000; or

"(II) with regard to leap year calculations.

"(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Administration shall—

"(i) establish a pilot loan guarantee program, under which the Administration shall guarantee loans made by eligible lenders to small business concerns in accordance with this subsection; and

"(ii) notify each eligible lender of the establishment of the program under this paragraph.

"(C) USE OF FUNDS.—A small business concern that receives a loan guaranteed under this paragraph shall use the proceeds of the loan solely to address the Year 2000 computer problems of that small business concern, including the repair or acquisition of information technology systems and other automated systems.

"(D) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The total amount of a loan made to a small business concern and guaranteed under this paragraph shall not exceed \$50,000.

"(E) GUARANTEE LIMIT.—The guarantee percentage of a loan guaranteed under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent of the balance of the financing outstanding at the time of disbursement of the loan.

"(F) REPORT.—The Administration shall annually submit to the Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the results of the program under this paragraph, which shall include information relating to—

"(i) the number and amount of loans guaranteed under this paragraph;

"(ii) whether the loans guaranteed were made to repair or replace information technology and other automated systems; and

"(iii) the number of eligible lenders participating in the program."

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall issue final regulations to carry out the program under section 7(a)(27) of the Small Business Act, as added by this section.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Except to the extent inconsistent this section or section 7(a)(27) of the Small Business Act, as added by this section, the regulations issued under this subsection shall be substantially similar to the requirements governing the FASTRACK pilot program of the Small Business Administration, or any successor pilot program to that pilot program.

(c) REPEAL.—Effective on October 1, 2001, this section and the amendment made by this section are repealed.

SEC. 4. PILOT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

Section 7(a)(25) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(25)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE.—Not later than 30 days prior to initiating any pilot program or making any change in a pilot program under this subsection that may affect the subsidy rate estimates for the loan program under this subsection, the Administration shall notify the Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate, which notification shall include—

"(i) a description of the proposed change; and

"(ii) an explanation, which shall be developed by the Administration in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, of the estimated effect that the change will have on the subsidy rate.

"(E) REPORT ON PILOT PROGRAMS.—The Administration shall annually submit to the Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on each pilot program under this subsection, which report shall include information relating to—

"(i) the number and amount of loans made under the pilot program;

"(ii) the number of lenders participating in the pilot program; and

"(iii) the default rate, delinquency rate, and recovery rate for loans under each pilot program, as compared to those rates for other loan programs under this subsection."

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2373. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the use of alternative dispute resolution processes in United States district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Alternative Dispute Resolution Act of 1998. My Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts has jurisdiction over this matter, and I am very pleased that the ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator DURBIN, has joined me in sponsoring this bill. It will require every Federal district court in the country to institute an alternative dispute resolution, or ADR, program. The bill will provide parties and district court judges with options other than the traditional, costly and adversarial process of litigation.

ADR programs have been gaining in popularity and respect for years now. For example, many contracts drafted today—between private parties, corporations, and even nations—include arbitration clauses. Most State and Federal bar associations, including the ABA, have established committees to focus on ADR. Also, comprehensive ADR programs are flourishing in many of the States.

ADR is also being used at the Federal level. In 1990, for example, President Bush signed into law a bill that I introduced called the Administrative Dispute Resolutions Act. The law pro-

moted the increased use of ADR in Federal agency proceedings. In 1996, because ADR was working so well, we permanently re-authorized the law. And earlier this year, the executive branch recommitted themselves to using ADR as much as possible.

Since the late 1970s, our Federal district courts have also been successfully introducing ADR. In 1998, we authorized 20 district courts to begin implementing ADR programs. The results were very encouraging, so last year we made these programs permanent. It's time to take another step and make ADR available in all district courts.

Mr. President, ADR allows innovations and flexibility in the administration of justice. The complex legal problems that people have demand creative and flexible solutions on the part of the courts. There are numerous benefits to providing people with alternatives to traditional litigation. For example, a recent Northwestern University study of ADR programs in State courts indicated that mediation significantly reduced the duration of lawsuits and produced significant cost savings for litigants. That means fewer cases on the docket and decreased costs. The Federal courts should be taking every opportunity to reap the benefits that the state courts have been enjoying.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that ADR works. The future of justice in this country includes ADR. Perhaps one of the signs of this is that many of the best law, business, and graduate schools in the country are beginning to emphasize training in negotiation, mediation, and other kinds of dispute resolution.

Quite simply, this bill will increase the availability of ADR in our Federal courts. It mandates that every district court establish some form of professional ADR program. It provides the district, however, with the flexibility to decide what kind of ADR works best locally. The bill also allows a district with a current ADR program that's working well to continue the program.

This bill is the Senate companion to H.R. 3528, which was reported out of the Judiciary Committee today without any opposition. Our bill tracks the original House bill, except for some findings and a few technical changes to improve the legislation. These changes were included in the bill reported out of committee. The House bill received overwhelming, bipartisan support, passing 405-2.

The Department of Justice, along with the administration, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and the American Bar Association, including its business section, all support the legislation with these improvements. The consensus is clear: ADR has an important role to play in our Federal court system.

Mr. President, this bill is a step in the right direction for the administra-

tion of justice in our country. Increased availability of ADR will benefit all of us. It should be an option to people in every judicial district of the country. This bill assures that it will be.

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 2374. A bill to provide additional funding for repair of the Korean War Veterans Memorial; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL LEGISLATION

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to fix and restore one of our most important monuments, the Korean War Veterans Memorial. My bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to provide, within existing funds, up to \$2 million to complete essential repairs to the Memorial.

The Korean War Memorial is the newest war monument in Washington, DC. It was authorized in 1986 by Public Law 99-752 which established a Presidential Advisory Board to raise funds and oversee the design of the project, and charged the American Battle Monuments Commission with the management of this project. The authorization provided \$1 million in federal funds for the design and initial construction of the memorial and Korean War Veterans' organizations and the Advisory Board raised over \$13 million in private donations to complete the facility. Construction on the memorial began in 1992 and it was dedicated on July 27, 1995.

For those who haven't visited, the Memorial is located south of the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial on the Mall, to the east of the Lincoln Memorial. Designed by world class Cooper Lecky Architects, the monument contains a triangular "field of service," with 19 stainless steel, larger than life statues, depicting a squad of soldiers on patrol. A curb of granite north of the statues lists the 22 countries of the United Nations that sent troops in defense of South Korea. To the south of the patrol stands a wall of black granite, with engraved images of more than 2,400 unnamed servicemen and women detailing the countless ways in which Americans answered the call to service. Adjacent to the wall is a fountain which is supposed to be encircled by a Memorial Grove of linden trees, creating a peaceful setting for quiet reflection. When this memorial was originally created, it was intended to be a lasting and fitting tribute to the bravery and sacrifice of our troops who fought in the "Forgotten War." Unfortunately, just three years after its dedication, the monument is not lasting and is no longer fitting.

The Memorial has not functioned as it was originally conceived and designed and has instead been plagued by a series of problems in its construction.

The grove of 40 linden trees have all died and been removed from the ground, leaving forty gaping holes. The pipes feeding the "pool of remembrance's" return system have cracked and the pool has been cordoned off. The monument's lighting system has been deemed inadequate and has caused safety problems for those who wish to visit the site at night. As a result, most of the 1.3 million who visit the monument each year—many of whom are veterans—must cope with construction gates or areas which have been cordoned off instead of experiencing the full effect of the Memorial.

Let me read a quote from the Washington Post—from a Korean War Veteran, John LeGault who visited the site—that I think captures the frustration associated with not having a fitting and complete tribute for the Korean War. He says, "Who cares?" "That was the forgotten war and this is the forgotten memorial." Mr. President, we ought not to be sunshine patriots when it comes to making decisions which affect our veterans. Too often, we are very high on the contributions that our military makes in times of crisis, but when a crisis fades from the scene, we seem to forget about this sacrifice. Our veterans deserve better.

To resolve these problems and restore this monument to something that our Korean War Veterans can be proud of, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers conducted an extensive study of the site in an effort to identify, comprehensively, what corrective actions would be required. The Corps has determined that an additional \$2 million would be required to complete the restoration of the grove work and replace the statuary lighting. My legislation would provide the authority for the funds to make these repairs swiftly and once and for all.

With the 50th anniversary of the Korean War conflict fast approaching, we must ensure that these repairs are made as soon as possible. This additional funding would ensure that we have a fitting, proper, and lasting tribute to those who served in Korea and that we will never forget those who served in the "Forgotten War." I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

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. 2374

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL.

Section 3 of Public Law 99-572 (40 U.S.C. 1003 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts made available under subsections (a) and (b),

the Secretary of the Army may expend, from any funds available to the Secretary on the date of enactment of this paragraph, \$2,000,000 for repair of the memorial.

“(2) DISPOSITION OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM CLAIMS.—Any funds received by the Secretary of the Army as a result of any claim against a contractor in connection with construction of the memorial shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.”•

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

S. 2376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for land sales for conservation purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE CONSERVATION TAX INCENTIVES ACT OF 1998

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Conservation Tax Incentives Act of 1998, a bill that will result in a reduction in the capital gains tax for landowners who sell property for conservation purposes. This bill creates a new incentive for private, voluntary land protection. This legislation is a cost-effective non-regulatory, market-based approach to conservation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

The tax code's charitable contribution deduction currently provides an incentive to taxpayers who give land away for conservation purposes. That is, we already have a tax incentive to encourage people to donate land or conservation easements to government agencies like the Fish and Wildlife Service or to citizens' groups like the Vermont Land Trust. This incentive has been instrumental in the conservation of environmentally significant land across the country.

Not all land worth preserving, however, is owned by people who can afford to give it away. For many landowners, their land is their primary financial asset, and they cannot afford to donate it for conservation purposes. While they might like to see their land preserved in its underdeveloped state, the tax code's incentive for donations is of no help.

The Conservation Tax Incentives Act will provide a new tax incentive for sales of land for conservation by reducing the amount of income that landowners would ordinarily have to report—and pay tax on—when they sell their land. The bill provides that when land is sold for conservation purposes, only one half of any gain will be included in income. The other half can be excluded from income, and the effect of this exclusion is to cut in half the capital gains tax the seller would otherwise have to pay. The bill will apply to land and to partial interests in land and water.

It will enable landowners to permanently protect a property's environmental value without forgoing the financial security it provides. The bill's benefits are available to landowners who sell land either to a government agency or to a qualified conservation

nonprofit organization, as long as the land will be used for such conservation purposes as protection of fish, wildlife or plant habitat, or as open space for agriculture, forestry, outdoor recreation or scenic beauty.

Land is being lost to development and commercial use at an alarming rate. By Department of Agriculture estimates, more than four square miles of farmland are lost to development every day, often with devastating effects on the habitat wildlife need to thrive. Without additional incentives for conservation, we will continue to lose ecologically valuable land.

A real-life example from my home state illustrates the need for this bill. A few years ago, in an area of Vermont known as the Northeast Kingdom, a large well-managed forested property came on the market. The land had appreciated greatly over the years and was very valuable commercially. With more than 3,000 acres of mountains, forests, and ponds, with hiking trails, towering cliffs, scenic views and habitat for many wildlife species, the property was very valuable environmentally. Indeed, the State of Vermont was anxious to acquire it and preserve it for traditional agricultural uses and habitat conservation.

After the property had been on the market for a few weeks, the seller was contacted by an out-of-state buyer who planned to sell the timber on the land and to dispose of the rest of the property for development. After learning of this, the State quickly moved to obtain appraisals and a legislative appropriation in preparation for a possible purchase of the land by the State. Subsequently, the State and The Nature Conservancy made a series of purchase offers to the landowner. The out-of-state buyer however, prevailed upon the landowner to accept his offer. Local newspaper headlines read, "State of Vermont Loses Out On Northeast Kingdom Land Deal." The price accepted by the landowner was only slightly higher than the amount the State had offered. Had the bill I'm introducing today been on the books, the lower offer by the State may well have been as attractive—perhaps more so—than the amount offered by the developer.

This bill provides an incentive-based means for accomplishing conservation in the public interest. It helps tax dollars accomplish more, allowing public and charitable conservation funds to go to higher-priority conservation projects. Preliminary estimates indicate that with the benefits of this bill, nine percent more land could be acquired, with no increase in the amount governments currently spend for conservation land acquisition. At a time when little money is available for conservation, it is important that we stretch as far as possible the dollars that are available.

State and local governments will be important beneficiaries of this bill.

Many local communities have voted in favor of raising taxes to finance bond initiatives to acquire land for conservation. My bill will help stretch these bond proceeds so that they can go further in improving the conservation results for local communities. In addition, because the bill applies to sales to publicly-supported national, regional, State and local citizen conservation groups, its provisions will strengthen private, voluntary work to save places important to the quality of life in communities across the country. Private fundraising efforts for land conservation will be enhanced by this bill, as funds will be able to conserve more, or more valuable, land.

Let me provide an example to show how I intend the bill to work. Let's suppose that in 1952 a young couple purchased a house and a tract of adjoining land, which they have maintained as open land. Recently, the county where they lived passed a bond initiative to buy land for open space, as county residents wanted to protect the quality of their life from rampant development and uncontrolled sprawl. Let's further assume that the couple, now contemplating retirement, is considering competing offers for their land, one from a developer, the other from the county, which will preserve the land in furtherance of its open-space goals. Originally purchased for \$25,000, the land is now worth \$250,000 on the open market. If they sell the land to the developer for its fair market value, the couple would realize a gain of \$225,000 (\$250,000 sales price minus \$25,000 costs), owe tax of \$45,000 (at a rate of 20% on the \$225,000 gain), and thus net \$205,000 after tax.

Under my bill, if the couple sold the land for conservation purposes, they could exclude from income one half of any gain they realized upon the sale. This means they would pay a lower capital gains tax; consequently, they would be in a position to accept a lower offer from a local government or a conservation organization, yet still end up with more money in their pockets than they would have had if they had accepted the developer's offer. Continuing with the example from the preceding paragraph, let's assume the couple sold the property to the county, for the purpose of conservation, at a price of \$240,000. They would realize a gain of \$215,000 (\$240,000 sales price minus \$25,000 cost). Under my bill, only half of this gain \$107,500, would be includible in income. The couple would pay \$21,500 in capital gains tax (at a rate of 20% on the \$107,500 gain includible in income) and thus net \$218,500 (\$240,000 sales price minus \$21,500 tax). Despite having accepted a sales price \$10,000 below the developer's offer, the couple will keep \$13,000 more than they would have kept if they had accepted his offer.

The end result is a win both for the landowners, who end up with more

money in their pocket than they would have had after a sale to an outsider, and for the local community, which is able to preserve the land at a lower price. This example illustrates how the exclusion from income will be especially beneficial to middle-income, "land rich/cash poor" landowners who can't avail themselves of the tax benefits available to those who can afford to donate land.

As this bill also applies to partial interests in land, the exclusion from income—and the resulting reduction in capital gains tax—will, in certain instances, also be available to landowners selling partial interests in their land for conservation purposes. A farmer could, for example, sell a conservation easement, continuing to remain on and farm his land, yet still be able to take advantage of the provisions in this bill. The conservation easement must meet the tax code's requirements i.e., it must serve a conservation purpose, such as the protection of fish or wildlife habitat or the preservation of open space (including farmland and forest land).

There are some things this bill does not do. It does not impose new regulations or controls on people who own environmentally-sensitive land. It does not compel anyone to do anything; it is entirely voluntary. Nor will it increase government spending for land conservation. In fact, the effect of this bill will be to allow better investment of tax and charitable dollars used for land conservation.

The estimated cost of this bill is just \$50 million annually. This modest cost, however, does not take into account the value of the land conserved. It is estimated that for every dollar foregone by the Federal treasury, \$1.76 in land will be permanently preserved.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of the Conservation Tax Incentives Act of 1998. ●

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. D'AMATO, and Mrs. BOXER):

S.2377. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to limit the concentration of sulfur in gasoline used in motor vehicles; to the committee on Environment and Public Works.

CLEAN GASOLINE ACT OF 1998

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce today the Clean Gasoline Act of 1998, a bill to establish a nationwide, year-round cap on the sulfur content of gasoline. My bill presents an opportunity to make tremendous progress in improving our national air quality through a simple, cost-effective measure. Today, 70 million people—30 percent of the nation's population—live in counties which exceed health-based ozone standards. For just a few pennies a gallon, we can

make our urban environment appreciably better.

Sulfur in gasoline contaminates catalytic converters so that they remove less of the nitrogen oxide (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and hydrocarbons (HC) contained in tailpipe emissions. These pollutants elevate the levels of particulate matter (PM) and contribute to ground-level ozone. By reducing the amount of sulfur allowed in gasoline sold nationwide, my bill will substantially improve air quality, especially in America's largest cities.

The current average sulfur content in U.S. gasoline is approximately 330 parts per million (ppm), and ranges as high as 1,000 ppm. The Clean Gasoline Act will impose a year-round cap of 40 ppm on the sulfur content of all gasoline sold in the United States. Under my bill, refineries will also have the option of meeting an 80 ppm cap, provided that they maintain an overall average sulfur content of no more than 30 ppm.

Imposing limits on the sulfur content of gasoline will achieve tremendous—and virtually immediate—air quality benefits. The emissions reductions achieved by lowering gasoline sulfur levels to 40 ppm would be equivalent to removing 3 million vehicles from the streets of New York, and nearly 54 million vehicles from our roads nationwide.

California imposed a similar cap on gasoline sulfur beginning in 1996, resulting in significant air quality gains. Japan has already established a 50 ppm gasoline standard, and the European Union currently has a gasoline sulfur standard of 150 ppm—which will drop to 50 ppm beginning in the year 2005.

The gasoline sulfur cap established by my bill will apply year-round. A seasonal cap is insufficient because the damage done to catalytic converters by sulfur poisoning is not fully reversible by typical driving—meaning that vehicle emission controls would be re-poisoned every year when high-sulfur gasoline returned to the market. In the absence of national standards, travel over state boundaries could disable emissions controls.

The current high-sulfur content of U.S. gasoline will also preclude the introduction of the next generation of fuel efficiency technologies—most notably fuel cells and direct-injection gasoline engines. U.S. citizen will not have access to these advanced technologies—unless we adopt low sulfur gasoline standards.

Mr. President, I believe our task is clear. A national low sulfur gasoline standard will result in considerable health and environmental benefits. It will maximize the effectiveness of currently available vehicle emissions technology, and will enable the introduction of the next generation of vehicle technology into the U.S. market.

Refineries can reduce the sulfur content of gasoline using existing technology that is already being used to supply markets in California, Japan, and the European Union. Our national fleet is already comprised of world-class vehicles. It is time for us to provide this fleet with world-class fuel. I urge my colleagues to join my cosponsors and me in supporting this important legislation.●

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I join Senator MOYNIHAN in offering legislation that would reduce the sulfur content of gasoline. Current levels of sulfur in gasoline lead to high nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxide, and hydrocarbon emissions by weakening catalytic converter emission controls. These emissions elevate ground-level ozone and particulate matter pollution.

As we all have learned, long-term exposure to ozone pollution can have significant health impacts, including asthma attacks, breathing and respiratory problems, loss of lung function, and lowered immunity to disease. The EPA has compared breathing ozone to getting a sunburn in your lungs. Children, including Vermont's approximately 10,000 asthmatic children, are at special risk for adverse health effects from ozone pollution. Children playing outside in the summer time, the season when concentrations of ground-level ozone are the greatest, may suffer from coughing, decreased lung function, and have trouble catching their breath. Exposure to particulate matter pollution is similarly dangerous causing premature death, increased respiratory symptoms and disease, decreased lung function, and alterations in lung tissue. These pollutants also result in adverse environmental effects such as acid rain and visibility impairment.

Mr. President, this bill will reduce these pollutants in our communities, and more importantly it will reduce these pollutants cost-effectively. To reduce the sulfur content of gasoline, refineries can use currently available technology. These measures will not break the bank. California has already adopted the measures in this bill on a statewide basis. So have Japan and the members of the European Union.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Let's clean up our air so we can all breathe just a little bit easier.●

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I am pleased today to announce that I have added my name as an original cosponsors of the Low Sulfur Fuel Act of 1998 and to express my reasons for supporting this important legislation. I would first like to thank my colleague from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, for his authorship of this measure and his leadership on this issue. The bill establishes a national, year-round cap on gasoline sulfur levels, and would impose a reduction of sulfur content in

gasoline from 300 parts per million (ppm) to 40 ppm within two years from the date of enactment.

High sulfur levels in gasoline increase vehicle emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and hydrocarbons (HC) which in turn produce higher levels of particulate matter (PM) and contribute to ground level ozone. Reducing sulfur content levels to 40 ppm has been shown to reduce Nitrogen Oxides by 51 percent, Carbon Monoxide by 40 percent, and Hydrocarbons by 24 percent. Essentially, the sulfur in gasoline inhibits the catalyst in an automobile from doing its job—which is to reduce the emissions of the aforementioned pollutants. Sulfur is a contaminant only and does not in any way enhance engine performance.

There are two compelling reasons which led me to support this bill: First, helping our states attain the health requirements set forth by the Clean Air Act by providing them with a viable tool for reducing NO_x and CO emissions; and second, updating our gasoline to keep pace with other industrialized nations thereby keeping our automotive fleet competitive in the international marketplace.

In my home state of Georgia, the Metro Atlanta area has experienced extensive difficulties in complying with the standards set forth by the Clean Air Act. In a recent attempt to meet these standards, the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR), has voted to implement reduced sulfur content in fuel. The rule would require gasoline in the 25 county area surrounding Atlanta to be reduced to 30 ppm by 2003. Georgia is only the second state, after California, to take such innovative steps to meet air quality goals. In my review of this bill, I sent a copy to Harold Reheis, Director of the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD), an agency of the Georgia DNR for his comments. In his response, which I will ask unanimous consent to add as part of the RECORD after my statement, Mr. Reheis states that the Moynihan bill would "result in a reduction in air pollutants statewide and nationwide." Further, he added that this bill "could help prevent ozone nonattainment problems in other urban areas of Georgia like Augusta, Columbus, and Macon, which all could have difficulty meeting the tighter federal ozone standards adopted by the USEPA last year." I encourage all my colleagues to contact their State Environmental Agencies to request their input on this matter.

Relating to the second point in support of the bill, the U.S. must maintain our innovative and forward thinking approach and support this measure because other countries, such as Japan, Egypt, Thailand, and every member of the European Union have already required similar caps on the sulfur con-

tent of their gasoline. Thus, in order for us to compete with these and other countries, we must take this extremely valuable step. California has already taken such action and now we have the opportunity to send a message to the rest of the world, that we, as a nation, are committed to cleaner, more fuel efficient gasoline. Further, we should signify that we are committed to ensuring that our auto industry and the U.S. consumer are equipped with the infrastructure necessary to take advantage of the emerging market for new, innovative, less polluting automobiles.

There is a real possibility that if the U.S. does not take this action, we would fall behind the rest of the industrialized world—a position that the US should never be in—and become the dumping ground for higher sulfur level fuels—making it more difficult to shift to the lower sulfur fuels and inhibiting U.S. automakers from producing and U.S. consumers from purchasing, cleaner and more fuel efficient technologies.

The crux of this issue is that reducing sulfur content in gasoline to 40 ppm, year round, is a viable, cost-effective tool to dramatically reduce pollutants which cause high levels of Particulate Matter as well as Ozone and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Reheis be printed in the RECORD.

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

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT
OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Atlanta, GA, June 22, 1998.

HON. MAX CLELAND,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CLELAND: Thank you for sharing with EPD the proposed bill by Senator Moynihan to require the use of low sulfur gasoline all over the United States. The bill is a fine idea, and we have done something similar in Georgia. The Board of Natural Resources, upon my recommendation, recently promulgated rules to require low sulfur gasoline to be sold in 25 counties in and around Metro Atlanta starting May 1999.

The proposed Senate bill would result in a reduction in air pollutants statewide and nationwide. This could help prevent ozone nonattainment problems in other urban areas of Georgia like Augusta, Columbus, and Macon, which all could have difficulty meeting the tighter federal ozone standards adopted by USEPA last year.

I think the bill deserves your support. Please contact me if you need future information.

Sincerely,

HAROLD F. REHEIS,
Director.●

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 2378. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of payment under the Medicare program for pap smear laboratory tests; to the Committee on Finance.

INVESTMENT IN WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1998

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I introduce the Investment in Women's Health Act of 1998, a bill to increase Medicare reimbursement for Pap smear laboratory tests. This is the Senate companion measure to the bill introduced in the House by my colleague and friend, Representative NEIL ABERCROMBIE.

Last year, I was contacted by pathologists who alerted me to the cost-payment differential for Pap smear testing in Hawaii. According to the American Pathology Foundation, Hawaii is one of 23 states where the cost of performing the test significantly exceeds the Medicare payment. In Hawaii, the cost of performing the test ranges between \$13.04 and \$15.80. The Medicare reimbursement rate is only \$7.15.

This large disparity between the reimbursement rate and the actual cost may force labs in Hawaii and other states to discontinue Pap smear testing. Additionally, the below-cost-reimbursement may compel some labs to process tests faster and in higher volume to improve cost efficiency. This situation increases the risk of inaccurate results and can severely handicap patient outcomes.

If the Pap smear is to continue an effective cancer screening tool, it must remain widely available and reasonably priced for all women. Adequate payment is a necessary component of ensuring women's continued access to quality Pap smears.

My bill will increase the Medicare reimbursement rate for Pap smear lab work from its current \$7.15 to \$14.60—the national average cost of the test. This rate is important because it establishes a benchmark for many private insurers.

No other cancer screening procedure is as effective for early detection of cancer as the Pap smear. Over the last 50 years, the incidence of cervical cancer deaths has declined by 70 percent due in large part to the use of this cancer detection measure. Experts agree that the detection and treatment of precancerous lesions can actually prevent cervical cancer. Evidence also shows that the likelihood of survival when cervical cancer is detected in its earliest stage is almost 100 percent with timely and appropriate treatment and follow-up.

Mr. President, an estimated 13,700 new cases of invasive cervical cancer will be diagnosed in 1998 and 4,900 women will die of the disease. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the average Pap smear production costs for 23 states be printed in the RECORD.

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

Pap Smear Production Costs

California	\$18.84
Colorado	17.11
Connecticut	17.00
Delaware	13.05
Florida	16.94
Georgia	16.87
Hawaii	22.00
Illinois	14.00
Iowa	10.73
Kansas	13.04
Kentucky	14.04
Maryland	15.40
Michigan	15.80
Michigan	13.12
Nebraska	13.78
New Mexico	14.62
Ohio	16.00
Ohio	13.01
Ohio	14.05
Ohio	13.16
Ohio	16.12
Ohio	20.65
Ohio	18.46
Ohio	14.15
Ohio	14.50
Ohio	16.89
Ohio	13.00
Ohio	10.25
Ohio	12.36
Ohio	13.50
Ohio	18.92
Ohio	11.64
Ohio	12.00
Ohio	12.52
Ohio	12.90
Ohio	12.91
Ohio	13.22
Ohio	13.42
Ohio	14.69
Ohio	13.00
Wisconsin	13.00

Note.—This data was obtained from the American Pathology Foundation.

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

S. 2379. A bill to establish a program to establish and sustain viable rural and remote communities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

THE RURAL AND REMOTE COMMUNITY FAIRNESS ACT OF 1998

• Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I introduce the Rural and Remote Community Fairness Act of 1998. This Act will lead to a brighter future for rural and remote communities by establishing two new grant programs that will address the unique economic and environmental challenges faced by small communities in rural and remote areas across this country. I am pleased that this legislation is co-sponsored by the Minority Leader, Senator DASCHLE.

The bill authorizes up to \$100 million a year in grant aid from 1999 through 2005 for any communities across the nation with populations of less than 10,000 which face electric rates in excess of 150 percent of the national average retail price. The money can go for electricity system improvements, energy efficiency and weatherization efforts, water and sanitation improvements or work to solve leaking fuel storage tanks.

The bill also amends the Rural Electrification Act to authorize Rural and Remote Electrification Grants of an

additional \$20 million a year to the same communities. The grants can be used to increase energy efficiency, lower electricity rates or provide for the modernization of electric facilities.

This nation has well-established programs for community development grants. The majority of these programs were established to help resolve the very real problems found in this Nation's urban areas. However, our most rural and remote communities experience different, but equally real, problems that are not addressed by existing law. Not only are these communities generally ineligible for the existing programs, their unique challenges, while sometimes similar to those experienced by urban areas, require a different focus and approach.

The biggest single economic problem facing small communities is the expense of establishing a modern infrastructure. These costs, which are always substantial, are exacerbated in remote and rural areas. The existence of this infrastructure, including efficient housing, electricity, bulk fuel storage, waste water and water service, is a necessity for the health and welfare of our children, the development of a prosperous economy and minimizing environmental problems.

There is a real cost in human misery and to the health and welfare of everyone, especially our children and our elderly from poor or polluted water or bad housing or an inefficient power system. Hepatitis B infections in rural Alaska are five times more common than in urban Alaska. We just have to do better if we are to bring our rural communities into the 21st Century.

The experience of many Alaskans is a perfect example. Most small communities or villages in Alaska are not interconnected to an electricity grid, and rely upon diesel generators for their electricity. Often, the fuel can only be delivered by barge or airplane, and is stored in tanks. These tanks are expensive to maintain, and in many cases, must be completely replaced to prevent leakage of fuel into the environment. While economic and environmental savings clearly justify the construction of new facilities, these communities simply don't have the ability to raise enough capital to make the necessary investments.

As a result, these communities are forced to bear an oppressive economic and environmental burden that can be eased with a relatively small investment on the part of the Federal government. I can give you some examples: in Manley Hot Springs, Alaska, the citizens pay almost 70 cents per kilowatt hour for electricity. In Igiugig, Kokhanok, Akiachak Native Community, and Middle Kuskokwim, consumers all pay over 50 cents per kilowatt hour for electricity. The national average is around 7 cents per kilowatt hour.

Further, in Alaska, for example, many rural villages still lack modern water and sewer sanitation systems taken for granted in all other areas of America. According to a Federal Field Working Group, 190 of the state's villages have "unsafe" sanitation systems, 135 villages still using "honey buckets" for waste disposal. Only 31 villages have a fully safe, piped water system; 71 villages having only one central watering source.

Concerning leaking storage tanks, the Alaska Department of Community and Regional Affairs estimates that there are more than 2,000 leaking above-ground fuel storage tanks in Alaska. There are several hundred other below-ground tanks that need repair, according to the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation.

These are not only an Alaskan problem. The highest electricity rates in America are paid by a small community in Missouri, and communities in Maine, as well as islands in Rhode Island and New York will likely qualify for this program. Providing safe drinking water and adequate waste treatment facilities is a problem for very small communities all across this land.

What will this Act do to address these problems? First, the Act authorizes \$100 million per year for the years 1999-2005 for block grants to communities of under 10,000 inhabitants who pay more than 150 percent of the national average retail price for electricity.

The grants will be allocated by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development among eligible communities proportionate to cost of electricity in the community, as compared to the national average. The communities may use the grants only for the following eligible activities:

Low-cost weatherization of homes and other buildings;

Construction and repair of electrical generation, transmission, distribution, and related facilities;

Construction, remediation and repair of bulk fuel storage facilities;

Facilities and training to reduce costs of maintaining and operating electrical generation, distribution, transmission, and related facilities;

Professional management and maintenance for electrical generation, distribution and transmission, and related facilities;

Investigation of the feasibility of alternate energy services;

Construction, operation, maintenance and repair of water and waste water services;

Acquisition and disposition of real property for eligible activities and facilities; and

Development of an implementation plan, including administrative costs for eligible activities and facilities.

In addition, this bill will amend the rural Electrification Act of 1936 to au-

thorize Rural and Remote Electrification Grants for \$20 million per year for years 1999-2005 for grants to qualified borrowers under the Act that are in rural and remote communities who pay more than 150 percent of the national average retail price for electricity. These grants can be used to increase energy efficiency, lower electricity rates, or provide or modernize electric facilities.

This Act makes a significant step toward resolving the critical social, economic, and environmental problems faced by our Nation's rural and remote communities. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.●

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2380. A bill to require the written consent of a parent of an unemancipated minor prior to the provision of contraceptive drugs or devices to such a minor, or the referral of such minor for abortion services, under any Federally funded program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUTTING PARENTS FIRST ACT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to reaffirm the vital role parents play in the lives of their children. My legislation, the Putting Parents First Act, will guarantee that parents have the opportunity to be involved in their children's most important decisions—whether or not to have an abortion and whether or not to receive federally-subsidized contraception.

The American people have long understood the unique role the family plays in our most cherished values. As usual, President Reagan said it best. Within the American family, Reagan said, "the seeds of personal character are planted, the roots of public value first nourished. Through love and instruction, discipline, guidance and example, we learn from our mothers and fathers the values that will shape our private lives and public citizenship."

The Putting Parents First Act contains two distinct provisions to protect the role of parents in the important life decisions of their minor children. The first part ensures that parents are given every opportunity to be involved in a child's decision whether or not to have an abortion. Specifically, the Act prohibits any individual from performing an abortion upon a woman under the age of 18 unless that individual has secured the informed written consent of the minor and a parent or guardian. In accordance with Supreme Court decisions concerning state-passed parental consent laws, the Putting Parents First Act allows a minor to forego the parental involvement requirement where a court has issued a waiver certifying that the process of obtaining the consent of a parent or guardian is not in the best interests of the minor or that the minor is emancipated.

For too long, the issue of abortion has polarized the American people. To some extent, this is the inevitable result of vastly distinct views of what an abortion is. Many, including myself, view abortion as the unconscionable taking of innocent human life. Others, including a majority of Supreme Court Justices, view abortion as a constitutionally-protected alternative for pregnant women.

There are, however, a few areas of common ground where people on both sides of the abortion issue can agree. One such area of agreement is that, whenever possible, parents should be involved in helping their young daughters to make the critically important decision of whether or not to have an abortion. A recent CNN/USA Today survey conducted by the Gallup Organization found that 74 percent of Americans support parental consent before an abortion is performed on a girl under age 18. Even those who do not view an abortion as a taking of human life recognize it as a momentous and life-changing decision that a minor should not make alone. The fact that nearly 40 states have passed laws requiring doctors to notify or seek the consent of a minor's parents before performing an abortion also demonstrates the consensus in favor of parental involvement.

The instruction and guidance of which President Reagan spoke are needed most when children are forced to make important life decisions. It is hard to imagine a decision more fundamental in our culture than whether or not to beget a child. Parental involvement in this crucial decision is necessary to ensure that the sanctity of human life is given appropriate consideration. There are few more issues deserving of our attention than promoting parental involvement.

Only half of the 39 states with parental involvement laws on the books currently enforce them. Some states have enacted laws that have been struck down in state or federal courts while in other states the executive department has chosen not to enforce the legislature's will. As a result, just over 20 states have parental laws in effect today. In these states, parents do not have the right to be involved in their minor children's most fundamental decisions, decisions that can have severe physical and emotional health consequences for young women.

Moreover, in those states where laws requiring consent are on the books and being enforced, those laws are frequently circumvented by pregnant minors who cross state lines to avoid the laws' requirements. Sadly, nowhere is this problem more apparent than in my home state of Missouri. I was proud to have successfully defended Missouri's parental consent law before the Supreme Court in *Planned Parenthood versus Ashcroft*. Unfortunately, the

law has not been as effective as I had hoped. A study last year in the American Journal of Public Health found that the odds of a minor traveling out of state for an abortion increased by over 50 percent after Missouri's parental consent law went into effect.

The limited degree of enforcement and the ease with which state laws can be evaded demand a national solution. The importance of protecting life demands a national solution. It is time for Congress to act. Requiring a parent's consent before a minor can receive an abortion is one way states have chosen to protect not only the role of parents and the health and safety of young women, but also, the lives of the unborn. Congress shares with the states the authority—and duty—to protect life under the Constitution. Thus, enactment of a federal parental consent law will allow Congress to protect the guiding role of parents as it protects human life.

The Putting Parents First Act is based on state statutes that already have been determined to be constitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court. The legislation establishes a minimum level of parental involvement that must be honored nationwide. It does not preempt state parental involvement laws that provide additional protections to the parents of pregnant minors.

The second part of the Putting Parents First Act extends the idea of parental involvement to the arena of federally-subsidized contraception. Currently, the federal government funds many different programs through the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education that can provide prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, as well as abortion referrals, to minors without parental consent.

The case of the little girl from Crystal Lake, IL is just one example, but it makes clear everything that is wrong with current law in this area. In that case, the young girl was just 14 years old when her 37-year-old teacher brought her to the county health department for birth control injections. He wanted to continue having sex with her, but had grown tired of using condoms. A county health official injected the young girl with the controversial birth control drug Depo-Provera without notifying the girl's parents. The teacher knew that federal Title X rules prohibited clinics from notifying parents when issuing birth control drugs to minors. He continued to molest her for 18 months until the girl finally broke down and told her parents. The teacher was arrested and sentenced to ten years in prison. The young girl spent five days a week in therapy and is still recovering from effects of anorexia nervosa.

Although the teacher's crime was unspeakable, it was the federal govern-

ment's policy that allowed him to shield his crime for so long. This is an outrage. The policy of the Government of the United States should be to help parents to help their children. Providing contraceptives and abortion referrals to children without involving parents undermines, not strengthens the role of parents. Worse yet, it jeopardizes the health of children.

The current law for federally-funded contraceptives puts bureaucrats in front of parents when it comes to a child's decision-making process. That is intolerable. We must put parents first when it comes to such critical decisions. The legislation I am introducing today restores common sense to government policy by requiring programs that receive federal funds to obtain a parent's consent before dispensing contraceptives or referring abortion services to the parent's minor child.

In my view, Mr. President, sound and sensible public policy requires that parents be involved in critical, life-shaping decisions involving their children. A young person whose life is in crisis may be highly anxious, and may want to take a fateful step without their parents' knowledge. But it is at these times of crisis that children need their parents, not government bureaucrats or uninvolved strangers. This legislation will strengthen the family and protect human life by ensuring that parents have the primary role in helping their children when they are making decisions that will shape the rest of their lives.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2382. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow certain community-based organizations and health care providers to determine that a child is presumptively eligible for medical assistance under a State plan under that title; to the Committee on Finance.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH ASSURANCE THROUGH THE MEDICAID PROGRAM (CHAMP) ACT

• Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, today I am proud to rise with my colleague and dear friend, JOHN KERRY, to introduce legislation which would help provide thousands, if not millions, of children with health care coverage. Clearly, a bipartisan priority in the 105th Congress has been to find a solution for providing access to health insurance for the approximately 10 million uninsured children in our nation. This matter has been a very high priority for me since coming to Congress. The legislation we are introducing today, the "Children's Health Assurance through the Medicaid Program" (CHAMP), would help our states reach more than 3 million uninsured children who are eligible for the Medicaid program but not enrolled.

The consequences of lack of insurance are problematic for everyone, but

they are particularly serious for children. Uninsured and low income children are less likely to receive vital primary and preventative care services. This is quite discouraging since it is repeatedly demonstrated that regular health care visits facilitate the continuity of care which plays a critical role in the development of a healthy child. For example, one analysis found that children living in families with incomes below the poverty line were more likely to go without a physician visit than those with Medicaid coverage or those with other insurance. The result is many uninsured, low-income children not seeking health care services until they are seriously sick.

Studies have further demonstrated that many of these children are more likely to be hospitalized or receive their care in emergency rooms, which means higher health care costs for conditions that could have been treated with appropriate outpatient services or prevented through regular check ups.

Last year, as Congress was searching for ways to reduce the number of uninsured children, I kept hearing about children who are uninsured, yet, could qualify for health care insurance through the Medicaid program. I was unable to find specific information about who these children are, where they reside, and why they are not enrolled in the Medicaid program. Subsequently, I requested that the General Accounting Office conduct an in-depth analysis to provide Congress data on uninsured Medicaid eligible children. This information would provide the necessary tools to develop community outreach strategies and education programs to address this problem.

The GAO study was completed in March. The data shows that 3.4 million children are eligible for the Medicaid program (under the minimum federal standards) but are not enrolled. It also shows that these kids are more likely to be part of a working family with parents who are employed but earning a low income. A significant number of these children come from two-parent families rather than single-parent families. The study also discovered that more than thirty-five percent of these children are Hispanic, with seventy-four percent of them residing in Southern or Western states. Finally, the GAO report suggested that states need to be developing and implementing creative outreach and enrollment strategies which specifically target the unenrolled children.

It is important that we build upon these findings and develop methods for states to reach out to these families and educate them about the resources which exist for their children. The CHAMP bill is an important step in this process and would assist these children by expanding the state offices which can presume Medicaid eligibility for a child.

As you know, the 1997 Balanced Budget Act provided states with the option of utilizing "presumptive eligibility" as an outreach method for enrolling eligible children into their state Medicaid programs. Presumptive eligibility allows certain agencies to temporarily enroll children in the state Medicaid program for a brief period if the child appears to be eligible for the program based on their family's income. Health care services can be provided to these children if necessary during this "presumptive" period while the state Medicaid agency processes the child's application and makes a final determination of their eligibility.

Presumptive eligibility is completely optional for the states and is not mandatory.

Under current law, states are only given the limited choice of using a few specific community agencies for presumptive eligibility including: Head Start Centers, WIC clinics, Medicaid providers and state or local child care agencies. The McCain-Kerry CHAMP bill would expand the types of community-based organizations which would be recognized as qualified entities and permitted to presume eligibility for children. Under our bill, public schools, entities operating child welfare programs under Title IV-A, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) offices and the new Children Health Insurance Program (CHIP) offices would be permitted to help identify Medicaid eligible kids. Allowing more entities to participate in outreach would increase the opportunities for screening children and educating their families about the Medicaid services available to them. By increasing the "net" for states, we would be helping them "capture" more children who are going without health care services because their families are not familiar, comfortable or aware of the Medicaid program and its enrollment process.

Our bill would help millions of children gain access to health care without creating a new government program, imposing mandates on states, or expanding the role of government in our communities. This is important to note—we would not be creating new agencies, bureaucracies or benefits. Instead we would be increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of a long-standing program designed to help one of our most vulnerable populations, children. We urge our colleagues to support this innovative piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2382

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 "Children's Health Assurance through the Medicaid Program (CHAMP) Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Twenty-three percent or 3,400,000 of the 15,000,000 medicaid-eligible children went without health insurance in 1996.

(2) Medicaid-eligible children with working parents are more likely to be uninsured.

(3) More than 35 percent of the 3,400,000 million uninsured medicaid-eligible children are Hispanic.

(4) Almost three-fourths of the uninsured medicaid-eligible children live in the Western and Southern States.

(5) Multiple studies have shown that insured children are more likely to receive preventive and primary health care services as well as to have a relationship with a physician.

(6) Studies have shown that a lack of health insurance prevents parents from trying to obtain preventive health care for their children.

(7) These studies demonstrate that low-income and uninsured children are more likely to be hospitalized for conditions that could have been treated with appropriate outpatient services, resulting in higher health care costs.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL ENTITIES QUALIFIED TO DETERMINE MEDICAID PRESUMPTIVE ELIGIBILITY FOR LOW-INCOME CHILDREN.

Section 1920A(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-1a(b)(3)(A)(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking "or (II)" and inserting " , (II)"; and

(2) by inserting "eligibility of a child for medical assistance under the State plan under this title, or eligibility of a child for child health assistance under the program funded under title XXI, or (III) is an elementary school or secondary school, as such terms are defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801), an elementary or secondary school operated or supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, a State child support enforcement agency, a child care resource and referral agency, or a State office or private contractor that accepts applications for or administers a program funded under part A of title IV or that determines eligibility for any assistance or benefits provided under any program of public or assisted housing that receives Federal funds, including the program under section 8 or any other section of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.)" before the semicolon.

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend and colleague Senator MCCAIN for his work on this important issue. I am honored to introduce with him this legislation, entitled the Children's Health Assurance Through the Medicaid Program (CHAMP), which would increase health coverage for eligible children and increase state flexibility.

Mr. President, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 gave States the option to bring more eligible but uninsured children into Medicaid by allowing states to grant "presumptive eligibility." This means that a child would temporarily be covered by Medicaid if preliminary information suggests that

they qualify. Providing health insurance for children is important because studies show that children without health insurance are more likely to be in worse health, less likely to see a doctor, and less likely to receive preventive care such as immunizations.

Mr. President, the legislation Senator MCCAIN and I are introducing today would strengthen the existing option and give states more flexibility. First, it will allow states to rely on a broader range of agencies to assist with Medicaid outreach and enrollment. By expanding the list of community-based providers and state and local agencies to include schools, child support agencies, and some child care facilities, states will be able to make significant gains in the number of children identified and enrolled in Medicaid. States would not be required to rely on these additional providers but would have the flexibility to choose among qualified providers and shape their own outreach and enrollment strategies.

The cost of these changes to the presumptive eligibility option for Medicaid under last year's Balanced Budget Act are modest. Our understanding is that our proposal would cost approximately \$250 million over five years. This is a positive step in the right direction, helping ensure that the growing population of American children start off on the right foot. Access to affordable health care in the early years saves the country's financial resources in the long run.

Once again, I would like to thank Senator MCCAIN for his invaluable work on behalf of children. I look forward to working with him and the Senate to pass this important legislation.●

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 2383. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to reform the provisions relating to child labor; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE CHILDREN'S ACT FOR RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYMENT

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN I introduce the Children's Act for Responsible Employment or the CARE Act that will modernize our antiquated domestic child labor laws. Congressman RICHARD GEPHARDT and Congressman TOM LANTOS are introducing companion legislation in the House.

It is hard to imagine that we are on the verge of entering the 21st century and we still have young children working under hazardous conditions in the United States. Unfortunately, outdated U.S. child labor laws that have not been revamped since the 1930's allow this practice to continue.

I have been working on the eradication of child labor overseas since

1992. At that time, I introduced the Child Labor Deterrence Act, which prohibits the importation of products made by abusive and exploitative child labor. Since then, we have made some important progress, but in order to end child labor overseas the U.S. must lead by example and address child labor in our own backyard.

Now, when I talk about child labor, I'm not talking about a part time job or a teenager who helps out on the family farm after school. There is nothing wrong with that. What I am talking about is the nearly 300,000 children illegally employed in the U.S. I would like to insert for the record at this time the testimony of Sergio Reyes, who was expected to testify at a hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Training I requested on June 11 of this year. Mr. Reyes was unable to attend that hearing but his written testimony tells a story that is becoming all too familiar in the United States.

According to a recent study by economist Douglas L. Krause of Rutgers University, there are nearly 60,000 children under age 14 working in the U.S. Of those children, one will die every five days in a work related accident according to the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health. Nowhere is this more true than children who work in agriculture.

In general, children receive fewer protections in agriculture than other industries. The minimum age for hazardous work in agriculture is 16, it is 18 for all other occupations. In a GAO preliminary report released in March 1998, the researchers noted that "children working in agriculture are legally permitted to work at younger ages, in more hazardous occupations, and for longer periods of time than their peers in other industries." For example, a 13 year old child can not work as a clerk in an air conditioned office building, but can pick strawberries in a field in the middle of summer. That same report noted that over 155,000 children are working in agriculture. However, because that number is based on census data, the Farm Worker Union places the number at nearly 800,000 children working in agriculture.

In December 1997, the Associated Press (AP) did a five part series on child labor in the United States documenting 4 year olds picking chili peppers in New Mexico and 10 year olds harvesting cucumbers in Ohio. In one tragic example reported by the AP, 14 year-old Alexis Jaimes was crushed to death when a 5000 lb. hammer fell on him while working on a construction site in Texas. I was outraged.

At the June hearing of the Senate Employment and Training Subcommittee, two things became clear with regard to U.S. domestic child labor. First, agricultural child laborers are dropping out of school at an alarm-

ing rate. Over of 45 percent of farm worker youth will never complete high school. Second, the laws that we do have regarding child labor are inadequate to protect a modern workforce. Our present civil and criminal penalties are simply insufficient to deter compliance with the law and need to be strengthened and more vigorously enforced.

My legislation, which is supported by the Administration and children's advocates groups across the country, such as the Child Labor Coalition and the Solidarity Center, will help rectify this alarming situation. It will; raise the current age of 16 to 18 in order to engage in hazardous agricultural work, close the loopholes in federal child labor laws which allow a three year old to work in the fields, and increase the civil and criminal penalties for child labor violations to a minimum of \$500, up from \$100 and a maximum of \$15,000, up from \$10,000.

In closing. Let me say that we must end child labor—the last vestige of slavery in the world. It is time to give all children the chance at a real childhood and give them the skills necessary to compete in tomorrow's work place. There is no excuse for the number of children being maimed or killed in work related accidents when labor saving technologies have been developed in recent years. So, on today's farms, it makes even less sense than ever to put kids in dangerous situations operating hazardous machinery.

Mr. President, I hope that we will be able to vote on this legislation in the near future so that we can prepare our children for the 21st century. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill, a letter from the Child Labor Coalition, and the testimony of Sergio Reyes be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2383

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Children's Act for Responsible Employment" or the "CARE Act".

(b) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

SEC. 2. AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT.

Section 13(c) (29 U.S.C. 213(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

"(1) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he or she is so em-

ployed, if such employee is employed by his or her parent or legal guardian, on a farm owned or operated by such parent or legal guardian."; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (4).

SEC. 3. YOUTH PEDDLING.

(a) FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT COVERAGE.—

(1) FINDING.—The last sentence of section 2(a) (29 U.S.C. 202(a)) is amended by inserting after "households" the following: ", and the employment of employees under the age of 16 years in youth peddling."

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 3 (29 U.S.C. 203) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(y) 'Youth peddling' means selling goods or services to customers at their residences, places of business, or public places such as street corners or public transportation stations. 'Youth peddling' does not include the activities of persons who, as volunteers, sell goods or services on behalf of not-for-profit organizations."

(b) DEFINITION OF OPPRESSIVE CHILD LABOR.—Section 3(1) (29 U.S.C. 203(1)) is amended in the last sentence by insert after "occupations other than" the following: "youth peddling."

(c) PROHIBITION OF YOUTH PEDDLING.—Section 12(c) (29 U.S.C. 212(c)) is amended by inserting after "oppressive child labor in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" the following: ", or in youth peddling."

SEC. 4. CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR CHILD LABOR VIOLATIONS.

(a) CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES.—Section 16(e) (29 U.S.C. 216(e)) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking "\$10,000" and inserting "\$15,000";

(2) by inserting after "subject to a civil penalty of" the following: "not less than \$500 and";

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 16(a) (29 U.S.C. 216(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "Any person who violates the provisions of section 15(a)(4), concerning oppressive child labor, shall on conviction be subject to a fine of not more than \$15,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, in the case of a willful or repeat violation that results in or contributes to a fatality of a minor employee or a permanent disability of a minor employee, or a violation which is concurrent with a criminal violation of any other provision of this Act or of any other Federal or State law."

SEC. 5. GOODS TAINTED BY OPPRESSIVE CHILD LABOR.

Section 12(a) (29 U.S.C. 212(a)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: "": And provided further, that the Secretary shall determine the circumstances under which such goods may be allowed to be shipped or delivered for shipment in interstate commerce."

SEC. 6. COORDINATION.

Section 4 (29 U.S.C. 204) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) The Secretary shall encourage and establish closer working relationships with non-governmental organizations and with State and local government agencies having responsibility for administering and enforcing labor and safety and health laws. Upon the request of the Secretary, and to the extent permissible under applicable law, State and local government agencies with information regarding injuries and deaths of employees shall submit such information to the Secretary for use as appropriate in the enforcement of section 12 and in the promulgation and interpretation of the regulations

and orders authorized by section 3(1). The Secretary may reimburse such State and local government agencies for such services."

SEC. 7. REGULATIONS AND MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Labor shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture shall, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, enter into a memorandum or understanding to coordinate the development and enforcement of measures to minimize child labor.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor such sums as may be necessary for to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

THE CHILD LABOR COALITION,
Washington, DC, July 30, 1998.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: The Child Labor Coalition thanks you for your leadership over the last six years to end child labor exploitation overseas. Your influence has spurred much of the progress that has been made in the international community.

As you are certainly aware, the United States is not immune to child labor problems. Two of our most significant problems are the escalating injuries to young workers and the inadequate protection of children working in agriculture. The legislation you are introducing is a positive step toward addressing these problems.

Every year, more than 200,000 minors are injured and more than 100 die in the workplace. Research has shown that injuries often occur when youth are engaged in prohibited duties or occupations. Your legislation to increase penalties for child labor violations will send a clear message to employers to ensure the safety of their young workers through increased diligence in following the child labor laws.

The FLSA does not adequately protect children working as hired farmworkers. Children may work at younger ages, for more hours, and engage in hazardous employment at a younger age than a minor employed in any other workplace or occupation. This has to change and your legislation to equalize the protections of all children who are working, regardless of the occupation, is applauded.

On behalf of the more than 50 organizational members of the Child Labor Coalition we thank you for your efforts to update our nation's child labor laws and wholeheartedly support this legislation.

Sincerely,

DARLENE S. ADKINS,
Coordinator.

TESTIMONY OF SERGIO REYES BEFORE THE
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT
AND TRAINING, JUNE 11, 1998

Good morning. My name is Sergio Reyes, and I'm 15 years old. This is my brother Oscar and he is nine years old. We're from Hollister, California, and we are farmworkers like our father and our grandfather. We are permanent residents here in the United States. Thank you for inviting us to speak today about our experience being farmworkers. We both have been farmworkers for five years now, ever since our

family came from Mexico. I started working when I was 10 years old, and Oscar started when he was four. He has been working for more than half of his life. We work for as many as 10 hours a day, cutting paprika, topping garlic and pulling onions. The work is very hard and it gets very hot. It's tough working these long and going to school too. We work after school, during the weekends, during the summer and on holidays. Oscar can show you some of the tools that we use and how we top garlic and cut onions. I don't have any idea when pesticides are used on these crops or not.

To do this work we have to stay bent over for most of the time and have to lift heavy bags and buckets filled with the crops that we're picking. It's hard work for adults and very hard work for kids. We work because our family needs the money. I'd rather be in school. I am in the 10th grade and someday I'd like to be a lawyer. Oscar wants to be a fireman when he grows up. My family knows how important it is to go to school and get an education. But there are times when working is more important. We know lots of families like ours where the kids drop out of school because they need to work. It's sad because they really need an education or to learn another job skill if they're ever going to get out of the fields. Without an education, I will never become a lawyer and Oscar will never be a fireman.

My dad is trying to get out of farmwork. He is working in farmwork and also in a farmworker job training program to learn another skill. He is trying to get another job so that he can earn more money and have some health insurance. We've never had health insurance before. As hard as my dad works, he's not guaranteed to make a good living. And my dad works very hard. I just hope that when I get older and if something happens to keep me from graduating from school, that there will be a program for Oscar and me.

Thank you for letting us come. We appreciate all the you do that will help our dad, other farmworker kids and my brother Oscar and me.●

By Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself
and Mr. FAIRCLOTH):

S. 2384. A bill entitled "Year 2000 Enhanced Cooperation Solution"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

YEAR 2000 SOLUTION LEGISLATION

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that addresses a critical problem that demands immediate attention from the Congress.

For many years now I have been involved with a variety of issues that affect the technology sector. As I have said before, no other sector of the economy is as vibrant and forward looking. The ingenuity, drive and vision of this industry should be a model for all of us, including those of us in the Senate. Moreover, the importance of this industry should only grow in the coming years. However, as I look to the future with the hope of seeing the next century stamped "Made in America" I see one large impediment—the Year 2000 bug.

The 105th Congress must consider this problem and assist the country in trying to avoid a potentially disastrous crisis. We cannot wait for disaster to strike. We must act now to enable com-

panies to avert the crisis. No individual will be left untouched if the country fails to address this problem and experiences widespread ramifications. No company will escape huge costs if they cannot successfully fix their own problems and have some assurances that their business partners and suppliers have fixed their problems. A great deal of effort has been undertaken to bring attention to this problem, including several efforts here in the U.S. Senate. However, it is now time to move beyond simply highlighting the problem. We need to roll up our sleeves and get to work on a solution.

I begin today to lay out my plan for assisting individuals and businesses to walk safely through the minefield called the Y2K problem. The first part of this overall plan is the Year 2000 Enhanced Cooperation Solution. This legislation provides a very narrow exemption to the antitrust laws if and when a company is engaged in cooperative conduct to alleviate the impact of a year 2000 date failure in hardware or software. The exemption has a clear sunset and expressly ensures that the law continues to prohibit anti-competitive conduct such as boycotts or agreements to allocate markets or fix prices.

This simple, straightforward proposal is critical to allowing for true cooperation in an effort to rectify the problem. No company can solve the Y2K problem alone. Even if one company devises a workable solution to their own problems they still face potential disaster from components provided by outside suppliers. What is more, when companies find workable solutions we certainly want to provide them with every incentive to disseminate those solutions as widely as possible. Cooperation is essential. But without a clear legislative directive, potential antitrust liability will stand in the way of cooperation. We must provide our industries with the appropriate incentives and tools to fix this problem without the threat of antitrust lawsuits based on the very cooperation we ought to be encouraging.

I do want to be very clear on one point—as important as it is that this legislation be enacted and enacted soon, it is merely the first piece of a difficult puzzle. The Administration has presented the Congress with their view of how information sharing on the Y2K problem should be furthered. Based on my initial review, that proposal appears to be headed in the right direction but falls far short of the target destination. Most importantly, the proposed approach which purports to promote information sharing does not accomplish its objective as it leaves the problem of potential antitrust liability. In other words, it does not accomplish the task that it set out to complete.

I will seek the introduction of the second piece of the solution, the Year

2000 Enhanced Information Solution, which while working within the guidelines of the Administration's language will add the teeth, make clear that good faith disclosure of information will be protected, and provide for protection of individual consumers. Together with the antitrust legislation I introduce today, this should provide sufficient protection to promote the kind of cooperation that will be essential to addressing this looming problem.

The final piece of the package will be the Year 2000 Litigation Solution. Real harm from inadequate efforts to address this problem must be compensated. However, we cannot allow the prospect of frivolous litigation to block efforts to avoid such harm. We also must ensure that frivolous litigation over the Y2K problem does not consume the lion's share of the next millennium. While it is not possible for Congress to guarantee that private individuals and companies will be able to solve the Y2K problem, Congress can eliminate legal obstacles that stand in the way of private solutions. Information regarding existing software and known problems must be shared as completely and openly as possible. The current fear of litigation and liability that imposes a distinct chilling effect on information sharing must be alleviated.

Resources to address the Y2K problem, particularly time, are finite. They must be focused as fully as possible on remediation, rather than on unproductive litigation. Moreover, the availability of adequate development and programming talent may hinge upon a working environment that protects good faith remediation efforts from the threat of liability for their work. Congress must prevent a fiasco where only lawyers win.

I look forward to working with those that are interested as this process moves forward. I believe that this Congress cannot wait to address this problem. This issue is about time, and we have precious little left in this Congress and before the Y2K problem is upon us. I hope we can work together to free up talented individuals to address this serious problem.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2385. A bill to establish the San Rafael Swell National Heritage Area and the San Rafael National Conservation Area in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE SAN RAFAEL NATIONAL HERITAGE AND CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the "San Rafael National Heritage and Conservation Act" and I am pleased to be joined by Senator HATCH in this effort.

The San Rafael National Heritage and Conservation Act not only accom-

plishes the preservation of an important historic area, but it is the result of a collaborative approach among Federal land managers, state and local governments and other concerned agencies and organizations. This revised legislation incorporates several of the suggestions of the Administration, the House and those who originally expressed concerns about the bill as introduced in the House. The legislation we introduce today is the result of months of discussions between the Bureau of Land Management, the citizens of Emery County and Members of Congress. It is a good-faith effort to initiate what we hope will bring resolution to the larger philosophical differences between land management practices in Utah. With a little luck, we might even begin a process which could lead to a resolution to the ongoing Utah wilderness debate.

The San Rafael Swell region in the State of Utah was one of America's last frontiers. I have in my office, a map of the State of Utah drafted in 1876 in which large portions of the San Rafael Swell were simply left blank because they were yet to be explored. Visitors who comment on this map are amazed when they see that large portions of the San Rafael area remained unmapped thirty years after the Mormon pioneers arrived in the Salt Lake Valley.

This area is known for its important historical sites, notable tradition of mining, widely recognized paleontological resources, and numerous recreational opportunities. As such, it needs to be protected. The San Rafael Swell National Conservation Area created through this legislation will be approximately 630,000 acres in size and will comprise wilderness, a Bighorn Sheep Management Area, a scenic Area of Critical Environmental Concern, and Semi-Primitive Area of Non-Motorized Use. The value of the new management structure for the National Conservation Area can be found in the flexibility it gives in addressing a broad array of issues from the protection of critical lands to the oversight of recreational uses.

The San Rafael National Heritage and Conservation Act sets aside 130,000 acres as BLM wilderness lands. It permanently removes the threat of mining, oil drilling, and timbering from the Swell. It also sets aside a conservation area of significant size to protect Utah's largest herd of Desert Bighorn Sheep. Vehicle travel is restricted to designated roads and trails in other areas and visitors recreational facilities are provided. Finally, it will assist the BLM and the local communities in developing a long term strategy to preserve the history and heritage of the region through the National Heritage Area. Careful study of the bill shows that the San Rafael Swell National Heritage and Conservation Act is a

multidimensional management plan for an area with multidimensional needs. It provides comprehensive protection and management for an entire ecosystem.

My colleagues in the House have worked hard to address the concerns of the Administration and they have made several changes to the House version as introduced in an effort to improve the legislation. We have redrawn maps, eliminated roads from wilderness areas, eliminated cherry stems of other roads and increased the size of wilderness and semi-primitive areas. Specifically, by including new provisions dealing with the Compact and Heritage Plan, the new language ensures that the resources found in the county will be properly surveyed and understood prior to the Heritage Area moving forward.

With regards to the Conservation Area, bill language guarantees that the management plan will not impair any of the important resources within the Swell. We have also included new language that ensures the Secretary of Interior is fully represented on the Advisory Council.

The San Rafael Swell National Heritage and Conservation Act is unique in that it sets the San Rafael Swell apart from Utah's other national parks and monuments. It protects not only the important lands in this area but also another resource just as precious—its captivating history and heritage. This bill is an example of how a legislative solution can result from a grassroots effort involving both state and local government officials, the BLM, historical preservation groups, and wildlife enthusiasts. Most important, it takes the necessary steps to preserve the wilderness value of these lands.

This legislation has broad statewide and local support. It is sound, reasonable, and innovative in its approach to protecting and managing the public land treasures of the San Rafael Swell. Finally, it is based on the scientific methods of ecosystem management and prevents the fracturing of large areas of multiple use lands with small parcels of wilderness interspersed between.

Mr. President, I will conclude with this point; the wilderness debate in Utah has gone on too long. My colleagues will be reminded that in the last Congress, the debate centered around whether two million acres or 5.7 million acres were the proper amount of wilderness to designate. We are now trying to protect more than 600,000 acres in one county in Utah alone. The Emery County Commissioners should be commended for their foresight and vision in preparing this proposal. I hope that this legislation can become a model for future conflict resolutions.

Unfortunately, the shouting match over acreage has often drowned out the discussion over what types of protection were in order for these lands. I

doubt that there are few people who would debate the need to protect these lands. But too often in the past we have argued over the definition of what constitutes "protection." Unfortunately for some groups, a certain designation is the only method of acceptable protection. I urge those groups to look beyond the trees and see the forest for a change. Should these groups decide to come to the table, lend their considerable expertise to our efforts and try to reach a consensus, the first steps toward resolving the decades-old wilderness debate in Utah will have been taken.

I hope my colleagues will carefully review this legislation and support for this bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the San Rafael Swell National Heritage and Conservation Act. As a cosponsor of this measure, I applaud the efforts of my friend and colleague, Senator BENNETT, for bringing this matter before the United States Senate. This is a refreshing approach to managing public lands in the West.

This legislation reflects the ability of our citizens to make wise decisions about how land in their area should be used and protected. It is an article of our democracy that we recognize the prerogatives and preferences of citizens who are most affected by public policy. This measure gives citizens who live next to these lands a say as to what is right and appropriate for the land's management. I believe this initiative, which began locally at the grassroots level, is a cynosure for future land management decisions in the West.

Much more than simply protecting rocks and soil, this legislation safeguards wildlife and their habitat, cultural sites and artifacts, and Indian and Western heritage. This is not your standard one-size-fits-all land management plan. It provides for the conservation of this unique area, opting to encourage visitors not development.

Mr. President, the San Rafael Swell is an area of immense scenic beauty and cultural heritage. It was once the home to Native Americans who adorned the area with petroglyphs on the rock outcrops and canyon walls. What were once their dwellings are now significant archaeological sites scattered throughout the Swell. After the Indian tribes came explorers, trappers, and outlaws. In the 1870s, ranchers and cowboys came to the area and began grazing the land, managing it for its continued sustainability. Today, there are still citizens with roots in this long western tradition. These citizens understand the land; they understand conservation and preservation principles; and they want to see the land they love and depend on preserved for present and future generations.

First of all, Mr. President, this legislation sets up a National Heritage Area, the first of its kind west of the

Mississippi. In the new National Heritage Area, tourists will walk where Indians walked and where other outstanding historical figures such as Kit Carson, Chief Walker, Jedediah Smith, John Wesley Powell, Butch Cassidy, and John C. Fremont spent time. The area already boasts a number of fine museums, including the John Wesley Powell Museum, the Museum of the San Rafael, the College of Eastern Utah Prehistoric Museum, the Helper Mining Museum, and the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry. Consolidated under the new National Heritage Area, these important sites and museums will add a Western flavor to the already diverse network of existing National Heritage Areas in our nation.

Next, this legislation sets up one of our nation's most significant and dynamic conservation areas. The San Rafael Conservation Area will encompass the entire San Rafael Swell and protect approximately 1 million acres of scenic splendor. The area will be managed according to the same standards set by Congress for all other conservation areas. In fact, this legislation withdraws the entire San Rafael Swell from future oil drilling, logging, mining, and tar sands development. Moreover, the area will protect important paleontological resources including an area on the northern edge of the Swell known as the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry which was set aside in 1966 as a National Natural Landmark, preserving one of the largest sources of fossils in the New World.

Of particular interest, Mr. President, is the designation of the Desert Bighorn Sheep National Management Area. This provision ensures that our precious herd of bighorn sheep will continue to be monitored by state wildlife managers. The bill also provides strict protections to other resources in the area. Last but not least, Mr. President, this legislation formally designates certain areas within the Swell as wilderness.

This proposal preserves a portion of the West as it currently exists and allows for traditional uses, where appropriate, such as hunting, trapping, and fishing. It will foster the development and management of tourism in keeping with the overall goals of preservation. This management concept is one of multiple use and allows for the continuation of working landscapes including agriculture, irrigation, and ranching, which are a part of our Western tradition.

Mr. President, this initiative is compatible with local and regional needs, but it invites the world to come and enjoy the natural and historical treasures of the San Rafael Swell. I urge my colleagues to support this important citizens' initiative to preserve the San Rafael Swell.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 2387. A bill to confer and confirm Presidential authority to use force abroad, to set forth procedures governing the exercise of that authority, and thereby to facilitate cooperation between the President and Congress in decisions concerning the use or deployment of United States Armed Forces abroad in situations of actual or potential hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

USE OF FORCE ACT

• Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation designed to provide a framework for joint congressional-executive decision-making about the most solemn decision that a nation can make: to send men and women to fight and die for their country.

Entitled the "Use of Force Act," the legislation would replace the war powers resolution of 1973 with a new mechanism that, I hope, will be more effective than the existing statute.

Enacted nearly a quarter century ago, over the veto of President Nixon, the war powers resolution has enjoyed an unhappy fate—scorned by Presidents who questioned its constitutionality, and ignored by a Congress too timid to exercise its constitutional duty.

That was not, of course, the intent of its framers, who sought to improve executive-congressional cooperation on questions involving the use of force—and to remedy a dangerous constitutional imbalance.

This imbalance resulted from what I call the "monarchist" view of the war power—the thesis that the President holds nearly unlimited power to direct American forces into action.

The thesis is largely a product of the cold war and the nuclear age: the view that, at a time when the fate of the planet itself appeared to rest with two men thousands of miles apart, Congress had little choice, or so it was claimed but to cede tremendous authority to the executive.

This thesis first emerged in 1950, when President Truman sent forces to Korea without congressional authorization. It peaked twenty years later, in 1970, when President Nixon sent U.S. forces into Cambodia—also without congressional authorization, but this time accompanied by sweeping assertions of autonomous Presidential power.

President Nixon's theory was so extreme that it prompted the Senate to begin a search—a search led by Republican Jacob Javits and strongly supported by a conservative Democrat, John Stennis of Mississippi—for some means of rectifying the constitutional imbalance. That search culminated in the war powers resolution.

Unfortunately, the war powers resolution has failed to fulfill its objective. If anything, the monarchist view has become more deeply ingrained with the passage of time.

This trend was been on display throughout this decade. Before the Gulf war, for example, with half a million American forces standing ready in Saudi Arabia—a situation clearly requiring congressional authorization—President Bush still refused to concede that he required an act of Congress before using force. Only at the last minute, and only grudgingly, did President Bush seek congressional support. Even then, he continued to assert that he sought only support, refusing to concede that congressional authorization was a legal necessity.

Several years ago, the notion of broad executive power was claimed on the eve of a proposed invasion of Haiti—an invasion that, thankfully, was averted by a last-minute diplomatic initiative.

In 1994, officials of the Clinton administration characterized the Haiti operation as a mere “police action”—a semantic dodge designed to avoid congressional authorization—and a demonstration that the monarchist view prevails in the White House, without regard to political party.

And, most recently, the Clinton administration asserted that it had all the authority it needed to initiate a military attack against Iraq—though it never publicly elaborated on this supposed authority.

In this case, the question was not clear-cut—as it was in 1991. But two things emerged in the debate that reinforce the need for this legislation. First, it demonstrated that the executive instinct to find “sufficient legal authority” to use force is undiluted.

Second, it demonstrated that Congress often lacks the institutional will to carry out its responsibilities under the war power. Although there was strong consensus that a strong response was required to Saddam Hussein’s resistance to U.N. inspections, there was no consensus in this body about whether Congress itself should authorize military action. Lacking such a consensus, Congress did nothing.

Congress’ responsibilities could not be clearer. Article one, section eight, clause eleven of the Constitution grants to Congress the power “to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal and to make rules concerning captures on land and water.”

To the President, the Constitution provides in article two, section two the role of “Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.”

It may fairly be said that, with regard to many constitutional provisions, the Framers’ intent was ambiguous. But on the war power, both the contemporaneous evidence and the early construction of these clauses do not leave much room for doubt.

The original draft of the Constitution would have given to Congress the power to “make war.” At the Constitu-

tional Convention, a motion was made to change this to “declare war.” The reason for the change is instructive.

* At the Convention, James Madison and Elbridge Gerry argued for the amendment solely in order to permit the President the power “to repel sudden attacks.” Just one delegate, Pierce Butler of South Carolina, suggested that the President should be given the power to initiate war.

The rationale for vesting the power to launch war in Congress was simple. The Framers’ views were dominated by their experience with the British King, who had unfettered power to start wars. Such powers the Framers were determined to deny the President.

Even Alexander Hamilton, a staunch advocate of Presidential power, emphasized that the President’s power as Commander in Chief would be “much inferior” to the British King, amounting to “nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces,” while that of the British King “extends to declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by [the U.S.] Constitution, would appertain to the legislature.”

It is frequently contended by those who favor vast Presidential powers that Congress was granted only the ceremonial power to declare war. But the Framers had little interest, it seems, in the ceremonial aspects of war. The real issue was congressional authorization of war. As Hamilton noted in *Federalist* twenty-five, the “ceremony of a formal denunciation of war has of late fallen into disuse.”

The conclusion that Congress was given the power to initiate all wars, except to repel attacks on the United States, is also strengthened in view of the second part of the war clause: the power to “grant letters of marque and reprisal.”

An anachronism today, letters of marque and reprisal were licenses issued by governments empowering agents to seize enemy ships or take action on land short of all-out war. In essence, it was an eighteenth century version of what we now regarded as “limited war” or “police actions.”

The framers undoubtedly knew that reprisals, or “imperfect war,” could lead to an all-out war. England, for example, had fought five wars between 1652 and 1756 which were preceded by public naval reprisals.

Surely, those who met at Philadelphia—all learned men—knew and understood this history. Given this, the only logical conclusion is that the framers intended to grant to Congress the power to initiate all hostilities, even limited wars.

In sum, to accept the proposition that the war power is merely ceremonial, or applies only to “big wars,” is to read much of the war clause out of the Constitution. Such a reading is

supported neither by the plain language of the text, or the original intent of the framers.

Any doubt about the wisdom of relying on this interpretation of the intent of the framers is dispelled in view of the actions of early Presidents, early Congresses, and early Supreme Court decisions.

Our earliest Presidents were extremely cautious about encroaching on Congress’ power under the war clause.

For example, in 1793, the first President, George Washington, stated that offensive operations against an Indian tribe, the Creek Nation, depended on congressional action: “The Constitution vests the power of declaring war with Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they have deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure.”

During the Presidency of John Adams, the United States engaged in an undeclared naval war with France. But it bears emphasis that these military engagements were clearly authorized by Congress by a series of incremental statutes.

The naval war with France also yielded three important Supreme Court decisions regarding the scope of the war power.

In 1799, Congress authorized the President to intercept any U.S. vessels headed to France. President Adams subsequently ordered the Navy to seize any ships traveling to or from France.

The Supreme Court declared the seizure of a U.S. vessel traveling from France to be illegal—thus ruling that Congress had the power not only to authorize limited war, and but also to limit Presidential power to take military action.

The court ruled in two other cases bearing on the question of limited war. Wars, the Court said, even if “imperfect,” are nonetheless wars. In still another case, Chief Justice Marshall opined that “the whole powers of war [are] by the Constitution . . . vested in Congress . . . [which] may authorize general hostilities . . . or partial war.”

These precedents, and the historical record of actions taken by other early Presidents, have significantly more bearing on the meaning of the war clause than the modern era.

As Chief Justice Warren once wrote, “The precedential value of [prior practice] tends to increase in proportion to the proximity” to the constitutional convention.

Unfortunately, this constitutional history seems largely forgotten, and the doctrine of Presidential power that arose during the cold war remains in vogue.

To accept the status quo requires us to believe that the constitutional imbalance serves our nation well. But it can hardly be said that it does.

As matters now stand, Congress is denied its proper role in sharing in the

decision to commit American troops, and the President is deprived of the consensus to help carry this policy through.

I believe that only by establishing an effective war powers mechanism can we ensure that both of these goals are met. The question then is this: How to revise the war powers resolution in a manner that gains bipartisan support—and support of the executive?

In the past two decades, a premise has gained wide acceptance that the war powers resolution is fatally flawed. Indeed, there are flaws in the resolution but they need not have been fatal.

In 1988, determining that a review of the war powers resolution was in order, the Foreign Relations Committee established a special subcommittee to assume the task.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I conducted extensive hearings. Over the course of two months, the subcommittee heard from many distinguished witnesses: former President Ford, former Secretaries of State and Defense, former Joint Chiefs of Staff, former Members of Congress who drafted the war powers resolution, and many constitutional scholars.

At the end of that process, I wrote a law review article describing how the war powers resolution might be thoroughly rewritten to overcome its actual and perceived liabilities.

That effort provided the foundation for the legislation I introduced in the 104th Congress, and that I reintroduce today. The bill has many elements; I will briefly summarize it.

First, the bill replaces the war powers resolution with a new version. But I should make clear that I retain its central element: a time-clock mechanism that limits the President's power to use force abroad. That mechanism, it bears emphasis, was found to be unambiguously constitutional in a 1980 opinion issued by the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice.

It is often asserted that the time-clock provisions is "unworkable," or that it invites our adversaries to make a conflict so painful in the short run so as to induce timidity in the Congress.

But with or without a war powers law, American willingness to undertake sustained hostilities will always be subject to democratic pressures. A statutory mechanism is simply a means of delineating procedure.

And the procedure set forth in this legislation assures that if the President wants an early congressional vote on a use of force abroad, his congressional supporters can produce it.

Recent history tells us, of course, that the American people, as well as Congress, rally around the flag—and the Commander-in-Chief—in the early moments of a military deployment.

Second, my bill defuses the specter that a "timid Congress" can simply sit on its hands and permit the authority for a deployment to expire.

First, it establishes elaborate expedited procedures designed to ensure that a vote will occur. And it explicitly defeats the "timid Congress" specter by granting to the President the authority he has sought if these procedures nonetheless fail to produce a vote.

Thus, if the President requests authority for a sustained use of force—one outside the realm of emergency—and Congress fails to vote, the President's authority is extended indefinitely.

Third, the legislation delineates what I call the "going in" authorities for the President to use force. One fundamental weakness of the war powers resolution is that it fails to acknowledge powers that most scholars agree are inherent Presidential powers: to repel an armed attack upon the United States or its Armed Forces, or to rescue Americans abroad.

My legislation corrects this deficiency by enumerating five instances where the President may use force:

- (1) To repel attack on U.S. territory or U.S. forces;
- (2) To deal with urgent situations threatening supreme U.S. interests;
- (3) To extricate imperiled U.S. citizens;
- (4) To forestall or retaliate against specific acts of terrorism;
- (5) To defend against substantial threats to international sea lanes or airspace;

It may be that no such enumeration can be exhaustive. But the circumstances set forth would have sanctioned virtually every use of force by the United States since World War Two.

This concession of authority is circumscribed by the maintenance of the time-clock provision.

After sixty days have passed, the President's authority would expire, unless one of three conditions had been met:

- (1) Congress has declared war or enacted specific statutory authorization;
- (2) The President has requested authority for an extended use of force but Congress has failed to act on that request, notwithstanding the expedited procedures established by this act;
- (3) The President has certified the existence of an emergency threatening the supreme national interests of the United States.

The legislation also affirms the importance of consultation between the President and Congress and establishes a new means to facilitate it.

To overcome the common complaint that Presidents must contend with "535 Secretaries of State," the bill establishes a congressional leadership group with whom the President is mandated to consult on the use of force.

Another infirmity of the war powers resolution is that it fails to define "hostilities." Thus, Presidents fre-

quently engaged in a verbal gymnastics of insisting that "hostilities" were not "imminent"—even when hundreds of thousands of troops were positioned in the Arabian desert opposite Saddam's legions.

Therefore, the legislation includes a more precise definition of what constitutes a "use of force."

Finally, to make the statutory mechanism complete, the use of force act provides a means for judicial review. Because I share the reluctance of many of my colleagues to inject the judiciary into decisions that should be made by the political branches, this provision is extremely limited. It empowers a three-judge panel to decide only whether the time-clock mechanism has been triggered.

The bill contains a provision granting standing to Members of Congress, a door that the Supreme Court appears to have largely closed in the case of *Raines versus Byrd*—the line-item veto challenge brought by the senior Senator from West Virginia. I believe, notwithstanding the holding of that case, that a Member of Congress would suffer the concrete injury necessary to satisfy the standing requirement under article three of the Constitution.

The reason is this: The failure of the President to submit a use of force report would harm the ability of a Member of Congress to exercise a power clearly reposed in Congress under article one, section eight. That injury, I believe, should suffice in clearing the high hurdle on standing which the Court imposed in the *Byrd* case. No private individual can bring such a suit; if a Member of Congress cannot, then no one can.

I have no illusions that enacting this legislation will be easy. But I am determined to try.

The status quo—with Presidents asserting broad executive power, and Congress often content to surrender its constitutional powers—does not serve the American people well.

More fundamentally, it does not serve the men and women who risk their lives to defend our interests. For that, ultimately, must be the test of any war powers law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section-by-section analysis be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section-by-section analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. *Short Title.* The title of the bill is the "Use of Force Act (UFA)."

Section 2. *Table of Contents.*

Section 3. *Findings.* This section sets forth three findings regarding the need to provide a statutory framework to facilitate joint decisionmaking between Congress and the President regarding decisions to use force abroad.

Section 4. *Statement of Purpose.* The key phrase in this section is "confer and confirm Presidential authority." The Use of Force

Act is designed to bridge the long-standing—and, for all practical purposes, unresolvable—dispute over precisely what constitutes the President's "inherent" authority to use force. Whereas the War Powers Resolution purported to delineate the President's constitutional authority and to grant no more, the Use of Force Act sets forth a range of authorities that are practical for the modern age and sufficiently broad to subsume all presidential authorities deemed "inherent" by any reasonable constitutional interpretation.

Section 5. *Definitions.* This section defines a number of terms, including the term "use of force abroad," thus correcting a major flaw of the War Powers Resolution, which left undefined the term "hostilities."

As defined in the Use of Force Act, a "use of force abroad" comprises two prongs:

(1) a deployment of U.S. armed forces (either a new introduction of forces, a significant expansion of the U.S. military presence in a country, or a commitment to a new mission or objective); and

(2) the deployment is aimed at deterring an identified threat, or the forces deployed are incurring or inflicting casualties (or are operating with a substantial possibility of incurring or inflicting casualties).

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 101. *Authority and Governing Principles.* This section sets forth the Presidential authorities being "conferred and confirmed." Based on the Constitution and this Act, the President may use force—

(1) to repel an attack on U.S. territory or U.S. forces;

(2) to deal with urgent situations threatening supreme U.S. interests;

(3) to extricate imperiled U.S. citizens;

(4) to forestall or retaliate against specific acts of terrorism;

(5) to defend against substantial threats to international sea lanes or airspace.

Against a complaint that this list is excessively permissive, it should be emphasized that these are the President's initial authorities to undertake a use of force—so-called "going in" authorities—and that the "staying in" conditions set forth in section 104 will, in most cases, bear heavily on the President's original decision.

Section 102. *Consultation.* Section 102 affirms the importance of consultation between the President and Congress and establishes new means to facilitate it. To overcome the common complaint that Presidents must contend with "535 secretaries of state," the UFA establishes a Congressional Leadership Group with whom the President is mandated to consult on the use of force.

A framework of regular consultations between specified Executive branch officials and relevant congressional committees is also mandated in order to establish a "norm" of consultative interaction and in hope of overcoming what many find to be the overly theatrical public-hearing process that has superseded the more frank and informal consultations of earlier years.

Note: An alternative to the Use of Force Act is to repeal (or effectively repeal) the War Powers Resolution and leave in its place only a Congressional Leadership Group. (This is the essence of S.J. Res. 323, 100th Congress, legislation to amend the War Powers Resolution introduced by Senators Byrd, Warner, Nunn, and Mitchell in 1988.) This approach, which relies on "consultation and the Constitution," avoids the complexities of enacting legislation such as the UFA but fails to solve chronic problems of procedure or authority, leaving matters of process and

power to be debated anew as each crisis arises. In contrast, the Use of Force Act would perform one of the valuable functions of law, which is to guide individual and institutional behavior.

Section 103. *Reporting Requirements.* Section 103 requires that the President report in writing to the Congress concerning any use of force, not later than 48 hours after commencing a use of force abroad.

Section 104. *Conditions for Extended Use of Force.* Section 104 sets forth the "staying in" conditions: that is, the conditions that must be met if the President is to sustain a use of force he has begun under the authorities set forth in section 101. A use of force may extend beyond 60 days only if—

(1) Congress has declared war or enacted specific statutory authorization;

(2) the President has requested authority for an extended use of force but Congress has failed to act on that request (notwithstanding the expedited procedures established by Title II of this Act);

(3) the President has certified the existence of an emergency threatening the supreme national interests of the United States.

The second and third conditions are designed to provide sound means other than a declaration of war or the enactment of specific statutory authority by which the President may engage in an extended use of force. Through these conditions, the Use of Force Act avoids two principal criticisms of the War Powers Resolution: (1) that Congress could irresponsibly require a force withdrawal simply through inaction; and (2) that the law might, under certain circumstances, unconstitutionally deny the President the use of his "inherent" authority.

To defuse the specter of a President hamstrung by a Congress too timid or inept to face its responsibilities, the UFA uses two means: first, it establishes elaborate expedited procedures designed to ensure that a vote will occur; second, it explicitly defeats the "timid Congress" specter by granting to the President the authority he has sought if these procedures nonetheless fail to produce a vote. Thus, if the President requests authority for a sustained use of force—one outside the realm of emergency—and Congress fails to vote, the President's authority is extended indefinitely.

The final condition should satisfy all but proponents of an extreme "monarchist" interpretation under which the President has the constitutional authority to use force as he sees fit. Under all other interpretations, the concept of an "inherent" authority depends upon the element of emergency: the need for the President to act under urgent circumstances to defend the nation's security and its citizens. If so, the UFA protects any "inherent" presidential authority by affirming his ability to act for up to 60 days under the broad-ranging authorities in section 101 and, in the event he is prepared to certify an extended national emergency, to exercise the authority available to him through the final condition of section 104.

Section 105. *Measures Eligible for Congressional Priority Procedures.* This section establishes criteria by which joint and concurrent resolutions become eligible for the expedited procedures created by Title II of the UFA.

A joint resolution that declares war or provides specific statutory authorization—or one that terminates, limits, or prohibits a use of force—becomes eligible if it is introduced: (1) pursuant to a written request by the President to any one member of Congress; (2) if cosponsored by a majority of the

members of the Congressional Leadership Group in the house where introduced; or (3) if cosponsored by 30 percent of the members of either house. Thus, there is almost no conceivable instance in which a President can be denied a prompt vote: he need only ask one member of Congress to introduce a resolution on his behalf.

A concurrent resolution becomes eligible if it meets either of the cosponsorship criteria cited above and contains a finding that a use of force abroad began on a certain date, or has exceeded the 60 day limitation, or has been undertaken outside the authority provided by section 101, or is being conducted in a manner inconsistent with the governing principles set forth in section 101.

While having no direct legal effect, the passage of a concurrent resolution under the UFA could have considerable significance: politically, it would represent a clear, prompt, and formal congressional repudiation of a presidential action; within Congress, it would trigger parliamentary rules blocking further consideration of measures providing funds for the use of force in question (as provided by section 106 of the UFA); and juridically, it would become a consideration in any action brought by a member of Congress for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief (as envisaged by section 107 of the UFA).

Section 106. *Funding Limitations.* This section prohibits the expenditure of funds for any use of force inconsistent with the UFA. Further, this section exercises the power of Congress to make its own rules by providing that a point of order will lie against any measure containing funds to perpetuate a use of force that Congress, by concurrent resolution, has found to be illegitimate.

Section 107. *Judicial Review.* This section permits judicial review of any action brought by a Member of Congress on the grounds that the UFA has been violated. It does so by—

(1) granting standing to any Member of Congress who brings suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia;

(2) providing that neither the District Court nor the Supreme Court may refuse to make a determination on the merits based on certain judicial doctrines, such as political question or ripeness (doctrines invoked previously by courts to avoid deciding cases regarding the war power);

(3) prescribing the judicial remedies available to the District Court; and

(4) creating a right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court and encouraging expeditious consideration of such appeal.

It bears emphasis that the remedy prescribed is modest, and does not risk unwarranted interference of the judicial branch in a decision better reposed in the political branches. It provides that the matter must be heard by a three-judge panel; one of these judges must be a circuit judge. Additionally, the power of the court is extremely limited: it may only declare that the 60-day period set forth in Section 104 has begun.

In 1997, the Supreme Court held, in *Raines v. Byrd*, that Members of Congress did not have standing to challenge an alleged constitutional violation under the Line-Item Veto Act. That case might be read to suggest that a Member of Congress can never attain standing. But such a conclusion would be unwarranted. First, the Court made clear in *Raines* that an explicit grant of authority to bring a suit eliminates any "prudential" limitations on standing. *Raines v. Byrd*, 521 U.S. ___, ___, n.3 (1997) (slip op., at 8, n.3). Second, a more recent decision of the Court

suggests that a Member of Congress could attain "constitutional standing" (that is, meet the "case or controversy" requirements of Article III) in just the sort of case envisaged by the Use of Force Act. In *Federal Election Commission v. Akins*, a case decided on June 1, 1998, the Court permitted standing in a case where the plaintiffs sought to require the Federal Election Commission (FEC) to treat an organization as a "political committee," which then would have triggered public disclosure of certain information about that organization. The Court held that standing would be permitted where the plaintiff "fails to obtain information which must be publicly disclosed pursuant to statute." A case under the Use of Force Act would be analogous—in that the plaintiff Members of Congress would seek information in a "Use of Force Report" required to be submitted to Congress by Section 103(a). Such information, quite obviously, would be essential to Members of Congress in the exercise of their constitutional powers under the war clause of the Constitution (Article I, Section 8, Clause 11), a power they alone possess.

Section 108. *Interpretation.* This section clarifies several points of interpretation, including these: that authority to use force is not derived from other statutes or from treaties (which create international obligations but not authority in a domestic, constitutional context); and that the failure of Congress to pass any joint or concurrent resolution concerning a particular use of force may not be construed as indicating congressional authorization or approval.

Section 109. *Severability.* This section stipulates that certain sections of the UFA would be null and void, and others not affected, if specified provisions of the UFA were held by the Courts to be invalid.

Section 110. *Repeal of War Powers Resolution.* Section 110 repeals the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

TITLE II—EXPEDITED PROCEDURES

Section 201. *Priority Procedures.* Section 201 provides for the expedited parliamentary procedures that are integral to the functioning of the Act. (These procedures are drawn from the war powers legislation cited earlier, introduced by Senator Robert Byrd *et al.* in 1988.)

Section 202. *Repeal of Obsolete Expedited Procedures.* Section 202 repeals other expedited procedures provided for in existing law.●

By Mr. DORGAN.

S. 2388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion for gain from the sale of farmland which is similar to the exclusion from gain on the sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Finance.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE EXCLUSION FOR GAIN FROM THE SALE OF FARMLAND

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, a new and disastrous farm crisis is roaring through the Upper Midwest. Family farmers are under severe assault and many of them are simply not making it. It's not their fault. It's just that the combination of bad weather, crop disease, low yield, low prices and bad federal farm policy is too much to handle. Under the current federal farm law there is no price safety net. Farmers are—as they were in the 1930's—at the mercy of forces much bigger than they are.

The exodus occurring from family farms in the Upper Midwest is heart-breaking and demands the immediate attention of this Congress. We need to address this problem both within the farm program and in other policy areas as well.

For example, Mr. President, there's a fundamental flaw in the tax code that we need to fix. It adds insult to injury for many of these farmers. You see, too often, these family farmers are not able to take full advantage of the \$500,000 capital gains tax break that city folks get when they sell their homes. Once family farmers have been beaten down and forced to sell the farm they've farmed for generations, they get a rude awakening. Many of them discover, as they leave the farm, that Uncle Sam is waiting for them at the end of the lane with a big tax bill.

One of the most popular provisions included in last year's major tax bill permits families to exclude from federal income tax up to \$500,000 of gain from the sale of their principal residences. That's a good deal, especially for most urban and suburban dwellers who have spent many years paying for their houses, and who regard their houses as both a home and a retirement account. For many middle income families, their home is their major financial asset, an asset the family can draw on in retirement. House prices in major growth markets such as Washington, D.C., New York, or California may start at hundreds of thousands of dollars. As a result, the urban dwellers who have owned their homes through many years of appreciation can often benefit from a large portion of this new \$500,000 capital gains tax exclusion. Unfortunately this provision, as currently applied, is virtually useless to family farmers.

For farm families, their farm is their major financial asset. Unfortunately, family farmers under current law receive little or no benefit from the new \$500,000 exclusion because the IRS separates the value of their homes from the value of the farmland the homes sit on. As people from my state of North Dakota know, houses out on the farmsteads of rural America are more commonly sold for \$5,000 to \$40,000. Most farmers plow any profits they make into the whole farm rather than into a house that will hold little or no value when the farm is sold. It's not surprising that the IRS often judges that homes far out in the country have very little value and thus farmers receive much less benefit from this \$500,000 exclusion than do their urban and suburban counterparts. As a result, the capital gain exclusion is little or no help to farmers who are being forced out of business. They may immediately face a hefty capital gains tax bill from the IRS.

This is simply wrong, Mr. President. It is unfair. Federal farm policy helped

create the hole that many of these farmers find themselves in. Federal tax policy shouldn't dig the hole deeper as they attempt to shovel their way out.

The legislation that I'm introducing today recognizes the unique character and role of our family farmers and their important contributions to our economy. It expands the \$500,000 capital gains tax exclusion for sales of principal residences to cover family farmers who sell their farmhouses or surrounding farmland, so long as they are actively engaged in farming prior to the sales. In this way, farmers may get some benefit from a tax break that would otherwise be unavailable to them.

I fully understand that this legislation is not a cure-all for financial hardships that are ailing our farm communities. This legislation is just one of a number of policy initiatives we can use to ease the pain for family farmers as we pursue other initiatives to help turn around the crippled farm economy.

Again, my legislation would expand the \$500,000 tax exclusion for principle residences to cover the entire farm. Specifically, the provision will allow a family or individual who has actively engaged in farming prior to the farm sale to exclude the gain from the sale up to the \$500,000 maximum.

What does this relief mean to the thousands of farmers who are being forced to sell off the farm due to current economic conditions?

Take, for example, a farmer who is forced to leave today because of crop disease and slumping grain prices and sells his farmstead that his family has operated for decades. If he must report a gain of \$10,000 on the sale of farm house, that is all he can exclude under current law. But if, for example, he sold 1000 acres surrounding the farm house for \$400,000, and the capital gain was \$200,000, he would be subject to \$40,000 tax on that gain. Again, my provision excludes from tax the gain on the farmhouse and land up to the \$500,000 maximum that is otherwise available to a family on the sale of its residence.

We must wage, on every federal and state policy front, the battle to stem the loss of family farmers. Tax provisions have grown increasingly important as our farm families deal with drought, floods, diseases and price swings.

I believe that Congress should move quickly to pass this legislation and other meaningful measures to help get working capital into the hands of our family farmers in the Great Plains. Let's stop penalizing farmers who are forced out of agriculture. Let's allow farmers to benefit from the same kind of tax exclusion that most homeowners already receive. This is the right thing to do. And it's the fair thing to do.●

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 2389. A bill to strengthen the rights of workers to associate, organize and strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

FAIR LABOR ORGANIZING ACT

• Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill, the Fair Labor Organizing Act, to strengthen the basic rights of workers freely to associate, organize and to join a union. The bill would address significant shortcomings in the National Labor Relations Act. These shortcomings amount to impediments to one of the most fundamental ways that working people can seek to improve their own and their families' standard of living and quality of life, which is to join, belong to and participate in a union.

Mr. President, in the past few years, working men and women across the country have been fighting and organizing with a new energy. They are fighting for better health care, pensions, a living wage, better education policy and fairer trade policy. They also are fighting and organizing to ensure that they have the opportunity to be represented by a union through which they can collectively bargain with their employers. Much of this organizing is taking place among sectors of the workforce, and among portions of our working population, that have not previously been organized. I think these new efforts are part of what really is a new civil rights and human rights struggle in our country. It is an important and positive historical development. There is probably no clearer indication that the impact of this development is being felt, and that many of these efforts are succeeding, than some of the attacks in the current Congress on unions representing the country's working people.

Why have we seen so many bills with Orwellian titles such as the TEAM Act, which has little to do with employer-employee teamwork and a lot more to do with company-dominated labor organizations? Such as the "Family Friendly Workplace Act," which really isn't family friendly, but would reduce working families' pay and undercut the 40-hour workweek? Such as the so-called SAFE Act, which doesn't promote safety but actually would roll back well-established and necessary OSHA protections?

Why does the majority in Congress seem so desperate to single out unions to suppress their political activities at the same time they maneuver to kill genuine political campaign finance reform?

It is because unions are succeeding. That is a good thing because in my view, when organized labor fights for job security, for dignity, justice and for a fair share of America's prosperity, it is not a struggle merely for their own benefit. The gains of unionized workers

on basic bread and butter issues are key to the economic security of all working families.

How can it be that as many as 10,000 Americans lose their jobs each year for supporting union organizing when the National Labor Relations Act already supposedly prohibits the firing of an employee to deny his or her right to freely organize or join a union? If more than four in 10 workers who are not currently in a union say they would join one if they had the opportunity, why aren't there more opportunities? Since we know that union workers earn up to one-third more than non-union workers and are more likely to have pensions and health benefits, why aren't more workers unionized when the new labor movement is correctly focused on organizing?

The answer to these basic questions is this: we need labor law reform. We need to improve the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

The Fair Labor Organizing Act would achieve three basic goals. First, it would help employees make fully informed, free decisions about union representation. Second, it would expand the remedies available to wrongfully discharged employees. Third, it would require mediation and arbitration when employers and employees fail to reach a collective bargaining agreement on their own.

It is late in the current Congress. My bill may not receive full consideration or be enacted into law this year. But I believe it is important to set a standard and place a marker. Workers across America are fighting for their rights, and many are finding that the playing field is tilted against them. The NLRA does not fully allow them fair opportunity to speak freely, to associate, organize and join a union, even though that is its intended purpose. I have walked some picket lines during the past two years. I have joined in solidarity with workers seeking to organize. I have called on employers to bargain in good faith with their employees during disputes. I intend to continue doing so, and I urge colleagues to do the same. At the same time, it is clear to nearly any organizer and to many workers who have sought to join a union that the rules in crucial ways are stacked against them. My bill seeks to address that fact.

First, it is a central tenet of U.S. labor policy that employees should be free to make informed and free decisions about union representation. Yet, union organizers have limited access to employees while employers have unfettered access. Employers have daily contact with employees. They may distribute written materials about unions. They may require employees to attend meetings where they present their views on union representation. They may talk to employees one-on-one about how they view union representa-

tion. On the other hand, union organizers are restricted from worksites and even public areas.

If we want people to make independent, informed decisions about whether they should be represented by a union, then we have to give them equal access to both sides of the story. This bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide equal time to labor organizations to provide information about union representation. Equal time. That means that an employer would trigger the equal time provision that this bill would insert into the NLRA by expressing opinions on union representation during work hours or at the worksite. The provision would give a union equal time to use the same media used by the employer to distribute information, and would allow the union access to the worksite to communicate with employees.

The second reform in the bill would toughen penalties for wrongful discharge violations. It would require the National Labor Relations Board to award back pay equal to 3 times the employee's wages when the Board finds that an employee is discharged as a result of an unfair labor practice. It also would allow employees to file civil actions to recover punitive damages when they have been discharged as a result of an unfair labor practice.

Third, the bill would put in place mediation and arbitration procedures to help employers and employees reach mutually agreeable first-contract collective bargaining agreements. It would require mediation if the parties cannot reach agreement on their own after 60 days. Should the parties not reach agreement 30 days after a mediator is selected, then either party could call in the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service for binding arbitration. I believe that this proposal represents a balanced solution—one that would help both parties reach agreements they can live with. It gives both parties incentive to reach genuine agreement without allowing either side to indefinitely hold the other hostage to unrealistic proposals.

Mr. President, this bill would be a step toward fairness for working families in America. The proposals are not new. I hope my colleagues will support the bill. •

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S. 2391. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to initiate an investigation under section 702 of the Tariff Act of 1930 of methyl tertiary butyl ether imported from Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Finance.

FAIR TRADE IN MTBE ACT OF 1998

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce legislation designed to combat unfairly traded imports of methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) from Saudi Arabia. MTBE is an oxygenated fuel additive derived from methanol.

Through the wintertime oxygenated fuels program to reduce carbon monoxide pollution and through the reformulated gasoline program to reduce emissions of toxics and ozone-causing chemicals, we have created considerable demand in this nation for oxygenated fuels, such as MTBE, ETBE and ethanol. It has been my hope that this demand could be met with domestically-produced oxygenates, thereby reducing our dependence on foreign imports and expanding economic opportunities at home. Unfortunately, this goal has not been achieved, in large part because of a substantial expansion of subsidized MTBE imports from Saudi Arabia.

Mr. President, I am a supporter of free trade when it is also fair trade. However, there has been a marked surge in MTBE imports from Saudi Arabia in recent years that does not reflect the natural outcome of market-based competition.

These imports appear to be driven by a pattern of government subsidies. Not only is this increasing our dependence on foreign suppliers, but it is unfairly harming domestic oxygenate producers and those who provide the raw materials for these oxygenates, such as America's farmers.

The Saudi government has made no secret of its desire to expand domestic industrial capacity of methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE). In particular, several years ago, there were public reports that the Saudi government promised investors a 30% discount relative to world prices on the feedstock raw materials used in the production of MTBE. The feedstock is the major cost component of MTBE production, and the Saudi government decree has apparently translated into a nearly -30% artificial cost advantage to Saudi-based producers and exporters.

Moreover, it appears that this blatant subsidy is in large measure responsible for the increase in Saudi MTBE exports to the United States in recent years. These exports have not only reduced the U.S. market share of American producers of MTBE, ETBE, and ethanol, but also has discouraged new capital investment, thereby depriving American workers, farmers, and investors of a significant share of the economic activity that Congress contemplated when it drafted the oxygenated fuel requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Mr. President, I believe it is high time for the United States government to respond to the Saudi government's subsidies. Saudi Arabia is a valued ally; however, our bond of friendship should not be a justification for turning a blind eye to an unfair element of our otherwise mutually beneficial trading relationship.

Because it is not a member of the World Trade Organization nor a party to its Agreement on Subsidies and

Countervailing Measures, the Saudi government may not feel constrained by the international trade rules by which we legally are required to abide. This does not mean, however, that we must stand idly by while foreign subsidies undermine an important sector of our economy.

For this reason, my bill would require the Secretary of Commerce to self-initiate an investigation under Section 702 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to determine whether a countervailable subsidy has been provided with respect to Saudi Arabian exports of methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE). If the Secretary finds that a subsidy has indeed been provided to Saudi producers, he would be required under the terms of our existing law to impose an import duty in the amount necessary to offset the subsidy. Because Saudi Arabia is not a member of the WTO, there would be no requirement for a demonstration of injury to the domestic industry as a result of the subsidy.

Let's talk for a moment about what is at stake here for American consumers. Last year, I asked the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) to assess the impact on U.S. oil imports of the Reformulated Gasoline (RFG) program that was created by Congress in 1991. The GAO found that the U.S. RFG program has already resulted in over 250,000 barrels per day less imported petroleum due to the addition of oxygenates like ethanol, ETBE and MTBE. That means, at an average of \$20 spent per barrel of imported oil, we currently save nearly \$2 billion per year due to domestically produced oxygenates.

The GAO further found that, if all gasoline in the U.S. were reformulated (compared to the current 35%), the U.S. would import 777,000 fewer barrels of oil per day. That is more than \$5.5 billion per year that would not be flowing to foreign oil producers and could be reinvested in the United States.

This is not "pie-in-the-sky" theory. Ethanol production and domestically produced MTBE can reduce oil imports and strengthen our economy. In rural America, for example, new ethanol and ETBE plants will be built, so long as we wise up and create a level playing field against subsidized Saudi competition.

Phase II of the Clean Air Act's reformulated gasoline program (RFG) requires transportation fuels to meet even tougher emissions standards starting in the year 2000. That gasoline market is growing, with demand for ethanol, ETBE and MTBE in 2005 estimated to be 300,000 barrels per day. Unless we act to ensure that American-made oxygenated fuels can compete in American fuels markets, we stand to cede those markets to subsidized Saudi Arabian MTBE.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that my legislation will help level the playing

field for American producers of ethanol, ETBE and MTBE and add new economic vitality to their associated communities of workers, farmers, and business owners. I urge my colleagues to give it serious consideration and to enact it as soon as possible so that we may begin the process of bringing fairness back into the realm of international trade in oxygenated fuels.

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. 2391

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 "Fair Trade in MTBE Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Section 814 of Public Law 101-549 (commonly referred to as the "Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990") expressed the sense of Congress that every effort should be made to purchase and produce American-made reformulated gasoline and other clean fuel products.

(2) Since the passage of the Clean Air Amendments Act of 1990, Saudi Arabia has added substantial industrial capacity for the production of methyl tertiary butyl ether (in this Act referred to as "MTBE").

(3) The expansion of Saudi Arabian production capacity has been stimulated by government subsidies, notably in the form of a governmental decree guaranteeing Saudi Arabian MTBE producers a 30 percent discount relative to world prices on feedstock.

(4) The expansion of subsidized Saudi Arabian production has been accompanied by a major increase in Saudi Arabian MTBE exported to the United States.

(5) The subsidized Saudi Arabian MTBE exports have reduced the market share of American producers of MTBE, ETBE, and ethanol, as well as discouraged capital investment by American producers.

(6) Saudi Arabia is not a member of the World Trade Organization and is not subject to the terms and conditions of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures negotiated as part of the Uruguay Round Agreements.

SEC. 3. INITIATION OF COUNTERVAILING DUTY INVESTIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the administering authority shall initiate an investigation pursuant to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) to determine if the necessary elements exist for the imposition of a duty under section 701 of such Act with respect to the importation into the United States of MTBE from Saudi Arabia.

(b) ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY.—For purposes of this section, the term "administering authority" has the meaning given such term by section 771(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(1)).

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. ROBB) (by request):

S. 2392. A bill to encourage the disclosure and exchange of information

about computer processing problems and related matters in connection with the transition to the Year 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

YEAR 2000 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT

• **Mr. BENNETT.** Mr. President, today I introduce, by request of President Bill Clinton, the Administration's "Good Samaritan" legislation referred to as the "Year 2000 Information Disclosure Act".

I want to thank the White House for joining Vice Chairman DODD and the rest of the members of the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem in the debate on how to promote the flow of information on Year 2000 readiness throughout the private sector. The Administration's recognition of this problem, the fear of law suits and its stifling effect on companies' willingness to disclose helpful Y2K information, is invaluable in helping all of us deal with this national crisis.

The existing legal framework clearly discourages the sharing of critical information between private sector companies. The President's bill attempts to limit the legal liability of corporations and other organizations who in good faith openly share information about computer and technology processing problems and related matters in connection with the transition to the Year 2000. We welcome the thoughtful ideas of the White House and the hard work of the Office of Management and Budget, as well as John Koskinen, the Chairman of the President's Council on Year 2000 Conversion.

President Clinton's proposal represents a good starting point from which to begin the process of addressing the critical need for private sector information sharing announced in his speech before the National Sciences Foundation on Tuesday, July 14.

The Senate Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, which I chair, has to date held hearings on Year 2000 problems in several industry sectors including energy utilities, financial institutions, and health care. This Friday, July 31, the Committee will hold its fourth hearing the subject of which will be the telecommunications industry. In each of the prior hearings, it has become increasingly evident that the fear of legal liability has proven to be the single biggest deterrent to the open sharing of Year 2000 information. With just over 500 days remaining before the Year 2000 problem manifests itself in full, we must do everything we can to encourage the sharing of vital Year 2000 information. Through this sharing, organizations can save valuable time and resources in addressing their Year 2000 problems.

But, we must be careful to pass meaningful legislation that will indeed encourage disclosure and sharing of Year 2000 information. For example, small companies which cannot afford

to do all of their own testing and who, for the most part, are not as knowledgeable about where the dangers of the Y2K bug may appear are significant elements of our economy and their Y2K failures could have devastating impacts on those who depend on their services.

We look forward to hearing the input of those companies and individuals who are affected both as plaintiffs and defendants. To be of value, we must pass legislation this year. To that end, we will be working closely with the administration, and with Senators HATCH and LEAHY of the Judiciary Committee which has the primary jurisdiction for this legislation.●

• **Mr. MOYNIHAN.** Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators ROBERT F. BENNETT (R-UT) and CHRISTOPHER DODD (D-CT) today as original cosponsors of President Clinton's "Year 2000 (Y2K) Information Disclosure Act." This legislation is intended to promote the open sharing of information about Y2K solutions by protecting those who share information in good faith from liability claims based on exchanges of information. As the President stated in his speech at the National Academy of Sciences on July 14, 1998, the purpose of this legislation is to "guarantee that businesses which share information about their readiness with the public or with each other, and do it honestly and carefully, cannot be held liable for the exchange of that information if it turns out to be inaccurate."

The open sharing of information on the Y2K problem will play a significant role in preparing the nation and the world for the millennial malady. I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation. There is no time to waste.●

• **Mr. DODD.** Mr. President, today I join with Senator ROBERT BENNETT, the chairman of the Senate Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, to introduce, at the request of the President of the United States, "The Year 2000 Information Disclosure Act." We are joined in this introduction by Senators MOYNIHAN, KOHL, and ROBB.

It should be clear to even the most disinterested observer that we are facing a serious economic challenge in form of the Year 2000 computer problem. There is little doubt that the millennium conversion will have a significant impact on the economy; the outstanding question is how large that impact will be.

One of the most relevant factors in assessing the potential impact of this problem is the expected readiness of small and medium sized businesses to deal with this issue. Many of the nation's largest corporations are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to prepare for Year 2000 conversion: Citibank is spending \$600 million, Aetna is spending more than \$125 mil-

lion, and the list goes on and on. However, it is not so clear that small and medium sized businesses are approaching the problem with similar vigor.

As a result, it is my opinion that it will become increasingly necessary for those companies that have successfully completed remediation and are now testing to be able to share those results with other companies that might not be as far along. It will be an increasing national economic priority to use all the tools available to help businesses and government entities meet the millennium deadline, and encouraging the sharing of information that can cut precious weeks off the time it takes to get ready will be essential.

I agree with the statements of President Clinton that companies that make such voluntary disclosures should not be punished for those disclosures with frivolous or abusive lawsuits. It is to address that concern that the President has requested that Senator BENNETT and I introduce his legislation.

I also agree with the President's analysis that in order for this information-sharing to be effective, it must start to take place as soon as possible. Sharing information about non-compliant systems six, eight, or twelve months from now will be of limited value to all concerned.

Some questions have emerged in the press as to the scope of this legislation. The fact is that there are very few weeks left in this session, and therefore the broader the bill, the more difficult it will be to pass. Therefore, if we are intent on providing protection for voluntary disclosures on Year 2000, it will be very hard to add to that provisions dealing with other aspects of Year 2000 liability. While I believe that concerns on underlying liability are real and meaningful, there is little question that dealing with any liability issues is always a controversial and lengthy process. So as we move forward with the concept of a safe harbor for voluntary disclosure, I hope that we can do so without encumbering that legislation with these larger and contentious issues regarding liability.

President Clinton has given us an excellent starting point for discussing these important issues. I look forward to working with all my colleagues in the weeks remaining to craft final legislation that addresses these issues in a meaningful and constructive manner.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 230

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 230, a bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the Hobbs Act), and for other purposes.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr.

MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive military retired pay concurrently with veterans' disability compensation.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 5-year extension of the credit for producing electricity from wind and closed-loop biomass.

S. 1759

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMBERS), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 1759, a bill to grant a Federal charter to the American GI Forum of the United States.

S. 1877

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1877, a bill to remove barriers to the provision of affordable housing for all Americans.

S. 1905

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1905, a bill to provide for equitable compensation for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes.

S. 1959

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1959, a bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds to provide or support programs to provide individuals with hypodermic needles or syringes for the use of illegal drugs.

S. 1960

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1960, a bill to allow the National Park Service to acquire certain land for addition to the Wilderness Battlefield, as previously authorized by law, by purchase or exchange as well as by donation.

S. 2061

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2061, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit transfers or discharges of residents of nursing facilities.

S. 2071

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2071, a bill to extend a quarterly financial report program administered by the Secretary of Commerce.

S. 2086

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2086, a bill to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National Monument.

S. 2161

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2161, a bill to provide Government-wide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 2213

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2213, a bill to allow all States to participate in activities under the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Act.

S. 2217

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2217, a bill to provide for continuation of the Federal research investment in a fiscally sustainable way, and for other purposes.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2233, a bill to amend section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the placed in service date for biomass and coal facilities.

S. 2295

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2295, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations of appropriations for that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2308

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

2308, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit transfers or discharges of residents of nursing facilities as a result of a voluntary withdrawal from participation in the medicaid program.

S. 2318

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2318, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period.

S. 2344

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2344, a bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to provide for the advance payment, in full, of the fiscal year 1999 payments otherwise required under production flexibility contracts.

At the request of Mr. BROWBACK, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2344, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2344, *supra*.

S. 2352

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2352, a bill to protect the privacy rights of patients.

S. 2354

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2354, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to impose a moratorium on the implementation of the per beneficiary limits under the interim payment system for home health agencies, and to modify the standards for calculating the per visit cost limits and the rates for prospective payment systems under the medicare home health benefit to achieve fair reimbursement payment rates, and for other purposes.

S. 2359

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2359, a bill to amend the National Environmental Education Act to extend the programs under the Act, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 83

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 83, a concurrent resolution remembering the life of

George Washington and his contributions to the Nation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 108

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 108, a concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 199

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 199, a resolution designating the last week of April of each calendar year as "National Youth Fitness Week."

AMENDMENT NO. 3124

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 3124 proposed to S. 2132, an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3338

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON his name was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 3338 proposed to H.R. 1151, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to clarify existing law and ratify the longstanding policy of the National Credit Union Administration Board with regard to field of membership of Federal credit unions.

AMENDMENT NO. 3388

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON his name was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 3388 proposed to S. 2312, an original bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3389

At the request of Mr. KERREY the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3389 proposed to S. 2312, an original bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 114—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF BOTH HOUSES

Mr. LOTT submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 114

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in consonance with section 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Friday, July 31, 1998, Saturday, August 1, 1998, or Sunday, August 2, 1998, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, August 31 or Tuesday, September 1, 1998, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, August 7, 1998, it stand adjourned until noon on Wednesday, September 9, 1998, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 115—TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING OF COPIES OF THE PUBLICATION ENTITLED "THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. WARNER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 115

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) a revised edition of the publication entitled "The United States Capitol" (referred to as "the pamphlet") shall be reprinted as a Senate document.

(b) There shall be printed 2,000,000 copies of the pamphlet in the English language at a cost not to exceed \$100,000 for distribution as follows:

(1)(A) 206,000 copies of the publication for the use of the Senate with 2,000 copies distributed to each Member;

(B) 886,000 copies of the publication for the use of the House of Representatives, with 2,000 copies distributed to each Member; and

(C) 908,000 of the publication for distribution to the Capitol Guide Service; or

(2) if the total printing and production costs of copies in paragraph (1) exceed \$100,000, such number of copies of the publication as does not exceed total printing and production costs of \$100,000, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as in paragraph (1).

(c) In addition to the copies printed pursuant to subsection (b), there shall be printed at a total printing and production cost of not to exceed \$70,000—

(1) 50,000 copies of the pamphlet in each of the following 5 languages: German, French, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese; and

(2) 100,000 copies of the pamphlet in Spanish; to be distributed to the Capitol Guide Service.

SENATE RESOLUTION 260—DESIGNATING "NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DAY"

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DODD, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. KOHL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 260

Whereas the people of the United States should celebrate children as the most valuable asset of the Nation;

Whereas children represent the future, hope, and inspiration of the United States;

Whereas the children of the United States should be allowed to feel that their ideas and dreams will be respected because adults in the United States take time to listen;

Whereas many children of the United States face crises of grave proportions, especially as they enter adolescent years;

Whereas it is important for parents to spend time listening to their children on a daily basis;

Whereas modern societal and economic demands often pull the family apart;

Whereas encouragement should be given to families to set aside a special time for all family members to engage together in family activities;

Whereas adults in the United States should have an opportunity to reminisce on their youth and to recapture some of the fresh insight, innocence, and dreams that they may have lost through the years;

Whereas the designation of a day to commemorate the children of the United States will provide an opportunity to emphasize to children the importance of developing an ability to make the choices necessary to distance themselves from impropriety and to contribute to their communities;

Whereas the designation of a day to commemorate the children of the Nation will emphasize to the people of the United States the importance of the role of the child within the family and society;

Whereas the people of the United States should emphasize to children the importance of family life, education, and spiritual qualities; and

Whereas children are the responsibility of all Americans and everyone should celebrate the children of the United States, whose questions, laughter, and tears are important to the existence of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) It is the sense of the Senate that October 11, 1998, should be designated as "National Children's Day"; and

(2) The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe "National Children's Day" with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I submit a resolution that designated October 11, 1998 as National Children's Day.

Our children are our future. Over 5 million children, however, go hungry at some point each month. There has been a 60 percent increase in the number of children needing foster care in the last 10 years. Many children today face crises of grave proportions, especially as they enter their adolescent years.

The establishment of a National Children's Day would help us focus on our children's needs and recognize their accomplishments. It would encourage families to spend more quality time together and highlight the special importance of the child in the family unit.

It is important that we show our support for the youth of America. This simple resolution will foster family togetherness and ensure that our children receive the attention they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to join me in establishing National Children's Day. •

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—TO PRIVATIZE THE SENATE BARBER AND BEAUTY SHOPS AND THE SENATE RESTAURANTS

Mr. BROWNBACK submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 261

Resolved, That (a) the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall convert the Senate barber shop and Senate beauty shop to operation by a private sector source under contract.

(b) The Architect of the Capitol shall convert the Senate restaurants to operation by a private sector source under contract.

SENATE RESOLUTION 262—TO STATE THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES SHOULD PLACE A PRIORITY ON FORMULATING A COMPREHENSIVE AND STRATEGIC POLICY WITH JAPAN IN ADVANCING SCIENCE

Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 262

Whereas, advances in science and technology will continue to underlie the prosperity and security of the United States and the international community into the next century;

Whereas, the United States and Japan are global leaders in science and technology;

Whereas, the rapid pace of innovation creates growing linkages between science and technology and bilateral relations in security and trade;

Whereas, the Government of Japan, through its 1996 Basic Plan for Science and Technology, made science and technology a

higher priority area of investment for the Government of Japan;

Whereas, the Supplemental Budget of the Government of Japan for 1998 will result in more than a 21 percent increase in the Government of Japan's support for science and technology this year;

Whereas, advances in Japanese science and technology are increasingly at the global frontier;

Whereas, cooperation between the United States and Japan in science and technology holds the promise of better assuring human health and nutrition, enhancing the quality of the environment, lessening the impact of natural and man-made disasters, providing for more productive agriculture, stimulating discoveries in the basic processes of life and matter, expanding supplies of energy, furthering advances in space exploration, improving manufacturing processes, and strengthening communications through electronic language translation;

Whereas, productive collaboration with Japan has increased due to negotiated frameworks such as the bilateral Agreement for Cooperation in Science and Technology and efforts by the Government of Japan to invite larger numbers of U.S. scientists to participate in university, government and industrial research in Japan;

Whereas, the flow of science and technology from the United States to Japan is nonetheless still larger than the reverse due partly to barriers Japan has erected to the outward flow of scientific and technological information and data, as well as barriers to the inward flow of foreign investment and foreign participation in industrial organizations such as consortia and associations;

Whereas, the application of rigorous scientific methods to the development of standards and regulations can help mitigate certain market access and trade problems;

Whereas, Japan's treatment of scientific and technological advances continues to handicap U.S. innovators in Japan due to inadequate intellectual property protection;

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

(1) The Government of the United States should place priority on formulating a comprehensive and strategic policy of engaging and cooperating with Japan in advancing science and technology for the benefit of both nations as well as the rest of the world;

(2) Among other goals, that policy should aim to promote strategic cooperation on areas that further U.S. policy interests in science and technology; more balanced flows of scientific and technological information and personnel between the United States and Japan; more rigorous application of scientific methods in the development of standards and regulations to promote efficient technological progress and mitigate trade problems; and more equitable intellectual property protection; and

(3) The Government of the United States should integrate this strategic policy into current and future science and technology agreements with the Government of Japan.

• Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Mr. BINGAMAN to submit a resolution to state the sense of the Senate that the Governments of the United States and Japan should place priority on formulating a comprehensive and strategic policy of advancing science and technology for the benefit of both nations as well as the rest of the world.

As this body is well aware, Japan is facing a number of economic and finan-

cial challenges that are of vital importance to the bilateral relationship. I have spoken about these challenges at length in other fora including through a hearing recently held by the Finance Committee. While our priority in bilateral relations should remain Japan's rapid economic recovery, we must not lose sight of other aspects of the relationship that are important to our shared future.

For example, Japan is a major source of leading-edge science and technology. Two years ago, the Government of Japan released its Basic Plan for Science and Technology. That plan called for substantial funding increases and important policy reforms to further innovation in the country's science and technology programs and processes.

This year, the Government of Japan will increase its investment in science and technology by more than 21 percent. With these new resources, Japan—already at the forefront in many areas of science and technology—will be poised to make further important advances.

For decades, the U.S. has shared the fruit of its own basic research with Japan and the rest of the world in an effort to enhance global prosperity and the lives of average people around the world. With its increased resources devoted to science and technology, Japan has a more important opportunity to join the United States in taking a similar approach toward sharing advances in science and technology. The potential for greater benefits for both countries and for the rest of the world are enormous.

For example, opportunities are emerging to improve human health by jointly addressing the problems posed by infectious diseases; sustaining the quality of the environment through research on global climate change; reducing the risks posed by earthquakes and hurricanes; furthering the fundamental understanding of matter so important for advances in new materials, telecommunications, and new medical treatments; and better ensuring mutual security.

Partly because Japan was engaged in catching up with other leaders in science and technology for much of the postwar period, Tokyo tended to emphasize the accumulation—rather than the sharing—of information. Now that Japan is a global leader in science and technology, however, I believe Tokyo should move toward greater emphasis on cooperation. Similarly, I believe it important that Japan pay more attention to basic research that advances general knowledge as opposed to Tokyo's traditional emphasis on applied research.

The potential for a greater bilateral partnership in science and technology is growing, and both the U.S. and Japanese governments should work toward

turning that potential into reality. That is the purpose of this resolution and I urge my colleagues to support its early passage.●

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in enthusiastic support of the statement made by Senator ROTH concerning the U.S.-Japan relationship and, furthermore, to ask our colleagues to support this resolution.

As you are aware, I have been integrally involved over the years with many of my colleagues in ascertaining the obstacles and opportunities that exist between the United States and Japan. I have offered ongoing support for a cooperative, forward-looking bilateral relationship that is defined by transparency, access, equity and reciprocity. Given the current environment in East Asia and the potential for political economic instability, I believe the U.S.-Japan relationship to be one of our country's most important in that region, and worthy of constant and precise attention.

In the future, much as in the past, Japan will be both partner and competitor, and we must ensure that we maintain our support for this relationship while we recognize both its possibilities and its limitations.

The resolution submitted by Senator ROTH and I identifies the level of science and technology interaction that has developed between the United States and Japan over the last decade, and gives a number of suggestions as to where we should go in the future. Specific reference is made to the U.S.-Japan Science and Technology Agreement, which is now being re-negotiated by our two governments. Let me describe in concise terms what I see as important in this regard.

Significantly, the United States and Japan are, at present, cooperating in a range of projects as diverse as Global Change, Earthquake Disaster Mitigation, Emerging Infectious Diseases, Global Information Infrastructure, Space Cooperation, Thermonuclear Experimentation, Deep Sea Drilling, and Sustainable Development. Individually, these projects include the participation of nearly every department and agency in the U.S. government, and all have been initiated and have prospered as a result of the U.S.-Japan Science and Technology Agreement. All of these projects will grow even more substantially with the renewal of the agreement. Clearly this is something to be encouraged.

Significantly, all of these projects mentioned above will benefit not only the United States and Japan, but also the developed and developing countries in the world—many of which are eager for the knowledge and technology that derive from our two countries' cooperative activities. This interaction has already provided innumerable advantages to the international community, and can only provide even more in the

future. With certain conditions, it deserves our wholehearted support.

The current resolution outlines some, but not all of these conditions. As specific examples, we need to ensure that the cooperative interaction between the United States and Japan results in balanced and easily accessible flows of information between the United States and Japan, and that all data from this interaction be easily available to other scientists and engineers in the international community. International access to private sector laboratories in Japan needs to be improved. Divisions that exist between ministries in Japan—fragmentation that creates serious obstacles for research projects that include national universities and government research laboratories—must be made less evident. Effective mechanisms that allow the U.S. and other countries to participate in Japanese research projects need to be identified and obstacles that preclude this interaction eliminated. A more complete development of common regulations and standards should be pursued, and dual use and export control policies clarified. Questions relating to intellectual property rights have existed far too long and should be rectified. Finally, the obvious relationship that exists between science, technology and trade relations should be recognized, and understandings reached between the two governments on important, cross-cutting issues.

While these aforementioned problems should not prevent the U.S.-Japan Science and Technology Agreement from being renewed, our concerns should be made apparent during negotiations.

I would argue that any new agreement must satisfy three criteria:

First, it must recognize that serious structural and procedural asymmetries still exist between the two countries and that they must be resolved;

Second, it must provide freedom for scientists and engineers to interact and complete their research as free as possible from government interference;

Finally, it must recognize that the results that derive from U.S.-Japan science and technology cooperation has the potential to alleviate many of the problems we face in the world today and, as such, should be easily diffused into the international community.

Much of our current science and technology cooperation with Japan rests on a single but extremely important premise: the U.S. economic and national security interest depends upon its ability to complete fundamental research in critical areas, and then encourage innovation that will result in competitive advantage. Where this research might once have been done in isolation and without data input from other countries, it now requires the capacity to access information and technologies being developed

elsewhere. While the United States has been inattentive to the importance of increased expenditures on science and technology, Japan has not. While we still lead in many technologies, we will not do so in perpetuity.

Science and engineering are the archetypical endeavors of the current international society: individuals and ideas come together in an effort to improve the collective welfare of the global community at large. We must recognize this dynamic, and encourage it every way we can.

Let me emphasize that the results of research in laboratories across the world are not abstractions. As America's productivity, competitiveness, and economic performance—indeed, its very economic security—depends upon cooperative research and development with Japan and other countries, these results provide tangible advantages for families in New Mexico and every other state in the union. The car you drive, the home you live in, the appliances you use, the food you eat, the air you breathe—all of these derive from research and development programs that were undertaken yesterday. These programs should be a national priority.

To this end, it is essential that we further solidify the cooperative linkages that exist between our two countries, to find ways to leverage increasingly scarce funds, to combine diverse and complementary streams of ideas and technologies, and to provide mutual advantages to our respective societies and the international community as a whole.

Although some would deny the obvious synergies that exist between the United States and Japan at this time, it is not in our national interest to do so. The question is no longer whether these synergies will exist, but under what conditions they will exist. Interaction between our two countries exists on a scale far beyond what many once considered possible, and it will only grow as scientific and technological interaction between the two countries increases. We should take real pride in this development, just as we must, at the same time, carefully consider the path we will follow in the future.

While the current resolution is non-binding, it does reflect our desire to engage Japan in an ongoing, cooperative, and reciprocal relationship. Senator ROTH and I consider the U.S.-Japan Science and Technology Agreement to be an interactive arrangements of the highest importance, and we hope other colleagues will join us in our support for its renewal.

SENATE RESOLUTION 263—TO AUTHORIZE PAYMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SENATE ATTENDING THE FUNERAL OF A SENATOR

Mr. WARNER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 263

Resolved, That, upon approval by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the representatives of the Senate who attend the funeral of a Senator, including the funeral of a retired Senator. Expenses of the Senate representatives attending the funeral of a Senator shall be processed on vouchers submitted by the Secretary of the Senate and approved by the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

GRASSLEY AMENDMENT NO. 3390

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2132) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Effective on June 30, 1999, section 8106(a) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under section 101(b) of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), is amended—

(1) by striking out "not later than June 30, 1997," and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than June 30, 1999,"; and

(2) by striking out "\$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

STEVENS (AND INOUE) AMENDMENT NO. 3391

Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. INOUE) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, in between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104(a) On page 34, line 24, strike out all after "\$94,500,000" down to and including "1999" on page 35, line 7.

(b) On page 42, line 1, strike out the amount "\$2,000,000,000", and insert the amount "\$1,775,000,000".

(c) In addition to funds provided under title I of this Act, the following amounts are hereby appropriated: for "Military Personnel, Army", \$58,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Navy", \$43,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$14,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$44,000,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$5,377,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Navy", \$3,684,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", \$1,103,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Air

Force", \$1,000,000; for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$9,392,000; and "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$4,112,000".

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount available in this Act for "Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense", real property maintenance is hereby decreased by reducing the total amounts appropriated in the following accounts: "Operation and Maintenance, Army", by \$58,000,000; "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", by \$43,000,000; "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", by \$14,000,000; and "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$44,000,000.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading "National Guard and Reserve Equipment", is hereby reduced by \$24,668,000.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 3392

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. . For an additional amount for "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund," \$1,858,600,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, the defense health program appropriations and working capital funds: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

ROBERTS AMENDMENT NO. 3393

Mr. ROBERTS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be obligated or expended for any deployment of forces of the Armed Forces of the United States to Yugoslavia, Albania, or Macedonia unless and until the President, after consultation with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and the Minority Leader of the Senate, transmits to Congress a report on the deployment that includes the following:

(1) The President's certification that the presence of those forces in each country to which the forces are to be deployed is necessary in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The reasons why the deployment is in the national security interests of the United States.

(3) The number of United States military personnel to be deployed to each country.

(4) The mission and objectives of forces to be deployed.

(5) The expected schedule for accomplishing the objectives of the deployment.

(6) The exit strategy for United States forces engaged in the deployment.

(7) The costs associated with the deployment and the funding sources for paying those costs.

(8) The anticipated effects of the deployment on the morale, retention, and effectiveness of United States forces.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to a deployment of forces—

(1) in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 795; or

(2) under circumstances determined by the President to be an emergency necessitating immediate deployment of the forces.

SANTORUM AMENDMENT NO. 3394

Mr. SANTORUM proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by \$8,200,000.

On page 10, line 6, reduce the first amount by \$8,200,000.

• Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, this amendment to S. 2132, the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act, seeks to add \$8.2 million for the procurement of M888, 60-millimeter, high-explosive munitions for the Marine Corps.

The additional funds would help alleviate training constraints for Marine Corps units due to shortages in this term, and will help reduce the coming "bow-wave" of procurement requirements we may not have the resources to fund in future years. The Marine Corps has stated that procurement at this level would be consistent with its acquisition strategy regarding ammunition.

I would like to clarify that funds for this procurement have been identified. In order to fund this important acquisition I have identified the Air Force war reserve materials account. •

KEMPTHORNE AMENDMENT NO. 3395

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KEMPTHORNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 11, line 7 after the period insert the following: "*Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$35,000,000 shall be made available only for use for Impact Aid to local educational agencies."

FAIRCLOTH AMENDMENT NO. 3396

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. FAIRCLOTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. (a) Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing a comprehensive assessment of the TRICARE program.

(b) The assessment under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A comparison of the health care benefits available under the health care options

of the TRICARE program known as TRICARE Standard, TRICARE Prime, and TRICARE Extra with the health care benefits available under the health care plan of the Federal Employees Health Benefits program most similar to each such option that has the most subscribers as of the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(A) the types of health care services offered by each option and plan under comparison;

(B) the ceilings, if any, imposed on the amounts paid for covered services under each option and plan under comparison; and

(C) the timeliness of payments to physicians providing services under each option and plan under comparison.

(2) An assessment of the effect on the subscription choices made by potential subscribers to the TRICARE program of the Department of Defense policy to grant priority in the provision of health care services to subscribers to a particular option.

(3) An assessment whether or not the implementation of the TRICARE program has discouraged medicare-eligible individuals from obtaining health care services from military treatment facilities, including—

(A) an estimate of the number of such individuals discouraged from obtaining health care services from such facilities during the two-year period ending with the commencement of the implementation of the TRICARE program; and

(B) an estimate of the number of such individuals discouraged from obtaining health care services from such facilities during the two-year period following the commencement of the implementation of the TRICARE program.

(4) An assessment of any other matters that the Comptroller General considers appropriate for purposes of this section.

(c) In this section:

(1) The term "Federal Employees Health Benefits program" means the health benefits program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The term "TRICARE program" has the meaning given that term in section 1072(7) of title 10, United States Code.

FEINGOLD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3397

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. BRYAN) submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 13, line 9, increase the amount by \$219,700,000.

On page 25, line 25, reduce the amount by \$219,700,000.

KYL AMENDMENT NO. 3398

Mr. KYL proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2312, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the establishment or operation of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency until the Secretary of Defense takes the following actions:

(1) Establishes within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy and designates that official to serve as the Director of the Defense Security Technology Agency with only the following duties:

(A) To develop for the Department of Defense policies and positions regarding the appropriate export control policies and procedures that are necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(B) To supervise activities of the Department of Defense relating to export controls.

(C) As the Director of the Defense Security Technology Agency—

(i) to administer the technology security program of the Department of Defense;

(ii) to review, under that program, international transfers of defense-related technology, goods, services, and munitions in order to determine whether such transfers are consistent with United States foreign policy and national security interests and to ensure that such international transfers comply with Department of Defense technology security policies;

(iii) to ensure (using automation and other computerized techniques to the maximum extent practicable) that the Department of Defense role in the processing of export license applications is carried out as expeditiously as is practicable consistent with the national security interests of the United States; and

(iv) to actively support intelligence and enforcement activities of the Federal Government to restrain the flow of defense-related technology, goods, services, and munitions to potential adversaries.

(2) Submits to Congress a written certification that—

(A) the Defense Security Technology Agency is to remain a Defense Agency independent of all other Defense Agencies of the Department of Defense and the military departments; and

(B) no funds are to be obligated or expended for integrating the Defense Security Technology Agency into another Defense Agency.

(b) The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy may report directly to the Secretary of Defense on the matters that are within the duties of the Deputy Under Secretary.

(c) Not later than 10 days after the Secretary of Defense establishes the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on National Security and on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the establishment of the position. The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of any organizational changes that have been made or are to be made within the Department of Defense to satisfy the conditions set forth in subsection (a) and otherwise to implement this section.

(2) A description of the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the export control activities of the Department of Defense after the establishment of the position, together with a discussion of how that role compares to the Chairman's role in those activities before the establishment of the position.

(d) Unless specifically authorized and appropriated for such purpose, funds may not be obligated to relocate any office or personnel of the Defense Security Technology Administration to any location that is more than five miles from the Pentagon Reservation (as defined in section 2674(f) of title 10, United States Code).

BAUCUS AMENDMENT NO. 3399

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 18, line 22, insert before the period at the end the following: "Provided further, That of the amounts available under this heading, \$150,000 shall be made available to the Bear Paw Development Council, Montana, for the management and conversion of the Havre Air Force Base and Training Site, Montana, for public benefit purposes, including public schools, housing for the homeless, and economic development".

BINGAMAN (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 3400

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, in between lines 17 and 18, insert before the period at the end the following: "Sec. 8104(a) that of the amount available under Air National Guard, Operations and Maintenance for flying hours and related personnel support, \$4,500,000 shall be available for the Defense Systems Evaluation program for support of test and training operations at White Sands Missile range, New Mexico, and Fort Bliss, Texas".

GRAHAM (AND MACK) AMENDMENT NO. 3401

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MACK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

TITLE IX—COMMERCIAL SPACE

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Commercial Space Act of 1998".

SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) COMMERCIAL PROVIDER.—The term "commercial provider" means any person providing space transportation services or other space-related activities, primary control of which is held by persons other than Federal, State, local, and foreign governments.

(3) PAYLOAD.—The term "payload" means anything that a person undertakes to transport to, from, or within outer space, or in suborbital trajectory, by means of a space transportation vehicle, but does not include the space transportation vehicle itself except for its components which are specifically designed or adapted for that payload.

(4) SPACE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.—The term "space-related activities" includes research and development, manufacturing, processing, service, and other associated and support activities.

(5) SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.—The term "space transportation services" means the preparation of a space transportation vehicle and its payloads for transportation to, from, or within outer space, or in suborbital trajectory, and the conduct of transporting a

payload to, from, or within outer space, or in suborbital trajectory.

(6) **SPACE TRANSPORTATION VEHICLE.**—The term "space transportation vehicle"—

(A) means any vehicle constructed for the purpose of operating in, or transporting a payload to, from, or within, outer space, or in suborbital trajectory; and

(B) includes any component of that vehicle not specifically designed or adapted for a payload.

(7) **STATE.**—The term "State" means each of the several States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(8) **UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER.**—The term "United States commercial provider" means a commercial provider, organized under the laws of the United States or of a State, that is—

(A) more than 50 percent owned by United States nationals; or

(B) a subsidiary of a foreign company and the Secretary of Transportation finds that—

(i) that subsidiary has in the past evidenced a substantial commitment to the United States market through—

(I) investments in the United States in long-term research, development, and manufacturing (including the manufacture of major components and subassemblies); and

(II) significant contributions to employment in the United States; and

(ii) (I) each country in which that foreign company is incorporated or organized; and

(II) if appropriate, in which that foreign company principally conducts its business, affords reciprocal treatment to companies described in subparagraph (A) comparable to that afforded to that foreign company's subsidiary in the United States, as evidenced by—

(aa) providing comparable opportunities for companies described in subparagraph (A) to participate in Government sponsored research and development similar to that authorized under this Act;

(bb) providing no barriers, to companies described in subparagraph (A) with respect to local investment opportunities, that are not provided to foreign companies in the United States; and

(cc) providing adequate and effective protection for the intellectual property rights of companies described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 903. COMMERCIALIZATION OF SPACE STATION.

(a) **POLICY.**—Congress declares that—

(1) a priority goal of constructing the International Space Station is the economic development of Earth orbital space;

(2) free and competitive markets create the most efficient conditions for promoting economic development, and should therefore govern the economic development of Earth orbital space; and

(3) the use of free market principles in operating, servicing, allocating the use of, and adding capabilities to the Space Station, and the resulting fullest possible engagement of commercial providers and participation of commercial users, will reduce International Space Station operational costs for all partners and the Federal Government's share of the United States burden to fund operations.

(b) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall deliver to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House

of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a study that identifies and examines—

(A) the opportunities for commercial providers to play a role in International Space Station activities, including operation, use, servicing, and augmentation;

(B) the potential cost savings to be derived from commercial providers playing a role in each of these activities;

(C) which of the opportunities described in subparagraph (A) the Administrator plans to make available to commercial providers during fiscal years 1999 and 2000;

(D) the specific policies and initiatives the Administrator is advancing to encourage and facilitate these commercial opportunities; and

(E) the revenues and cost reimbursements to the Federal Government from commercial users of the International Space Station.

(2) **STUDY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall deliver to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an independently-conducted market study that examines and evaluates potential industry interest in providing commercial goods and services for the operation, servicing, and augmentation of the International Space Station, and in the commercial use of the International Space Station.

(B) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—In addition to meeting the requirements under subparagraph (A), the study under this paragraph shall also include updates to the cost savings and revenue estimates made in the study described in paragraph (1) based on the external market assessment.

(3) **SUBMISSION OF REPORT.**—The Administrator shall deliver to Congress, no later than the submission of the President's annual budget request for fiscal year 2000 submitted in accordance with section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a report detailing how many proposals (whether solicited or not) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration received during calendar year 1998 regarding commercial operation, servicing, utilization, or augmentation of the International Space Station, broken down by each of those 4 categories, and specifying how many agreements the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has entered into in response to these proposals, also broken down by those 4 categories.

(4) **ROLE OF STATE GOVERNMENTS.**—Each of the studies and reports required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall include consideration of the potential role of State governments as brokers in promoting commercial participation in the International Space Station program.

SEC. 904. COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH AMENDMENTS.

(a) **AMENDMENTS.**—Chapter 701 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the table of sections—

(A) by amending the item relating to section 70104 to read as follows:

"70104. Restrictions on launches, operations, and reentries.";

(B) by amending the item relating to section 70108 to read as follows:

"70108. Prohibition, suspension, and end of launches, operation of launch sites and reentry sites, and reentries.";

(C) by amending the item relating to section 70109 to read as follows:

"70109. Preemption of scheduled launches or reentries.";

and

(D) by adding at the end the following new items:

"70120. Regulations.

"70121. Report to Congress."

(2) in section 70101—

(A) by inserting "microgravity research," after "information services," in subsection (a)(3);

(B) by inserting ", reentry," after "launching" both places it appears in subsection (a)(4);

(C) by inserting ", reentry vehicles," after "launch vehicles" in subsection (a)(5);

(D) by inserting "and reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (a)(6);

(E) by inserting ", reentries," after "launches" both places it appears in subsection (a)(7);

(F) by inserting ", reentry sites," after "launch sites" in subsection (a)(8);

(G) by inserting "and reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (a)(8);

(H) by inserting "reentry sites," after "launch sites," in subsection (a)(9);

(I) by inserting "and reentry site" after "launch site" in subsection (a)(9);

(J) by inserting ", reentry vehicles," after "launch vehicles" in subsection (b)(2);

(K) by striking "launch" in subsection (b)(2)(A);

(L) by inserting "and reentry" after "conduct of commercial launch" in subsection (b)(3);

(M) by striking "launch" after "and transfer commercial" in subsection (b)(3); and

(N) by inserting "and development of reentry sites," after "launch-site support facilities," in subsection (b)(4);

(3) in section 70102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking "and any payload" and inserting in lieu thereof "or reentry vehicle and any payload from Earth";

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma; and

(iii) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

"including activities involved in the preparation of a launch vehicle or payload for launch, when those activities take place at a launch site in the United States.";

(B) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "means of a launch vehicle" in paragraph (8);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (10), (11), and (12) as paragraphs (14), (15), and (16), respectively;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraphs:

"(10) 'reenter' and 'reentry' mean to return or attempt to return a reentry vehicle and its payload, if any, from Earth orbit or from outer space to Earth.

"(11) 'reentry services' means—

"(A) activities involved in the preparation of a reentry vehicle and its payload, if any, for reentry; and

"(B) the conduct of a reentry.

"(12) 'reentry site' means the location on Earth to which a reentry vehicle is intended to return (as defined in a license the Secretary issues or transfers under this chapter).

"(13) 'reentry vehicle' means a vehicle designed to return from Earth orbit or outer space to Earth, or a reusable launch vehicle designed to return from Earth orbit or outer space to Earth, substantially intact.";

(E) by inserting "or reentry services" after "launch services" each place it appears in

paragraph (15), as so redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph;

(4) in section 70103(b)—

(A) by inserting "AND REENTRIES" after "LAUNCHES" in the subsection heading;

(B) by inserting "and reentries" after "commercial space launches" in paragraph (1); and

(C) by inserting "and reentry" after "space launch" in paragraph (2);

(5) in section 70104—

(A) by amending the section designation and heading to read as follows:

"§ 70104. Restrictions on launches, operations, and reentries";

(B) by inserting "or reentry site, or to reenter a reentry vehicle," after "operate a launch site" each place it appears in subsection (a);

(C) by inserting "or reentry" after "launch or operation" in subsection (a)(3) and (4);

(D) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "launch license" and inserting in lieu thereof "license";

(ii) by inserting "or reenter" after "may launch"; and

(iii) by inserting "or reentering" after "related to launching"; and

(E) in subsection (c)—

(i) by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: "PREVENTING LAUNCHES AND REENTRIES.—";

(ii) by inserting "or reentry" after "prevent the launch"; and

(iii) by inserting "or reentry" after "describes the launch";

(6) in section 70105—

(A) by inserting "(1)" before "A person may apply" in subsection (a);

(B) by striking "receiving an application" both places it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "accepting an application in accordance with criteria established pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(D)";

(C) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following: "The Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives a written notice not later than 30 days after any occurrence when a license is not issued within the deadline established by this subsection.

"(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary may establish procedures for safety approvals of launch vehicles, reentry vehicles, safety systems, processes, services, or personnel that may be used in conducting licensed commercial space launch or reentry activities."

(D) by inserting "or a reentry site, or the reentry of a reentry vehicle," after "operation of a launch site" in subsection (b)(1);

(E) by striking "or operation" and inserting in lieu thereof "operation, or reentry" in subsection (b)(2)(A);

(F) by striking "and" at the end of subsection (b)(2)(B);

(G) by striking the period at the end of subsection (b)(2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "and";

(H) by adding at the end of subsection (b)(2) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) regulations establishing criteria for accepting or rejecting an application for a license under this chapter within 60 days after receipt of such application."; and

(I) by inserting "including the requirement to obtain a license," after "waive a requirement" in subsection (b)(3);

(7) in section 70106(a)—

(A) by inserting "or reentry site" after "observer at a launch site";

(B) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "assemble a launch vehicle"; and

(C) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "with a launch vehicle";

(8) in section 70108—

(A) by amending the section designation and heading to read as follows:

"§ 70108. Prohibition, suspension, and end of launches, operation of launch sites and reentry sites, and reentries";

and

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting "or reentry site, or reentry of a reentry vehicle," after "operation of a launch site"; and

(ii) by inserting "or reentry" after "launch or operation";

(9) in section 70109—

(A) by amending the section designation and heading to read as follows:

"§ 70109. Preemption of scheduled launches or reentries";

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting "or reentry" after "ensure that a launch";

(ii) by inserting "reentry site," after "United States Government launch site";

(iii) by inserting "or reentry date commitment" after "launch date commitment";

(iv) by inserting "or reentry" after "obtained for a launch";

(v) by inserting "reentry site," after "access to a launch site";

(vi) by inserting "or services related to a reentry," after "amount for launch services"; and

(vii) by inserting "or reentry" after "the scheduled launch"; and

(C) in subsection (c), by inserting "or reentry" after "prompt launching";

(10) in section 70110—

(A) by inserting "or reentry" after "prevent the launch" in subsection (a)(2); and

(B) by inserting "or reentry site, or reentry of a reentry vehicle," after "operation of a launch site" in subsection (a)(3)(B);

(11) in section 70111—

(A) by inserting "or reentry" after "launch" in subsection (a)(1)(A);

(B) by inserting "and reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (a)(1)(B);

(C) by inserting "or reentry services" after "or launch services" in subsection (a)(2);

(D) by striking "source." in subsection (a)(2) and inserting "source, whether such source is located on or off a Federal range.";

(E) by inserting "or reentry" after "commercial launch" both places it appears in subsection (b)(1);

(F) by inserting "or reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (b)(2)(C);

(G) by inserting after subsection (b)(2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) The Secretary shall ensure the establishment of uniform guidelines for, and consistent implementation of, this section by all Federal agencies.";

(H) by striking "or its payload for launch" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "or reentry vehicle, or the payload of either, for launch or reentry"; and

(I) by inserting "reentry vehicle," after "manufacturer of the launch vehicle" in subsection (d);

(12) in section 70112—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "launch or reentry" after "(1) When a";

(B) by inserting "or reentry" after "one launch" in subsection (a)(3);

(C) by inserting "or reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (a)(4);

(D) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting "launch or reentry" after "(1) A";

(E) by inserting "or reentry services" after "launch services" each place it appears in subsection (b);

(F) by inserting "applicable" after "carried out under the" in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b);

(G) by striking "Space, and Technology" in subsection (d)(1);

(H) by inserting "OR REENTRIES" after "LAUNCHES" in the heading for subsection (e);

(I) by inserting "or reentry site or a reentry" after "launch site" in subsection (e); and

(J) in subsection (f), by inserting "launch or reentry" after "carried out under a";

(13) in section 70113—by inserting "or reentry" after "one launch" each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d);

(14) in section 70115(b)(1)(D)(i)—

(A) by inserting "reentry site," after "launch site,"; and

(B) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "launch vehicle" both places it appears;

(15) in section 70117—

(A) by inserting "or reentry site, or to reenter a reentry vehicle" after "operate a launch site" in subsection (a);

(B) by inserting "or reentry" after "approval of a space launch" in subsection (d);

(C) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(f) LAUNCH NOT AN EXPORT; REENTRY NOT AN IMPORT.—A launch vehicle, reentry vehicle, or payload that is launched or reentered is not, because of the launch or reentry, an export or import, respectively, for purposes of a law controlling exports or imports, except that payloads launched pursuant to foreign trade zone procedures as provided for under the Foreign Trade Zones Act (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u) shall be considered exports with regard to customs entry."; and

(D) in subsection (g)—

(i) by striking "operation of a launch vehicle or launch site," in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "reentry, operation of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle, or operation of a launch site or reentry site,"; and

(ii) by inserting "reentry," after "launch," in paragraph (2); and

(16) by adding at the end the following new sections:

"§ 70120. Regulations

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation, not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this section, shall issue regulations to carry out this chapter that include—

"(1) guidelines for industry and State governments to obtain sufficient insurance coverage for potential damages to third parties;

"(2) procedures for requesting and obtaining licenses to launch a commercial launch vehicle;

"(3) procedures for requesting and obtaining operator licenses for launch;

"(4) procedures for requesting and obtaining launch site operator licenses; and

"(5) procedures for the application of government indemnification.

"(b) REENTRY.—The Secretary of Transportation, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, shall issue a notice of proposed rulemaking to carry out this chapter that includes—

"(1) procedures for requesting and obtaining licenses to reenter a reentry vehicle;

"(2) procedures for requesting and obtaining operator licenses for reentry; and

"(3) procedures for requesting and obtaining reentry site operator licenses.

"§ 70121. Report to Congress

"The Secretary of Transportation shall submit to Congress an annual report to accompany the President's budget request submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, that—

"(1) describes all activities undertaken under this chapter, including a description of the process for the application for and approval of licenses under this chapter and recommendations for legislation that may further commercial launches and reentries; and

"(2) reviews the performance of the regulatory activities and the effectiveness of the Office of Commercial Space Transportation."

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 70119 of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 70119. Authorization of appropriations

"There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for the activities of the Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation—

"(1) \$6,275,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999; and

"(2) \$6,600,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000."

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a)(6)(B) shall take effect upon the effective date of final regulations issued pursuant to section 70105(b)(2)(D) of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(6)(H).

SEC. 905. PROMOTION OF UNITED STATES GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM STANDARDS.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that the Global Positioning System, including satellites, signal equipment, ground stations, data links, and associated command and control facilities, has become an essential element in civil, scientific, and military space development because of the emergence of a United States commercial industry which provides Global Positioning System equipment and related services.

(b) **INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.**—In order to support and sustain the Global Positioning System in a manner that will most effectively contribute to the national security, public safety, scientific, and economic interests of the United States, Congress encourages the President to—

(1) ensure the operation of the Global Positioning System on a continuous worldwide basis free of direct user fees;

(2) enter into international agreements that promote cooperation with foreign governments and international organizations to—

(A) establish the Global Positioning System and its augmentations as an acceptable international standard; and

(B) eliminate any foreign barriers to applications of the Global Positioning System worldwide; and

(3) provide clear direction and adequate resources to United States representatives so that on an international basis they can—

(A) achieve and sustain efficient management of the electromagnetic spectrum used by the Global Positioning System; and

(B) protect that spectrum from disruption and interference.

SEC. 906. ACQUISITION OF SPACE SCIENCE DATA.

(a) **ACQUISITION FROM COMMERCIAL PROVIDERS.**—In order to satisfy the scientific and educational requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and where practicable of other Federal agencies and scientific researchers, the Ad-

ministrator shall to the maximum extent practicable acquire, if cost effective, space science data from a commercial provider.

(b) **TREATMENT OF SPACE SCIENCE DATA AS COMMERCIAL ITEM UNDER ACQUISITION LAWS.**—Acquisitions of space science data by the Administrator shall be carried out in accordance with applicable acquisition laws and regulations (including chapters 137 and 140 of title 10, United States Code), except that space science data shall be considered to be a commercial item for purposes of such laws and regulations. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude the United States from acquiring sufficient rights in data to meet the needs of the scientific and educational community or the needs of other government activities.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term "space science data" includes scientific data concerning the elemental and mineralogical resources of the moon, asteroids, planets and their moons, and comets, microgravity acceleration, and solar storm monitoring.

(d) **SAFETY STANDARDS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring compliance with applicable safety standards.

(e) **LIMITATION.**—This section does not authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide financial assistance for the development of commercial systems for the collection of space science data.

SEC. 907. ADMINISTRATION OF COMMERCIAL SPACE CENTERS.

The Administrator shall administer the Commercial Space Center program in a coordinated manner from National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters in Washington, D.C.

SEC. 908. LAND REMOTE SENSING POLICY ACT OF 1992 AMENDMENTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) a robust domestic United States industry in high resolution Earth remote sensing is in the economic, employment, technological, scientific, and national security interests of the United States;

(2) to secure its national interests the United States must nurture a commercial remote sensing industry that leads the world;

(3) the Federal Government must provide policy and regulations that promote a stable business environment for that industry to succeed and fulfill the national interest;

(4) it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to create domestic and international conditions favorable to the health and growth of the United States commercial remote sensing industry;

(5) it is a fundamental goal of United States policy to support and enhance United States industrial competitiveness in the field of remote sensing, while at the same time protecting the national security concerns and international obligations of the United States;

(6) it is fundamental that the States be able to deploy and utilize that technology in their land management responsibilities;

(7) to date, very few States have the ability to deploy and utilize that technology in the manner described in paragraph (6) without engaging the academic institutions within their boundaries; and

(8) in order to develop a market for the commercial sector, the States must have the capacity to fully utilize that technology.

(b) **AMENDMENTS.**—The Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 is amended—

(1) in section 2 (15 U.S.C. 5601)—

(A) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) Commercialization of land remote sensing is a near-term goal, and should remain a long-term goal, of United States policy."

(B) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraphs (7) through (16) as paragraphs (6) through (15), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (11), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by striking "determining the design" and all that follows through "international consortium" and inserting in lieu thereof "ensuring the continuity of Landsat quality data"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(16) The United States should encourage remote sensing systems to promote access to land remote sensing data by scientific researchers and educators.

"(17) It is in the best interest of the United States to encourage remote sensing systems whether privately-funded or publicly-funded, to promote widespread affordable access to unenhanced land remote sensing data by scientific researchers and educators and to allow such users appropriate rights for redistribution for scientific and educational non-commercial purposes."

(2) in section 101 (15 U.S.C. 5611)—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (6);

(ii) by striking paragraph (7); and

(iii) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (7); and

(B) in subsection (e)(1)—

(i) by inserting "and" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(3) in section 201 (15 U.S.C. 5621)—

(A) by inserting "(1)" after "NATIONAL SECURITY," in subsection (b);

(B) in subsection (b)(1), as redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph—

(i) by striking "No license shall be granted by the Secretary unless the Secretary determines in writing that the applicant will comply" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary shall grant a license if the Secretary determines that the activities proposed in the application are consistent";

(ii) by inserting "and" after "that the applicant has provided assurances adequate to indicate, in combination with other information available to the Secretary that is relevant to activities proposed in the application, that the applicant will comply with all terms of the license" after "concerns of the United States"; and

(iii) by inserting "and policies" after "international obligations";

(C) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, shall publish in the Federal Register a complete and specific list of all information required to comprise a complete application for a license under this title. An application shall be considered complete when the applicant has provided all information required by the list most recently published in the Federal Register before the date the application was first submitted. Unless the Secretary has, within 30 days after receipt of an application, notified the applicant of information necessary to complete an application, the Secretary may not deny the application on the basis of the absence of any such information."

(D) in subsection (c), by amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "If

the Secretary has not granted the license within such 120-day period, the Secretary shall inform the applicant, within such period, of any pending issues and actions required to be carried out by the applicant or the Secretary in order to result in the granting of a license.”;

(4) in section 202 (15 U.S.C. 5622)—

(A) by striking “section 506” in subsection (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof “section 507”;

(B) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “as soon as such data are available and on reasonable terms and conditions” and inserting in lieu thereof “on reasonable terms and conditions, including the provision of such data in a timely manner subject to United States national security and foreign policy interests”;

(C) in subsection (b)(6), by striking “any agreement” and all that follows through “nations or entities” and inserting in lieu thereof “any significant or substantial agreement”;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6) of subsection (b) the following:

“The Secretary may not seek to enjoin a company from entering into a foreign agreement the Secretary receives notification of under paragraph (6) unless the Secretary has, within 30 days after receipt of such notification, transmitted to the licensee a statement that such agreement is inconsistent with the national security, foreign policy, or international obligations of the United States, including an explanation of that inconsistency.”;

(5) in section 203(a)(2) (15 U.S.C. 5623(a)(2)), by striking “under this title and” and inserting in lieu thereof “under this title or”;

(6) in section 204 (15 U.S.C. 5624), by striking “may” and inserting in lieu thereof “shall”;

(7) in section 205(c) (15 U.S.C. 5625(c)), by striking “if such remote sensing space system is licensed by the Secretary before commencing operation” and inserting in lieu thereof “if such private remote sensing space system will be licensed by the Secretary before commencing its commercial operation”;

(8) by adding at the end of title II the following new section:

“SEC. 206. NOTIFICATION.

“(a) LIMITATIONS ON LICENSEE.—Not later than 30 days after a determination by the Secretary to require a licensee to limit collection or distribution of data from a system licensed under this title, the Secretary shall provide written notification to Congress of such determination, including the reasons therefor, the limitations imposed on the licensee, and the period during which those limitations apply.

“(b) TERMINATION, MODIFICATION, OR SUSPENSION.—Not later than 30 days after an action by the Secretary to seek an order of injunction or other judicial determination pursuant to section 202(b) or section 203(a)(2), the Secretary shall provide written notification to Congress of that action and the reasons for that action.”;

(9) in section 301 (15 U.S.C. 5631)—

(A) by inserting “, that are not being commercially developed” after “and its environment” in subsection (a)(2)(B); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) DUPLICATION OF COMMERCIAL SECTOR ACTIVITIES.—The Federal Government shall not undertake activities under this section which duplicate activities available from the United States commercial sector, unless such activities would result in significant cost savings to the Federal Government, or are necessary for reasons of national secu-

rity or international obligations or policies.”;

(10) in section 302 (15 U.S.C. 5632)—

(A) by striking “(a) GENERAL RULE.—”;

(B) by striking “, including unenhanced data gathered under the technology demonstration program carried out pursuant to section 303,”; and

(C) by striking subsection (b);

(11) by striking section 303 (15 U.S.C. 5633);

(12) in section 401(b)(3) (15 U.S.C. 5641(b)(3)), by striking “, including any such enhancements developed under the technology demonstration program under section 303,”;

(13) in section 501(a) (15 U.S.C. 5651(a)), by striking “section 506” and inserting “section 507”;

(14) in section 502(c)(7) (15 U.S.C. 5652(c)(7)), by striking “section 506” and inserting “section 507”;

(15) in section 507 (15 U.S.C. 5657)—

(A) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Defense on all matters under title II affecting national security. The Secretary of Defense shall be responsible for determining those conditions, consistent with this Act, necessary to meet national security concerns of the United States, and for notifying the Secretary promptly of such conditions. The Secretary of Defense shall convey to the Secretary the determinations for a license issued under title II, consistent with this Act, that the Secretary of Defense determines necessary to meet the national security concerns of the United States.”;

(B) by striking subsection (b)(1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(b) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—(1) The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of State on all matters under title II affecting international obligations and policies of the United States. The Secretary of State shall be responsible for determining those conditions, consistent with this Act, necessary to meet international obligations and policies of the United States and for notifying the Secretary promptly of such conditions. The Secretary of State shall convey to the Secretary the determinations for a license issued under title II, consistent with this Act, that the Secretary of State determines necessary to meet the international obligations and policies of the United States.

“(2) Appropriate United States Government agencies are authorized and encouraged to provide to developing nations, as a component of international aid, resources for purchasing remote sensing data, training, and analysis from commercial providers. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, United States Geological Survey, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration should develop and implement a program to aid the transfer of remote sensing technology and Mission to Planet Earth (OES) science at the state level”;

(C) in subsection (d), by striking “Secretary may require” and inserting “Secretary shall, if appropriate, require”.

SEC. 909. ACQUISITION OF EARTH SCIENCE DATA.

(a) ACQUISITION.—For purposes of meeting Government goals for Mission to Planet Earth, and in order to satisfy the scientific and educational requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and if appropriate, of other Federal agencies and scientific researchers, the Administrator shall to the maximum extent practicable acquire, if cost-effective, space-based and airborne Earth remote sensing

data, services, distribution, and applications from a commercial provider.

(b) TREATMENT AS COMMERCIAL ITEM UNDER ACQUISITION LAWS.—Acquisitions by the Administrator of the data, services, distribution, and applications referred to in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with applicable acquisition laws and regulations (including chapters 137 and 140 of title 10, United States Code), except that those data, services, distribution, and applications shall be considered to be a commercial item for purposes of such laws and regulations. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude the United States from acquiring sufficient rights in data to meet the needs of the scientific and educational community or the needs of other government activities.

(c) SAFETY STANDARDS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring compliance with applicable safety standards.

(d) ADMINISTRATION AND EXECUTION.—This section shall be carried out as part of the Commercial Remote Sensing Program at the Stennis Space Center.

SEC. 910. REQUIREMENT TO PROCURE COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Federal Government shall acquire space transportation services from United States commercial providers in any case in which those services are required in the course of its activities. To the maximum extent practicable, the Federal Government shall plan missions to accommodate the space transportation services capabilities of United States commercial providers.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The Federal Government shall not be required to acquire space transportation services under subsection (a) if, on a case-by-case basis, the Administrator or, in the case of a national security issue, the Secretary of the Air Force, determines that—

(1) a payload requires the unique capabilities of the Space Shuttle;

(2) cost effective space transportation services that meet specific mission requirements would not be reasonably available from United States commercial providers when required;

(3) the use of space transportation services from United States commercial providers poses an unacceptable risk of loss of a unique scientific opportunity;

(4) the use of space transportation services from United States commercial providers is inconsistent with national security objectives;

(5) the use of space transportation services from United States commercial providers is inconsistent with foreign policy purposes, or launch of the payload by a foreign entity serves foreign policy purposes;

(6) it is more cost effective to transport a payload in conjunction with a test or demonstration of a space transportation vehicle owned by the Federal Government; or

(7) a payload may make use of the available cargo space on a Space Shuttle mission as a secondary payload, and that payload is consistent with the requirements of research, development, demonstration, scientific, commercial, and educational programs authorized by the Administrator.

(c) DELAYED EFFECT.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to space transportation services and space transportation vehicles acquired or owned by the Federal Government before the date of enactment of this Act, or with respect to which a contract for that acquisition or ownership has been entered into before that date.

(d) HISTORICAL PURPOSES.—This section shall not be construed to prohibit the Federal Government from acquiring, owning, or maintaining space transportation vehicles solely for historical display purposes.

SEC. 911. ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.

(a) TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AS COMMERCIAL ITEM UNDER ACQUISITION LAWS.—Acquisitions of space transportation services by the Federal Government shall be carried out in accordance with applicable acquisition laws and regulations (including chapters 137 and 140 of title 10, United States Code), except that space transportation services shall be considered to be a commercial item for purposes of those laws and regulations.

(b) SAFETY STANDARDS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring compliance with applicable safety standards.

SEC. 912. LAUNCH SERVICES PURCHASE ACT OF 1990 AMENDMENTS.

The Launch Services Purchase Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2465b et seq.) is amended—

- (1) by striking section 202;
- (2) in section 203—
 - (A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2); and
 - (B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;
- (3) by striking sections 204 and 205; and
- (4) in section 206—
 - (A) by striking “(a) COMMERCIAL PAYLOADS ON THE SPACE SHUTTLE.—”; and
 - (B) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 913. SHUTTLE PRIVATIZATION.

(a) POLICY AND PREPARATION.—The Administrator shall prepare for an orderly transition from the Federal operation, or Federal management of contracted operation, of space transportation systems to the Federal purchase of commercial space transportation services for all nonemergency launch requirements, including human, cargo, and mixed payloads. In those preparations, the Administrator shall take into account the need for short-term economies, as well as the goal of restoring the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's research focus and its mandate to promote the fullest possible commercial use of space. As part of those preparations, the Administrator shall plan for the potential privatization of the Space Shuttle program. That plan shall keep safety and cost effectiveness as high priorities. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from studying, designing, developing, or funding upgrades or modifications essential to the safe and economical operation of the Space Shuttle fleet.

(b) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The Administrator shall conduct a study of the feasibility of implementing the recommendation of the Independent Shuttle Management Review Team that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration transition toward the privatization of the Space Shuttle. The study shall identify, discuss, and, where possible, present options for resolving, the major policy and legal issues that must be addressed before the Space Shuttle is privatized, including—

- (1) whether the Federal Government or the Space Shuttle contractor should own the Space Shuttle orbiters and ground facilities;
- (2) whether the Federal Government should indemnify the contractor for any third party liability arising from Space Shuttle operations, and, if so, under what terms and conditions;
- (3) whether payloads other than National Aeronautics and Space Administration pay-

loads should be allowed to be launched on the Space Shuttle, how missions will be prioritized, and who will decide which mission flies and when;

(4) whether commercial payloads should be allowed to be launched on the Space Shuttle and whether any classes of payloads should be made ineligible for launch consideration;

(5) whether National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other Federal Government payloads should have priority over non-Federal payloads in the Space Shuttle launch assignments, and what policies should be developed to prioritize among payloads generally;

(6) whether the public interest requires that certain Space Shuttle functions continue to be performed by the Federal Government; and

(7) how much cost savings, if any, will be generated by privatization of the Space Shuttle.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall complete the study required under subsection (b) and shall submit a report on the study to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 914. USE OF EXCESS INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Government shall not—

(1) convert any missile described in subsection (c) to a space transportation vehicle configuration or otherwise use any such missile to place a payload in space; or

(2) transfer ownership of any such missile to another person, except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) AUTHORIZED FEDERAL USES.—

(1) A missile described in subsection (c) may be converted for use as a space transportation vehicle by the Federal Government if except as provided in paragraph (2), at least 30 days before that conversion the agency seeking to use the missile as a space transportation vehicle transmits to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on National Security and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, shall ensure in writing that the use of that missile—

(A) would result in cost savings to the Federal Government when compared to the cost of acquiring space transportation services from United States commercial providers;

(B) meets all mission requirements of the agency, including performance, schedule, and risk requirements;

(C) is consistent with international obligations of the United States; and

(D) is approved by the Secretary of Defense or his designee.

(2) The requirement under paragraph (1) that the assurance described in that paragraph must be transmitted at least 30 days before conversion of the missile shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense determines that compliance with that requirement would be inconsistent with meeting immediate national security requirements.

(c) MISSILES REFERRED TO.—The missiles referred to in this section are missiles owned by the United States that—

(1) were formerly used by the Department of Defense for national defense purposes as intercontinental ballistic missiles; and

(2) have been declared excess to United States national defense needs and are in

compliance with international obligations of the United States.

SEC. 915. NATIONAL LAUNCH CAPABILITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) a robust satellite and launch industry in the United States serves the interest of the United States by—

(A) contributing to the economy of the United States;

(B) strengthening employment, technological, and scientific interests of the United States; and

(C) serving the foreign policy and national security interests of the United States.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Defense.

(2) TOTAL POTENTIAL NATIONAL MISSION MODEL.—The term “total potential national mission model” means a model that—

(A) is determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, to assess the total potential space missions to be conducted by the United States during a specified period of time; and

(B) includes all United States launches (including launches conducted on or off a Federal range).

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the Administrator and appropriate representatives of the satellite and launch industry and the governments of States and political subdivisions thereof—

(A) prepare a report that meets the requirements of this subsection; and

(B) submit that report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR REPORT.—The report prepared under this section shall—

(A) identify the total potential national mission model for the period beginning on the date of the report and ending on December 31, 2007;

(B) identify the resources that are necessary to carry out the total potential national mission model described in subparagraph (A), including providing for—

(i) launch property and services of the Department of Defense; and

(ii) the ability to support a launch within 6 hours after the appropriate official of the Federal Government receives notification by telephone at Government facilities located at—

(I) Cape Canaveral in Florida; or

(II) Vandenberg Air Force Base in California;

(C) identify each deficiency in the resources referred to in subparagraph (B);

(D) with respect to the deficiencies identified under subparagraph (C), including estimates of the level of funding necessary to address those deficiencies for the period described in subparagraph (A);

(E) identify opportunities for investment by non-Federal entities (including States and political subdivisions thereof and private sector entities) to assist the Federal Government in providing launch capabilities for the commercial space industry in the United States;

(F) identify 1 or more methods by which, if sufficient resources referred to in subparagraph (D) are not available to the Department of Defense, the control of the launch property and launch services of the Department of Defense may be transferred from the Department of Defense to—

(1) 1 or more other Federal agencies;

(ii) 1 or more States (or subdivisions thereof);

(iii) 1 or more private sector entities; or
(iv) any combination of the entities described in clauses (i) through (iii); and

(G) identify the technical, structural, and legal impediments associated with making launch sites in the United States cost-competitive on an international level.

HARKIN AMENDMENTS NOS. 3402-3404

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. HARKIN submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3402

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Of the total amount appropriated under title IV for research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide, for basic research, \$29,646,000 is available for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of title IV, the total amount available under title IV for the Foreign Military Comparative Testing program is \$10,000,000 less than the amount provided for that program under that title.

AMENDMENT NO. 3403

On page 36, line 22, before the period at the end insert the following: "Provided, That the total amount available under this heading is hereby increased by \$50,000,000, which shall be available for making smoking cessation therapy available for members of the Armed Forces (including retired members), former members of the Armed Forces entitled to retired or retainer pay, and dependents of such members and former members who are identified as persons likely to benefit from effective smoking cessation therapy, including providing subsidies for defraying costs incurred by the members, former members, and dependents for counseling and nicotine replacement: *Provided, further,* That the total amount appropriated under title IV is hereby reduced by \$50,000,000, to be derived from amounts appropriated under that title for advisory and assistance services".

AMENDMENT NO. 3404

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Out of funds appropriated by this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall make available to the Army Reserve Personnel Command, the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and the Air Force Personnel Center, and the National Archives and Records Administration funds in amounts necessary to ensure the elimination of the backlog in satisfying requests of former members of the Armed Forces for replacement medals and replacements for other decorations that such personnel have earned in the military service of the United States, and shall make any additional allocations of resources that the Secretary considers necessary to ensure the elimination of that backlog.

(b) An allocation of funds may be made under subsection (a) only if and to the extent that the allocation does not detract from the performance of other personnel service and personnel support activities within the Department of Defense.

FRIST AMENDMENT NO. 3405

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. FRIST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 9, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,000,000.

LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 3406

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . TRAINING AND OTHER PROGRAMS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program or exercise involving a unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has credible information that a member of such unit has committed a gross violation of human rights.

(b) MONITORING.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish procedures to ensure full consideration of all available information relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in paragraph (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under paragraph (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

COATS (AND LIEBERMAN)

AMENDMENT NO. 3407

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

JOINT WAR FIGHTING EXPERIMENTATION SEC. FINDINGS.

The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the unprecedented explosion of technological advances that could fundamentally redefine military threats and military capabilities in the future have generated a need to assess the defense policy, strategy, and force structure necessary to meet future defense requirements of the United States.

(2) The assessment conducted by the administration of President Bush (known as the "Base Force" assessment) and the assessment conducted by the administration of President Clinton (known as the "Bottom-Up Review") were important attempts to redefine the defense strategy of the United States and the force structure of the Armed Forces necessary to execute that strategy.

(3) Those assessments have become inadequate as a result of the pace of global geopolitical change and the speed of technological change, which have been greater than expected.

(4) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reacted to the changing environment by developing and publishing in May 1996 a vision statement, known as "Joint Vision 2010", to be a basis for the transformation of United States military capabilities. The vision statement embodies the improved intelligence and command and control that is available in the information age and sets forth the operational concepts of dominant maneuver, precision engagement, full-dimensional protection, and focused logistics to achieve the objective of full spectrum dominance.

(5) In 1996 Congress, concerned about the shortcomings in defense policies and programs derived from the Base-Force Review and the Bottom Up Review, determined that there was a need for a new, comprehensive assessment of the defense strategy of the United States and the force structure of the Armed Forces necessary for meeting the threats to the United States in the 21st century.

(6) As a result of that determination, Congress passed the Military Force Structure Review Act of 1996 (subtitle B of title IX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997), which required the Secretary of Defense to complete in 1997 a quadrennial defense review of the defense program of the United States. The review was required to include a comprehensive examination of the defense strategy, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, and other elements of the defense program and policies with a view toward determining and expressing the defense strategy of the United States and establishing a revised defense program through 2005. The Act also established a National Defense Panel to assess the Quadrennial Defense Review and to conduct an independent, nonpartisan review of the strategy, force structure, and funding required to meet anticipated threats to the national security of the United States through 2010 and beyond.

(7) The Quadrennial Defense Review, completed by the Secretary of Defense in May 1997, defined the defense strategy in terms of "Shape, Respond, and Prepare Now". The Quadrennial Defense Review placed greater emphasis on the need to prepare now for an uncertain future by exploiting the revolution in technology and transforming the force toward Joint Vision 2010. It concluded that our future force will be different in character than our current force.

(8) The National Defense Panel Report, published in December 1997, concluded that "the Department of Defense should accord the highest priority to executing a transformation strategy for the United States military, starting now." The panel recommended the establishment of a Joint Forces Command with the responsibility to be the joint force integrator and provider and the responsibility for driving the process for transforming United States forces, including the conduct of joint experimentation, and to have the budget for carrying out those responsibilities.

(9) The assessments of both the Quadrennial Defense Review and the National Defense Panel provide the Senate with a compelling argument that the future security environment and the military challenges to be faced by the United States in the future will be fundamentally different than the current environment and challenges. The assessments also reinforce the foundational premise of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 that warfare, in all of its varieties, will be

joint warfare requiring the execution of developed joint operational concepts.

(10) A process of joint experimentation is necessary for—

(A) integrating advances in technology with changes in the organizational structure of the Armed Forces and the development of joint operational concepts that will be effective against national security threats anticipated for the future; and

(B) identifying and assessing the interdependent aspects of joint warfare that are key for transforming the conduct of military operations by the United States to meet those anticipated threats successfully.

(11) It is critical for future readiness that the Armed Forces of the United States innovatively investigate and test technologies, forces, and joint operational concepts in simulations, wargames, and virtual settings, as well as in field environments under realistic conditions against the full range of future challenges. It is essential that an energetic and innovative organization be established and empowered to design and implement a process of joint experimentation to develop and validate new joint warfighting concepts, along with experimentation by the Armed Forces, that is directed at transforming the Armed Forces to meet the threats to the national security that are anticipated for the early 21st century. That process will drive changes in doctrine, organization, training and education, materiel, leadership, and personnel.

(12) The Department of Defense is committed to conducting aggressive experimentation as a key component of its transformation strategy. The competition of ideas is critical for achieving effective transformation. Experimentation by each of the Armed Forces has been, and will continue to be, a vital aspect of the pursuit of effective transformation. Joint experimentation leverages the effectiveness of each of the Armed Forces and the Defense Agencies.

SEC. . SENSE OF SENATE.

(a) DESIGNATION OF COMMANDER TO HAVE JOINT WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTATION MISSION.—It is the sense of Senate that Congress supports the initiative of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to designate a commander of a combatant command to have the mission for joint warfighting experimentation, consistent with the understanding of the Senate that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will assign the designated commander the tasks to develop and validate new joint warfighting concepts and capabilities, and to determine the implications, for doctrine, organization, training and education, materiel, leadership, and personnel, of the Department of Defense strategy for transforming the Armed Forces to meet the national security threats of the future.

(b) RESOURCES OF COMMANDER.—It is, further, the sense of Senate that the commander designated to have the joint warfighting experimentation mission should—

(1) have sufficient freedom of action and authority over the necessary forces to successfully establish and conduct the process of joint warfighting experimentation;

(2) be provided resources adequate for the joint warfighting experimentation process; and

(3) have authority over the use of the resources for the planning, preparation, conduct, and assessment of joint warfighting experimentation.

(c) AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMANDER.—It is, further, the sense of Sen-

ate that, for the conduct of joint warfighting experimentation to be effective, it is necessary that the commander designated to have the joint warfighting experimentation mission also have the authority and responsibility for the following:

(1) Developing and implementing a process of joint experimentation to formulate and validate concepts critical for joint warfighting in the future, including (in such process) analyses, simulations, wargames, information superiority and other experiments, advanced concept technology demonstrations, and joint exercises conducted in virtual and actual field environments.

(2) Planning, preparing, and conducting the program of joint warfighting experimentation.

(3) Assessing the effectiveness of organizational structures, operational concepts, and technologies employed in joint experimentation, investigating opportunities for coordinating the evolution of the organizational structure of the Armed Forces compatibly with the concurrent evolution of advanced technologies, and investigating new concepts for transforming joint warfighting capabilities to meet the operational challenges expected to be encountered by the Armed Forces in the early 21st century.

(4) Coordinating with each of the Armed Forces and the Defense Agencies regarding the development of the equipment (including surrogate or real technologies, platforms, and systems) necessary for the conduct of joint experimentation, or, if necessary, developing such equipment directly.

(5) Coordinating with each of the Armed Forces and the Defense Agencies regarding the acquisition of the materiel, supplies, services, and surrogate or real technology resources necessary for the conduct of joint experimentation, or, if necessary, acquiring such items and services directly.

(6) Developing scenarios and measures of effectiveness for joint experimentation.

(7) conducting so-called "red team" vulnerability assessments as part of joint experimentation.

(8) Assessing the interoperability of equipment and forces.

(9) Providing the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with the commander's recommendations (developed on the basis of joint experimentation) for reducing unnecessary redundancy of equipment and forces.

(10) Providing the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with the commander's recommendations (developed on the basis of joint experimentation) regarding synchronization of the fielding of advanced technologies among the Armed Forces to enable the development and execution of joint operational concepts.

(11) Submitting, reviewing, and making recommendations (in conjunction with the joint experimentation and evaluation process) to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on mission needs statements and operational requirements documents.

(12) Exploring new operational concepts (including those developed within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Defense Agencies, other unified commands, the Armed Forces, and the Joint Staff), and integrating and testing in joint experimentation the systems and concepts that result from warfighting experimentation by the Armed Forces and the Defense Agencies.

(13) Developing, planning, refining, assessing, and recommending to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the most promising joint con-

cepts and capabilities for experimentation and assessment.

(14) Assisting the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prioritize joint requirements and acquisition programs on the basis of joint warfighting experimentation.

(d) CONTINUED EXPERIMENTATION BY OTHER DEFENSE ORGANIZATIONS.—It is, further, the sense of Senate that—

(1) the Armed Forces are expected to continue to develop concepts and conduct intraservice and multiservice warfighting experimentation within their core competencies; and

(2) the commander of United States Special Operations Command is expected to continue to develop concepts and conduct joint experimentation associated with special operations forces.

(e) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—It is, further, the sense of Senate that—

(1) The Senate will carefully review the initial report and annual reports on joint warfighting experimentation required under section 1203 to determine the adequacy of the scope and pace of the transformation of the Armed Forces to meet future challenges to the national security; and

(2) if the progress is inadequate, the Senate will consider legislation to establish a unified combatant command with the mission, forces, budget, responsibilities, and authority described in the preceding provisions of this section.

SEC. . REPORTS ON JOINT WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTATION.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—(1) On such schedule as the Secretary of Defense shall direct, the commander of the combatant command assigned the mission for joint warfighting experimentation shall submit to the Secretary an initial report on the implementation of joint experimentation. Not later than April 1, 1999, the Secretary shall submit the report, together with any comments that the Secretary considers appropriate and any comments that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff considers appropriate, to the U.S. Senate.

(2) The initial report of the commander shall include the following:

(A) The commander's understanding of the commander's specific authority and responsibilities and of the commander's relationship to the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Joint Staff, the commanders of other combatant commands, the Armed Forces, and the Defense Agencies and activities.

(B) The organization of the commander's combatant command, and of its staff, for carrying out the joint warfighting experimentation mission.

(C) The process established for tasking forces to participate in joint warfighting experimentation and the commander's specific authority over the forces.

(D) Any forces designated or made available as joint experimentation forces.

(E) The resources provided for joint warfighting experimentation, including the personnel and funding for the initial implementation of joint experimentation, the process for providing the resources to the commander, the categories of the funding, and the authority of the commander for budget execution.

(F) The authority of the commander, and the process established, for the development and acquisition of the material, supplies, services, and equipment necessary for the conduct of joint warfighting experimentation, including the authority and process

for development and acquisition by the Armed Forces and the Defense Agencies and the authority and process for development and acquisition by the commander directly.

(G) The authority of the commander to design, prepare, and conduct joint experiments (including the scenarios and measures of effectiveness used) for assessing operational concepts for meeting future challenges to the national security.

(H) The role assigned the commander for—
(i) integrating and testing in joint warfighting experimentation the systems that emerge from warfighting experimentation by the Armed Forces or the Defense Agencies;

(ii) assessing the effectiveness of organizational structures, operational concepts, and technologies employed in joint warfighting experimentation; and

(iii) assisting the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in prioritizing acquisition programs in relationship to future joint warfighting capabilities.

(I) Any other comments that the commander considers appropriate.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) On such schedule as the Secretary of Defense shall direct, the commander of the combatant command assigned the mission for joint warfighting experimentation shall submit to the Secretary an annual report on the conduct of joint experimentation activities for the fiscal year ending in the year of the report. Not later than December 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit the report, together with any comments that the Secretary considers appropriate and any comments that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff considers appropriate, to the U.S. Senate. The first annual report shall be submitted in 1999.

(2) The annual report of the commander shall include, for the fiscal year covered by the report, the following:

(A) Any changes in—

(i) the commander's authority and responsibilities for joint warfighting experimentation;

(ii) the commander's relationship to the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the commanders of the other combatant commands, the Armed Forces, or the Defense Agencies or activities;

(iii) the organization of the commander's command and staff for joint warfighting experimentation;

(iv) any forces designated or made available as joint experimentation forces;

(v) the process established for tasking forces to participate in joint experimentation activities or the commander's specific authority over the tasked forces;

(vi) the procedures for providing funding for the commander, the categories of funding, or the commander's authority for budget execution;

(vii) the authority of the commander, and the process established, for the development and acquisition of the material, supplies, services, and equipment necessary for the conduct of joint warfighting experimentation;

(viii) the commander's authority to design, prepare, and conduct joint experiments (including the scenarios and measures of effectiveness used) for assessing operational concepts for meeting future challenges to the national security; or

(ix) any role described in subsection (a)(2)(H).

(B) The conduct of joint warfighting experimentation activities, including the number of activities, the forces involved, the na-

tional security challenges addressed, the operational concepts assessed, and the scenarios and measures of effectiveness used.

(C) An assessment of the results of warfighting experimentation within the Department of Defense.

(D) The effect of warfighting experimentation on the process for transforming the Armed Forces to meet future challenges to the national security.

(E) Any recommendation that the commander considers appropriate regarding—

(i) the development or acquisition of advanced technologies; or

(ii) changes in organizational structure, operational concepts, or joint doctrine.

(F) An assessment of the adequacy of resources, and any recommended changes for the process of providing resources, for joint warfighting experimentation.

(G) Any recommended changes in the authority or responsibilities of the commander.

(H) Any additional comments that the commander considers appropriate.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 3408

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall carry out a program to distribute surplus dental equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to the recipients, to Federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(1)(2)(B))) that serve special medically underserved populations including migratory and seasonal agricultural workers, the homeless, and residents of public housing.

(b) Not later than March 15, 1999, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the program, including the actions taken under the program.

HUTCHISON (AND ABRAHAM) AMENDMENT NO. 3409

Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. ABRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill, S 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. (a): Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since 1989,

(A) The national defense budget has been cut in half as a percentage of the gross domestic product;

(B) The national defense budget has been cut by over \$120 billion in real terms;

(C) The U.S. military force structure has been reduced by more than 30 percent;

(D) The Department of Defense's operations and maintenance accounts have been reduced by 40 percent;

(E) The Department of Defense's procurement funding has declined by more than 50 percent;

(F) U.S. military operational commitments have increased fourfold;

(G) The Army has reduced its ranks by over 630,000 soldiers and civilians, closed over 700 installations at home and overseas, and cut 10 divisions from its force structure;

(H) The Army has reduced its presence in Europe from 215,000 to 65,000 personnel;

(I) The Army has averaged 14 deployments every four years, increased significantly from the Cold War trend of one deployment every four years;

(J) The Air Force has downsized by nearly 40 percent, while experiencing a four-fold increase in operational commitments.

(2) In 1992, 37 percent of the Navy's fleet was deployed at any given time. Today that number is 57 percent; at its present rate, it will climb to 62 percent by 2005.

(3) The Navy Surface Warfare Officer community will fall short of its needs a 40 percent increase in retention to meet requirements;

(4) The Air Force is 18 percent short of its retention goal for second-term airmen;

(5) The Air Force is more than 800 pilots short, and more than 70 percent eligible for retention bonuses have turned them down in favor of separation;

(6) The Army faces critical personnel shortages in combat units, forcing unit commanders to borrow troops from other units just to participate in training exercises.

(7) An Air Force F-16 squadron commander testified before the House National Security Committee that his unit was forced to borrow three aircraft and use cannibalized parts from four other F-16s in order to deploy to Southwest Asia;

(8) In 1997, the Army averaged 31,000 soldiers deployed away from their home station in support of military operations in 70 countries with the average deployment lasting 125 days;

(9) Critical shortfalls in meeting recruiting and retention goals is seriously affecting the ability of the Army to train and deploy. The Army reduced its recruiting goals for 1998 by 12,000 personnel;

(10) In fiscal year 1997, the Army fell short of its recruiting goal for critical infantry soldiers by almost 5,000. As of February 15, 1998, Army-wide shortages existed for 28 Army specialties. Many positions in squads and crews are left unfilled or minimally filled because personnel are diverted to work in key positions elsewhere;

(11) The Navy reports it will fall short of enlisted sailor recruitment for 1998 by 10,000

(12) One in ten Air Force front-line units are not combat ready;

(13) Ten Air Force technical specialties, representing thousands of airmen, deployed away from their home station for longer than the Air Force standard 120-day mark in 1997;

(14) The Air Force fell short of its reenlistment rate for mid-career enlisted personnel by an average of six percent, with key war fighting career fields experiencing even larger drops in reenlistments;

(15) In 1997, U.S. Marines in the operating forces have deployed on more than 200 exercises, rotational deployments, or actual contingencies.

(16) U.S. Marine Corps maintenance forces are only able to maintain 92 percent ground equipment and 77 percent aviation equipment readiness rates due to excessive deployments of troops and equipment;

(17) The National Security Strategy of the United States assumes the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces to prevail in two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously.

(18) To execute the National Security of the United States, the U.S. Army's five later-deploying divisions, which constitute almost half of the Army's active combat forces, are critical to the success of specific war plans;

(19) According to commanders in these divisions, the practice of under staffing squads

and crews that are responsible for training, and assigning personnel to other units as fillers for exercises and operations, has become common and is degrading unit capability and readiness.

(20) In the aggregate, the Army's later-deploying divisions were assigned 93 percent of their authorized personnel at the beginning of fiscal year 1998. In one specific case, the 1st Armored Division was staffed at 94 percent in the aggregate; however, its combat support and service support specialties were filled at below 85 percent, and captains and majors were filled at 73 percent.

(21) At the 10th Infantry Division, only 138 of 162 infantry squads were fully or minimally filled, and 36 of the filled squads were unqualified. At the 1st Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division, only 56 percent of the authorized infantry soldiers for its Bradley Fighting Vehicles were assigned, and in the 2nd Brigade, 21 of 48 infantry squads had no personnel assigned. At the 3rd Brigade of the 1st Armored Division, only 16 of 116 M1A1 tanks had full crews and were qualified, and in one of the Brigade's two armor battalions, 14 of 58 tanks had no crewmembers assigned because the personnel were deployed to Bosnia.

(23) At the beginning of fiscal year 1998, the five later-deploying divisions critical to the execution of the U.S. National Security Strategy were short nearly 1,900 of the total 25,357 Non-Commissioned Officers authorized, and as of February 15, 1998, this shortage had grown to almost 2,200.

(24) Rotation of units to Bosnia is having a direct and negative impact on the ability of later-deploying divisions to maintain the training and readiness levels needed to execute their mission in a major regional conflict. Indications of this include:

(A) The reassignment by the Commander of the 3rd Brigade Combat Team of 63 soldiers within the brigade to serve in infantry squads of a deploying unit of 800 troops, stripping non-deploying infantry and armor units of maintenance personnel, and reassigning Non-Commissioned Officers and support personnel to the task force from throughout the brigade;

(B) Cancellation of gunnery exercises for at least two armor battalions in later-deploying divisions, causing 43 of 116 tank crews to lose their qualifications on the weapon system;

(C) Hiring of outside contract personnel by 1st Armored and 1st Infantry later-deploying divisions to perform routine maintenance.

(25) National Guard budget shortfalls compromise the Guard's readiness levels, capabilities, force structure, and end strength, putting the Guard's personnel, schools, training, full-time support, retention and recruitment, and morale at risk.

(26) The President's budget requests for the National Guard have been insufficient, notwithstanding the frequent calls on the Guard to handle wide-ranging tasks, including deployments in Bosnia, Iraq, Haiti, and Somalia.

(b) Sense of Congress:

(1) It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) The readiness of U.S. military forces to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States is being eroded from a combination of declining defense budgets and expanded missions;

(B) The ongoing, open-ended commitment of U.S. forces to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia is causing assigned and supporting units to compromise their principle wartime assignments;

(C) Defense appropriations are not keeping pace with the expanding needs of the armed forces.

(c) Report Requirement.

(1) Not later than June 1, 1999, the President shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives, and to the Committees on Appropriations in both Houses, a report on the military readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States. The President shall include in the report a detailed discussion of the competition for resources service-by-service caused by the ongoing commitment to the peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, including in those units that are supporting but not directly deployed to Bosnia. The President shall specifically include in the report the following:

(A) an assessment of current force structure and its sufficiency to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States;

(B) an outline of the service-by-service force structure expected to be committed to a major regional contingency as envisioned in the National Security Strategy of the United States;

(C) a comparison of the force structures outlined in sub-paragraph (c)(1)(B) above with the service-by-service order of battle in Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, as a representative and recent major regional conflict;

(D) the force structure and defense appropriation increases that are necessary to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States assuming current projected ground force levels assigned to the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia are unchanged;

(E) a discussion of the U.S. ground force level in Bosnia that can be sustained without impacting the ability of the Armed Forces to execute the National Security Strategy of the United States, assuming no increases in force structure and defense appropriations during the period in which ground forces are assigned to Bosnia.

HARKIN (AND BUMPERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3410

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. BUMPERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . No later than the date that the Senate passes S. 2132, CBO shall revise and reduce its estimates of outlays for fiscal year 1999 for nondefense outlays in a manner consistent with the adjustments and reductions made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate of outlays for fiscal year 1999 for defense outlays.

HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 3411

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall take such actions as are necessary to ensure the elimination of the backlog of incomplete actions on requests of former members of the Armed Forces for replacement medals and replacements for other decorations that such personnel have earned in the military service of the United States.

(b)(1) The actions taken under subsection (a) shall include, except as provided in para-

graph (2), allocations of additional resources to improve relevant staffing levels at the Army Reserve Personnel Command, the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and the Air Force Personnel Center, allocations of Department of Defense resources to the National Archives and Records Administration, and any additional allocations of resources that the Secretary considers necessary to carry out subsection (a).

(2) An allocation of resources may be made under paragraph (1) only if and to the extent that the allocation does not detract from the performance of other personnel service and personnel support activities within the Department of Defense.

COATS (AND LIEBERMAN) AMENDMENT NO. 3412

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. COATS (for himself, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:
REQUIREMENT FOR QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—Chapter 2 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 116 the following:

"§ 117. Quadrennial defense review

"(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall conduct in each year in which a President is inaugurated a comprehensive examination of the defense strategy, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the defense program and policies with a view toward determining and expressing the defense strategy of the United States and establishing a revised defense plan for the ensuing 10 years and a revised defense plan for the ensuing 20 years.

"(b) CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE PANEL.—In conducting the review, the Secretary shall take into consideration the reports of the National Defense Panel submitted under section 181(d) of this title.

"(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit a report on each review to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives not later than September 30, 2001. The report shall include the following:

"(1) The results of the review, including a comprehensive discussion of the defense strategy of the United States and the force structure best suited to implement that strategy.

"(2) The threats examined for purposes of the review and the scenarios developed in the examination of such threats.

"(3) The assumptions used in the review, including assumptions relating to the cooperation of allies and mission-sharing, levels of acceptable risk, warning times, and intensity and duration of conflict.

"(4) The effect on the force structure of preparations for and participation in peace operations and military operations other than war.

"(5) The effect on the force structure of the utilization by the Armed Forces of technologies anticipated to be available for the ensuing 10 years and technologies anticipated to be available for the ensuing 20 years, including precision guided munitions, stealth, night vision, digitization, and communications, and the changes in doctrine

and operational concepts that would result from the utilization of such technologies.

"(6) The manpower and sustainment policies required under the defense strategy to support engagement in conflicts lasting more than 120 days.

"(7) The anticipated roles and missions of the reserve components in the defense strategy and the strength, capabilities, and equipment necessary to assure that the reserve components can capably discharge those roles and missions.

"(8) The appropriate ratio of combat forces to support forces (commonly referred to as the "tooth-to-tail" ratio) under the defense strategy, including, in particular, the appropriate number and size of headquarter units and Defense Agencies for that purpose.

"(9) The air-lift and sea-lift capabilities required to support the defense strategy.

"(10) The forward presence, pre-positioning, and other anticipatory deployments necessary under the defense strategy for conflict deterrence and adequate military response to anticipated conflicts.

"(11) The extent to which resources must be shifted among two or more theaters under the defense strategy in the event of conflict in such theaters.

"(12) The advisability of revisions to the Unified Command Plan as a result of the defense strategy.

"(13) Any other matter the Secretary considers appropriate."

(b) NATIONAL DEFENSE PANEL.—Chapter 7 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 181. National Defense Panel

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a nonpartisan, independent panel to be known as the National Defense Panel. The Panel shall have the duties set forth in this section.

"(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Panel shall be composed of a chairman and eight other individuals appointed by the Secretary, in consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives, from among individuals in the private sector who are recognized experts in matters relating to the national security of the United States.

"(c) DUTIES.—The Panel shall—

"(1) conduct and submit to the Secretary of Defense and to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a comprehensive assessment of the defense strategy, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the defense program and policies with a view toward recommending a defense strategy of the United States and a revised defense plan for the ensuing 10 years and a revised defense plan for the ensuing 20 years; and

"(2) identify issues that the Panel recommends for assessment during the next QDR.

"(d) REPORT.—(1) The Panel, (c), shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives two reports on its activities and the findings and recommendations of the Panel, including any recommendations for legislation that the Panel considers appropriate, as follows:

"(A) An interim report not later than July 1, 2000.

"(B) A final report not later than December 1, 2000.

"(2) Not later than December 15, 2000, the Secretary shall submit to the committees referred to in subsection (b) a copy of the report together with the Secretary's comments on the report.

"(e) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Panel may secure directly from the Department of Defense and any of its components and from any other Federal department and agency such information as the Panel considers necessary to carry out its duties under this section. The head of the department or agency concerned shall ensure that information requested by the Panel under this subsection is promptly provided.

"(f) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—(1) Each member of the Panel shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5 for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Panel.

"(2) The members of the Panel shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5 while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Panel.

"(3)(A) The chairman of the Panel may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and a staff if the Panel determines that an executive director and staff are necessary in order for the Panel to perform its duties effectively. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Panel.

"(B) The chairman may fix the compensation of the executive director without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5 relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

"(4) Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Panel without reimbursement of the employee's agency, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege. The Secretary shall ensure that sufficient personnel are detailed to the Panel to enable the Panel to carry out its duties effectively.

"(5) To the maximum extent practicable, the members and employees of the Panel shall travel on military aircraft, military ships, military vehicles, or other military conveyances when travel is necessary in the performance of a duty of the Panel, except that no such aircraft, ship, vehicle, or other conveyance may be scheduled primarily for the transportation of any such member or employee when the cost of commercial transportation is less expensive.

"(g) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—(1) The Panel may use the United States mails and obtain printing and binding services in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

"(2) The Secretary shall furnish the Panel any administrative and support services requested by the Panel.

"(3) The Panel may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

"(h) PAYMENT OF PANEL EXPENSES.—The compensation, travel expenses, and per diem allowances of members and employees of the Panel shall be paid out of funds available to

the Department of Defense for the payment of compensation, travel allowances, and per diem allowances, respectively, of civilian employees of the Department. The other expenses of the Panel shall be paid out of funds available to the Department for the payment of similar expenses incurred by the Department.

"(i) TERMINATION.—The Panel shall terminate at the end of the year following the year in which the Panel submits its final report under subsection (d)(1)(B). For the period that begins 90 days after the date of submittal of the report, the activities and staff of the panel shall be reduced to a level that the Secretary of Defense considers sufficient to continue the availability of the panel for consultation with the Secretary of Defense and with the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 2 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 116 the following:

"117. Quadrennial defense review."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

"181. National Defense Panel."

**HUTCHISON (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3413**

Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. FEINGOLD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) The Congress finds the following:

(1) United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina have accomplished the military mission assigned to them as a component of the Implementation and Stabilization Forces.

(2) The continuing and open-ended commitment of U.S. ground forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is subject to the oversight authority of the Congress.

(3) Congress may limit the use of appropriated funds to create the conditions for an orderly and honorable withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(4) On November 27, 1995, the President affirmed that United States participation in the multinational military Implementation Force in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina would terminate in about one year.

(5) The President declared the expiration date of the mandate for the Implementation Force to be December 20, 1996.

(6) The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff expressed confidence that the Implementation Force would complete its mission in about one year.

(7) the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff expressed the critical importance of establishing a firm deadline, in the absence of which there is a potential for expansion of the mission of U.S. forces.

(8) On October 3, 1996, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff announced the intention of the United States Administration to delay the removal of United States Armed

Forces personnel from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina until March 1997.

(9) In November 1996 the President announced his intention to further extend the deployment of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina until June 1998.

(10) The President did not request authorization by the Congress of a policy that would result in the further deployment of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina until June 1998.

(11) Notwithstanding the passage of two previously established deadlines, the reaffirmation of those deadlines by senior national security officials, and the endorsement by those same national security officials of the importance of having a deadline as a hedge against an expanded mission, the President announced on December 17, 1997 that establishing a deadline had been a mistake and that U.S. ground combat forces were committed to the NATO-led mission in Bosnia for the indefinite future.

(12) NATO military forces have increased their participation in law enforcement, particularly police activities.

(13) U.S. Commanders of NATO have stated on several occasions that, in accordance with the Dayton Peace Accords, the principal responsibility for such law enforcement and police activities lies with the Bosnian parties themselves.

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF FUNDS.

(a) Funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for any fiscal year may not be obligated for the ground elements of the United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina except as conditioned below.

(1) The President shall continue the ongoing withdrawal of American forces from the NATO Stabilization Force in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina such that U.S. ground forces in that force or the planned multi-national successor force shall not exceed:

- (A) 6500, by February 2, 1999;
- (B) 5000, by October 1, 1999.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) to the extent necessary for U.S. ground forces to protect themselves as the drawdowns outlined in sub-paragraph (a)(1) proceeds;

(2) to the extent necessary to support a limited number of United States military personnel sufficient only to protect United States diplomatic facilities in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(3) to the extent necessary to support non-combat military personnel sufficient only to advise the commanders North Atlantic Treaty Organization peacekeeping operations in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and

(4) to U.S. ground forces that may be deployed as part of NATO containment operations in regions surrounding the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(v) CONSTRUCTION OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to restrict the authority of the President under the Constitution to protect the lives of the United States citizens.

(d) LIMITATION ON SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES IN BOSNIA.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended after the date of the enactment of this Act for the—

(1) conduct of, or direct support for, law enforcement and police activities in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, except for

the training of law enforcement personnel or to prevent imminent loss of life;

(2) conduct of, or support for, any activity in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina that may have the effect of jeopardizing the primary mission of the NATO-led force in preventing armed conflict between the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska ("Bosnian Entities");

(3) transfer of refugees within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina that, in the opinion of the commander of NATO Forces involved in such transfer—

(A) has as one of its purposes the acquisition of control by a Bosnian Entity of territory allocated to the other Bosnian Entity under the Dayton Peace Agreement; or

(B) may expose United States Armed Forces to substantial risk to their personal safety; and

(4) implementation of any decision to change the legal status of any territory within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina unless expressly agreed to by all signatories to the Dayton Peace Agreement.

SEC. 4. PRESIDENTIAL REPORT.

(a) Not later than December 1, 1998, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the progress towards meeting the drawdown limit established in section 2(a).

(b) The report under paragraph (a) shall include an identification of the specific steps taken by the United States Government to transfer the United States portion of the peacekeeping mission in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to European allied nations or organizations.

DODD AMENDMENT NO. 3414

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Of the total amount appropriated for the Army, the Army Reserve, and the Army National Guard under title I, \$1,700,000 shall be available for taking the actions required under this section to eliminate the backlog of unpaid retired pay and to submit a report.

(b) The Secretary of the Army shall take such actions as are necessary to eliminate, by December 31, 1998, the backlog of unpaid retired pay for members and former members of the Army (including members and former members of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard).

(c) Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to Congress a report on the backlog of unpaid retired pay. The report shall include the following:

- (1) The actions taken under subsection (b).
- (2) The extent of the remaining backlog.

(3) A discussion of any additional actions that are necessary to ensure that retired pay is paid in a timely manner.

DODD AMENDMENT NO. 3415

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds available under title VI for the Defense Health Program, \$3,000,000 shall be available for Department of Defense programs relating to Lyme disease and other

tick-borne diseases, which shall include programs involving risk assessments at military installations, training for medical personnel in the detection, diagnosis and treatment of such diseases, improvement of educational and awareness programs for Armed Forces personnel, development of diagnostic tests for such diseases, testing of repellents, and field testing of new control technologies, and may include other programs.

MURKOWSKI AMENDMENT NO. 3416

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new section: "From within the funds provided, with the heading 'Operations and Maintenance, Army', up to \$500,000 shall be available for paying subcontractors and suppliers for work performed at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, in 1994, under Army services contract number DACA85-93-C-0065'."

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 3417

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. LOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. The Department of Defense shall, in allocating funds for the Next Generation Internet (NGI) initiative, give full consideration to the allocation of funds to the regional partnerships that will best leverage Department investments in the Major Shared Resource Centers and Distributed Centers of the Department, including the high performance networks associated with such centers.

ROBB AMENDMENT NO. 3418

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. ROBB submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY", \$45,000,000 shall be available for emergency and extraordinary expenses associated with the accident involving a United States Marine Corps A-6 aircraft on February 3, 1998, near Cavalese, Italy: *Provided*, That the amount available under this section shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the amount available under this section shall be available only for payments to persons, communities, or other entities in Italy for reimbursement for damages resulting from the expenses, or for settlement of claims arising from deaths, associated with the accident described in this section: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount available under this section may be used to rebuild or replace the funicular system in Cavalese, Italy, destroyed on February 3, 1998, by United States aircraft: *Provided further*, That any amount paid to any individual or entity from the amount available under this section shall be credited against any amount subsequently determined to be payable to that individual or entity under section 127 or chapter 163 of title

10, United States Code, or any other provision of law for administrative settlement of claims against the United States with respect to damages arising from the accident described in this section: *Provided further*, That payment of an amount under this section shall not be considered to constitute a statement of legal liability on the part of the United States or otherwise to prejudice any judicial proceeding or investigation arising from the accident described in this section.

HUTCHINSON (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3419

Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3124 proposed by Mr. HUTCHINSON to the bill, S. 2132, *supra*; as follows:

Strike all after the word "TITLE" and insert the following:

IX
HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

Subtitle A—Forced Abortions in China

SEC. 9001. This subtitle may be cited as the "Forced Abortion Condemnation Act".

SEC. 9002. Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Forced abortion was rightly denounced as a crime against humanity by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal.

(2) For over 15 years there have been frequent and credible reports of forced abortion and forced sterilization in connection with the population control policies of the People's Republic of China. These reports indicate the following:

(A) Although it is the stated position of the politburo of the Chinese Communist Party that forced abortion and forced sterilization have no role in the population control program, in fact the Communist Chinese Government encourages both forced abortion and forced sterilization through a combination of strictly enforced birth quotas and immunity for local population control officials who engage in coercion. Officials acknowledge that there have been instances of forced abortions and sterilization, and no evidence has been made available to suggest that the perpetrators have been punished.

(B) People's Republic of China population control officials, in cooperation with employers and works unit officials, routinely monitor women's menstrual cycles and subject women who conceive without government authorization to extreme psychological pressure, to harsh economic sanctions, including unpayable fines and loss of employment, and often to physical force.

(C) Official sanctions for giving birth to unauthorized children include fines in amounts several times larger than the per capita annual incomes of residents of the People's Republic of China. In Fujian, for example, the average fine is estimated to be twice a family's gross annual income. Families which cannot pay the fine may be subject to confiscation and destruction of their homes and personal property.

(D) Especially harsh punishments have been inflicted on those whose resistance is motivated by religion. For example, according to a 1995 Amnesty International report, the Catholic inhabitants of 2 villages in Hebei Province were subjected to population control under the slogan "better to have more graves than one more child". Enforcement measures included torture, sexual abuse, and the detention of resisters' relatives as hostages.

(E) Forced abortions in Communist China often have taken place in the very late stages of pregnancy.

(F) Since 1994 forced abortion and sterilization have been used in Communist China not only to regulate the number of children, but also to eliminate those who are regarded as defective in accordance with the official eugenic policy known as the "Natal and Health Care Law".

SEC. 9003. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 to issue any visa to any official of any country (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers) who the Secretary finds, based on credible and specific information, has been directly involved in the establishment or enforcement of population control policies forcing a woman to undergo an abortion against her free choice, or forcing a man or woman to undergo sterilization against his or her free choice or policies condoning the practice of genital mutilation.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1999 to admit to the United States any national covered by subsection (a).

(c) The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) if the President—

(1) determines that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to Congress containing a justification for the waiver.

Subtitle B—Freedom on Religion in China

SEC. 9011. (a) It is the sense of Congress that the President should make freedom of religion one of the major objectives of United States foreign policy with respect to China.

(b) As part of this policy, the Department of State should raise in every relevant bilateral and multilateral forum the issue of individuals imprisoned, detained, confined, or otherwise harassed by the Chinese Government on religious grounds.

(c) In its communications with the Chinese Government, the Department of State should provide specific names of individuals of concern and request a complete and timely response from the Chinese Government regarding the individuals' whereabouts and condition, the charges against them, and sentence imposed.

(d) The goal of these official communications should be the expeditious release of all religious prisoners in China and Tibet and the end of the Chinese Government's policy and practice of harassing and repressing religious believers.

SEC. 9012. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 to issue a visa to any official or any country (except the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet level ministers) who the Secretary of State finds, based on credible and specific information, has been directly involved in the establishment or enforcement of policies or practices designed to restrict religious freedom.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General may not utilize any funds appropriated or otherwise available for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1999 to admit to the United States any national covered by subsection (a).

(c) The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) or (b) with respect to

an individual described in such subsection if the President—

(1) determines that it is vital to the national interest to do so; and

(2) provides written notification to the appropriate congressional committees containing a justification for the waiver.

SEC. 9014. In this subtitle, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

AKAKA (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3420

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. AKAKA for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. COATS, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. INOUE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2132, *supra*; as follows:

On page 33, line 25, insert before the period at the end the following: "Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$12,000,000 shall be available only to continue development of electric and hybrid-electric vehicles".

BINGAMAN (AND DOMENICI)
AMENDMENT NO. 3421

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BINGAMAN for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, *supra*; as follows:

On page 99, in between lines 17 and 18, insert before the period at the end the following: "SEC. 8104(a). That of the amount available under Air National Guard, Operations and Maintenance for flying hours and related personnel support, 2,250,000 shall be available for the Defense Systems Evaluation program for support of test and training operations at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and Fort Bliss, Texas".

COCHRAN AMENDMENT NO. 3422

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. COCHRAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, *supra*; as follows:

On page 99, insert at the appropriate place the following new section:

SEC. . That of the funds appropriated for Defense-wide research, development test and evaluation, \$1,000,000 is available for Acoustic Sensor Technology Development Planning.

DOMENICI (AND HARKIN)
AMENDMENT NO. 3423

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI for himself and Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, *supra*; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on food stamp assistance for members of the Armed Forces. The Secretary shall submit the report at the same time that the Secretary submits to Congress, in support of the fiscal year 2000 budget, the materials that relate to the funding provided in that budget for the Department of Defense.

(b) The report shall include the following:

(1) The number of members of the Armed Forces and dependents of members of the

Armed Forces who are eligible for food stamps.

(2) The number of members of the Armed Forces and dependents of members of the Armed Forces who received food stamps in fiscal year 1998.

(3) A proposal for using, as a means for eliminating or reducing significantly the need of such personnel for food stamps, the authority under section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, to lease housing facilities for enlisted members of the Armed Forces and their families when Government quarters are not available for such personnel.

(4) A proposal for increased locality adjustments through the basic allowance for housing and other methods as a means for eliminating or reducing significantly the need of such personnel for food stamps.

(5) Other potential alternative actions (including any recommended legislation) for eliminating or reducing significantly the need of such personnel for food stamps.

(6) A discussion of the potential for each alternative action referred to in paragraph (3) or (4) to result in the elimination or a significant reduction in the need of such personnel for food stamps.

(c) Each potential alternative action included in the report under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (b) shall meet the following requirements:

(1) Apply only to persons referred to in paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(2) Be limited in cost to the lowest amount feasible to achieve the objectives.

(d) In this section:

(1) The term "fiscal year 2000 budget" means the budget for fiscal year 2000 that the President submits to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

(2) The term "food stamps" means assistance under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

SEC. 8105. (a) The Comptroller General shall carry out a study of issues relating to family life, morale, and retention of members of the Armed Forces and, not later than June 25, 1999, submit the results of the study to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Comptroller General may submit to the committees an interim report on the matters described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c). Any such interim report shall be submitted by February 12, 1999.

(b) In carrying out the study, the Comptroller General shall consult with experts on the subjects of the study who are independent of the Department of Defense.

(c) The study shall include the following matters:

(1) The conditions of the family lives of members of the Armed Forces and the members' needs regarding their family lives, including a discussion of each of the following:

(A) How leaders of the Department of Defense and leaders of each of the Armed Forces—

(i) collect, organize, validate, and assess information to determine those conditions and needs;

(ii) determine consistency and variations among the assessments and assessed information for each of the Armed Forces; and

(iv) use the information and assessments to address those conditions and needs.

(B) How the information on those conditions and needs compares with any corresponding information that is available on the conditions of the family lives of civilians in the United States and the needs of such civilians regarding their family lives.

(C) How the conditions of the family lives of members of each of the Armed Forces and the members' needs regarding their family lives compare with those of the members of each of the other Armed Forces.

(D) How the conditions and needs of the members compare or vary among members in relation to the pay grades of the members.

(E) How the conditions and needs of the members compare or vary among members in relation to the occupational specialties of the members.

(F) What, if any, effects high operating tempos of the Armed Forces have had on the family lives of members, including effects on the incidence of substance abuse, physical or emotional abuse of family members, and divorce.

(G) The extent to which family lives of members of the Armed Forces prevent members from being deployed.

(2) The rates of retention of members of the Armed Forces, including the following:

(A) The rates based on the latest information available when the report is prepared.

(B) Projected rates for future periods for which reasonably reliable projections can be made.

(C) An analysis of the rates under subparagraphs (A) and (B) for each of the Armed Forces, each pay grade, and each major occupational specialty.

(3) The relationships among the quality of the family lives of members of the Armed Forces, high operating tempos of the Armed Forces, and retention of the members in the Armed Forces, analyzed for each of the Armed Forces, each pay grade, and each occupational specialty, including, to the extent ascertainable and relevant to the analysis of the relationships, the reasons expressed by members of the Armed Forces for separating from the Armed Forces and the reasons expressed by the members of the Armed Forces for remaining in the Armed Forces.

(4) The programs and policies of the Department of Defense (including programs and policies specifically directed at quality of life) that have tended to improve, and those that have tended to degrade, the morale of members of the Armed Forces and members of their families, the retention of members of the Armed Forces, and the perceptions of members of the Armed Forces and members of their families regarding the quality of their lives.

(d) In this section, the term "major occupational specialty" means the aircraft pilot specialty and each other occupational specialty that the Comptroller General considers a major occupational specialty of the Armed Forces.

DURBIN AMENDMENT NO. 3424

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out any conveyance of land at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, unless such conveyance is consistent with a regional agreement among the communities and jurisdictions in the vicinity of Fort Sheridan and in accordance with section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104-106; 110 Stat. 573).

(2) The land referred to in paragraph (1) is a parcel of real property, including any im-

provements thereon, located at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, consisting of approximately 14 acres, and known as the northern Army Reserve enclave area, that is covered by the authority in section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and has not been conveyed pursuant to that authority as of the date of enactment of this Act.

GREGG AMENDMENT NO. 3425

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GREGG) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, without consideration, to the Town of Newington, New Hampshire, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, together with improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 1.3 acres located at former Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, and known as the site of the old Stone School.

(b) EXCEPTION FROM SCREENING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall make the conveyance under subsection (a) without regard to the requirement under section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, that the property be screened for further Federal use in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the Secretary.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

HOLLINGS AMENDMENT NO. 3426

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HOLLINGS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense by this Act, up to \$10,000,000 may be available for the Department of Defense share of environmental remediation and restoration activities at Defense Logistics Agency inventory location 429 (Macalloy site) in Charleston, South Carolina.

INOUYE AMENDMENTS NOS. 3427-3429

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. INOUYE) proposed three amendments to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3427

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", for Materials and Electronics Technology, \$2,000,000 shall be made available only for the Strategic Materials Manufacturing Facility project.

AMENDMENT NO. 3428

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2641 the following:

“§ 2641a. Transportation of American Samoa veterans on Department of Defense aircraft for certain medical care in Hawaii

“(a) TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may provide transportation on Department of Defense aircraft for the purpose of transporting any veteran specified in subsection (b) between American Samoa and the State of Hawaii if such transportation is required in order to provide hospital care to such veteran as described in that subsection.

“(b) VETERANS ELIGIBLE FOR TRANSPORT.—A veteran eligible for transport under subsection (a) is any veteran who—

“(1) resides in and is located in American Samoa; and

“(2) as determined by an official of the Department of Veterans Affairs designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, must be transported to the State of Hawaii in order to receive hospital care to which such veteran is entitled under chapter 17 of title 38 in facilities of such Department in the State of Hawaii.

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—(1) Transportation may be provided to veterans under this section only on a space-available basis.

“(2) A charge may not be imposed on a veteran for transportation provided to the veteran under this section.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38.

“(2) The term ‘hospital care’ has the meaning given that term in section 1701(5) of title 38.”

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 157 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2641 the following new item:

“2641a. Transportation of American Samoa veterans on Department of Defense aircraft for certain medical care in Hawaii.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3424

SEC. . Not later than December 1, 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the President and the Congressional Defense Committees a report regarding the potential for development of Ford Island within the Pearl Harbor Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii through an integrated resourcing plan incorporating both appropriated funds and one or more public-private ventures. This report shall consider innovative resources development measures, including but not limited to, an enhanced-use leasing program similar to that of the Department of Veterans Affairs as well as the sale or other disposal of land in Hawaii under the control of the Navy as part of an overall program for Ford Island development. The report shall include proposed legislation for carrying out the measures recommended therein.

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 3430

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Within the amounts appropriated under Title IV of this Act under the heading “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, the amount available for S-3 Weapon System Improvement is hereby reduced by \$8,000,000: *Provided*, Within the

amounts appropriated under Title IV of this Act under the heading “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, the amount available for a cyber-security program is hereby increased by \$8,000,000: *Provided further*, That the funds are made available for the cyber-security program to conduct research and development on issues relating to security information assurance and to facilitate the transition of information assurance technology to the defense community.

**SARBANES (AND CAMPBELL)
AMENDMENT NO. 3431**

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SARBANES for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8 . . . ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL

Section 3 of Public Law 99-572 (40 U.S.C. 1003 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts made available under subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary of the Army may expend, from any funds available to the Secretary on the date of enactment of this paragraph, \$2,000,000 for repair of the memorial.

“(2) DISPOSITION OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM CLAIMS.—Any funds received by the Secretary of the Army as a result of any claim against a contractor in connection with construction of the memorial shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.”

**MCCONNELL (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3432**

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MCCONNELL for himself, Mr. FORD, and Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds available under title VI for chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense, for research and design, \$18,000,000 shall be made available for the program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (under section 8065 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997) for demonstrations of technologies under the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment, for planning and preparation to proceed from demonstration of an alternative technology immediately into the development of a pilot-scale facility for the technology, and for the design, construction, and operation of a pilot facility for the technology.

MACK AMENDMENT NO. 3433

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MACK) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. (a) The Secretary of the Navy may lease to the University of Central Florida (in this section referred to as the “University”), or a representative or agent of the University designated by the University, such portion of the property known as the Naval Air Warfare Center, Training Systems Division, Orlando, Florida, as the Secretary

considers appropriate as a location for the establishment of a center for research in the fields of law enforcement, public safety, civil defense, and national defense.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term of the lease under subsection (a) may not exceed 50 years.

(c) As consideration for the lease under subsection (a), the University shall—

(1) undertake and incur the cost of the planning, design, and construction required to establish the center referred to in that subsection; and

(2) during the term of the lease, provide the Secretary such space in the center for activities of the Navy as the Secretary and the University jointly consider appropriate.

(d) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the lease authorized by subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

MIKULSKI AMENDMENT NO. 3434

Mr. STEVENS (for Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99 in between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Funds appropriated under O&M Navy are available for a vessel scrapping pilot program which the Secretary of the Navy may carry out during fiscal year 1999 and (notwithstanding the expiration of authority to obligate funds appropriated under this heading) fiscal year 2000, and for which the Secretary may define the program scope as that which the Secretary determines sufficient for gathering data on the cost of scrapping Government vessels and for demonstrating cost effective technologies and techniques to scrap such vessels in a manner that is protective of worker safety and health and the environment”.

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 3435

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. The Department of Defense shall, in allocating funds for the Next Generation Internet (NGI) initiative, give full consideration to the allocation of funds to the regional partnerships that will best leverage Department investments in the DoD Major Shared Resource Centers and Centers with supercomputers purchased using DoD RDT&E funds, including the high performance networks associated with such centers.

MURKOWSKI AMENDMENT NO. 3436

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new section: “From within the funds provided, with the heading, ‘Operations and Maintenance, Army’, up to \$500,000 shall be available for paying subcontractors and suppliers for work performed at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, in 1994, under Army services contract number DACA85-93-C-0065”.

SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 3437

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", for Industrial Preparedness, \$2,000,000 shall be made available only for the Electronic Circuit Board Manufacturing Development Center.

SPECTER AMENDMENT NO. 3438

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SPECTER) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . COMMISSION TO ASSESS THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO COMBAT THE PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

The Combatting Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (as contained in Public Law 104-293) is amended—

(1) in section 711(b), in the text above paragraph (1), by striking "eight" and inserting "twelve";

(2) in section 711(b)(2), by striking "one" and inserting "three";

(3) in section 711(b)(4), by striking "one" and inserting "three";

(4) in section 711(e), by striking "on which all members of the Commission have been appointed" and inserting "on which the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, is enacted, regardless of whether all members of the Commission have been appointed"; and

(5) in section 712(c), by striking "not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act," and inserting "Not later than June 15, 1999,".

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 3439

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title III of this Act under the heading "Other Procurement, Army", for Training Devices \$4,000,000 shall be made available only for procurement of Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System (MILES) equipment to support Department of Defense Cope Thunder exercises.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 3440

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 73, line 4 of the bill, revise the text "rescinded from" to read "rescinded as of the date of enactment of this act from".

COCHRAN AMENDMENT NO. 3441

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. COCHRAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Within the amounts appropriated under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", the amount available for Joint Tactical Radio is hereby reduced by \$10,981,000, and the amount available for Army Data Distribution System development is hereby increased by \$10,981,000.

WARNER AMENDMENT NO. 3442

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", for Digitization, \$2,000,000 shall be made available only for the Digital Intelligence Situation Mapboard (DISM).

BOXER AMENDMENT NO. 3443

Mr. STEVENS (for Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds available for the Navy for research, development, test, and evaluation under title IV, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the Shortstop Electronic Protection System".

FORD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3444

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. FORD for himself, Mr. BOND, and Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Subsection (a)(3) of section 112 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and leasing of equipment" and inserting in lieu thereof "and equipment, and the leasing of equipment,".

(b) Subsection (b)(2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) A member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under orders authorized under paragraph (1) shall participate in the training required under section 502(a) of this title in addition to the duty performed for the purpose authorized under that paragraph. The pay, allowances, and other benefits of the member while participating in the training shall be the same as those to which the member is entitled while performing duty for the purpose of carrying out drug interdiction and counter-drug activities.

"(B) Appropriations available for the Department of Defense for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be used for paying costs associated with a member's participation in training described in subparagraph (A). The appropriation shall be reimbursed in full, out of appropriations available for paying those costs, for the amounts paid. Appropriations available for paying those costs shall be available for making the reimbursements."

(c) Subsection (b)(3) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) A unit or member of the National Guard of a State may be used, pursuant to a State drug interdiction and counter-drug activities plan approved by the Secretary of Defense under this section, to provide services or other assistance (other than air transportation) to an organization eligible to receive services under section 508 of this title if—

"(A) the State drug interdiction and counter-drug activities plan specifically recognizes the organization as being eligible to receive the services or assistance;

"(B) in the case of services, the provision of the services meets the requirements of

paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of section 508 of this title; and

"(C) the services or assistance is authorized under subsection (b) or (c) of such section or in the State drug interdiction and counter-drug activities plan."

(d) Subsection (1)(1) of such section is amended by inserting after "drug interdiction and counter-drug law enforcement activities" the following: ", including drug demand reduction activities,".

DODD AMENDMENT NO. 3445

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 36, line 22, insert before the period at the end the following: "Provided, That, of the funds available under this heading, \$3,000,000 shall be available for research and surveillance activities relating to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases".

KERRY AMENDMENT NO. 3446

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the amounts appropriated by title IV of this Act under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY", \$3,000,000 shall be available for advanced research relating to solid state dye lasers.

MCCAIN (AND KYL) AMENDMENT NO. 3447

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MCCAIN for himself and Mr. KYL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into an agreement to lease from the City of Phoenix, Arizona, the parcel of real property described in subsection (b), together with improvements on the property, in consideration of annual rent not in excess of one dollar.

(b) The real property referred to in subsection (a) is a parcel, known as Auxiliary Field 3, that is located approximately 12 miles north of Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, in section 4 of township 3 north, range 1 west of the Gila and Salt River Base and Meridian, Maricopa County, Arizona, is bounded on the north by Bell Road, on the east by Litchfield Road, on the south by Greenway Road, and on the west by agricultural land, and is composed of approximately 638 acres, more or less, the same property that was formerly an Air Force training and emergency field developed during World War II.

(c) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the lease under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

MCCAIN (AND KYL) AMENDMENT NO. 3448

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MCCAIN for himself and Mr. KYL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", up to \$1,300,000 may be made available only to integrate and evaluate enhanced, active and passive, passenger safety system for heavy tactical trucks.

GRASSLEY AMENDMENT NO. 3449

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:
SEC. . . Effective on June 30, 1999, section 8106(a) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under section 101(b) of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), is amended—

(1) by striking out "not later than June 30, 1997," and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than June 30, 1999,"; and

(2) by striking out "\$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 3450

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Of the total amount appropriated under title IV for research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide, for basic research, \$29,646,000 is available for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 3451

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Within the amounts appropriated under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", the amount available for Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System is hereby reduced by \$9,827,000, and the amount available for Consolidated Training Systems Development is hereby increased by \$9,827,000.

FAIRCLOTH AMENDMENT NO. 3452

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. FAIRCLOTH) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. (a) Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing a comprehensive assessment of the TRICARE program.

(b) The assessment under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A comparison of the health care benefits available under the health care options of the TRICARE program known as TRICARE Standard, TRICARE Prime, and TRICARE Extra with the health care benefits available under the health care plan of the Federal Employees Health Benefits program most similar to each such option that has the most subscribers as of the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(A) the types of health care services offered by each option and plan under comparison;

(B) the ceilings, if any, imposed on the amounts paid for covered services under each option and plan under comparison; and

(C) the timeliness of payments to physicians providing services under each option and plan under comparison.

(2) An assessment of the effect on the subscription choices made by potential subscribers to the TRICARE program of the Department of Defense policy to grant priority in the provision of health care services to subscribers to a particular option.

(3) An assessment of the effect on the implementation of the TRICARE program has discouraged medicare-eligible individuals from obtaining health care services from military treatment facilities, including—

(A) an estimate of the number of such individuals discouraged from obtaining health care services from such facilities during the two-year period ending with the commencement of the implementation of the TRICARE program; and

(B) an estimate of the number of such individuals discouraged from obtaining health care services from such facilities during the two-year period following the commencement of the implementation of the TRICARE program.

(4) An assessment of any other matters that the Comptroller General considers appropriate for purposes of this section.

(c) In this section:

(1) The term "Federal Employees Health Benefits program" means the health benefits program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The term "TRICARE program" has the meaning given that term in section 1072(7) of title 10, United States Code.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 3453

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force may each enter into one or more multiyear leases of non-tactical firefighting equipment, non-tactical crash rescue equipment, or non-tactical snow removal equipment. The period of a lease entered into under this section shall be for any period not in excess of 10 years. Any such lease shall provide that performance under the lease during the second and subsequent years of the contract is contingent upon the appropriation of funds and shall provide for a cancellation payment to be made to the lessor if such appropriations are not made.

(b) Lease payments made under subsection (a) shall be made from amounts provided in this or future appropriations Acts.

(c) This section is effective for all fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998.

BUMPERS AMENDMENT NO. 3454

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BUMPERS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill in Title VIII, insert the following:

"Sec. . . Of the amounts appropriated in this bill for the Defense Threat Reduction and Treaty Compliance Agency and for Operations and Maintenance, National Guard, \$1,500,000 shall be available to develop training materials and a curriculum for a Domestic Preparedness Sustainment Training Center at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas."

FAIRCLOTH AMENDMENT NO. 3455

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. FAIRCLOTH) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", up to \$10,000,000 may be made available only for the efforts associated with building and demonstrating a deployable mobile large aerostat system platform.

BAUCUS AMENDMENT NO. 3456

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BAUCUS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert before the period at the end the following: "SEC. . . That of the amounts available under this heading, \$150,000 shall be made available to the Bear Paw Development Council, Montana, for the management and conversion of the Havre Air Force Base and Training Site, Montana, for public benefit purposes, including public schools, housing for the homeless, and economic development".

MCCAIN (AND HUTCHISON) AMENDMENT NO. 3457

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MCCAIN for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Section 4344(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (2), by striking out " , except that the reimbursement rates may not be less than the cost to the United States of providing such instruction, including pay, allowances, and emoluments, to a cadet appointed from the United States"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (3).

(b) Section 6957(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (2), by striking out " , except that the reimbursement rates may not be less than the cost to the United States of providing such instruction, including pay, allowances, and emoluments, to a midshipman appointed from the United States"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (3).

(c) Section 9344(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (2), by striking out " , except that the reimbursement rates may not be less than the cost to the United States of providing such instruction, including pay, allowances, and emoluments, to a cadet appointed from the United States"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (3).

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 3458

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 54, strike Section 8023 and insert the following:

SEC. 8023. (a) In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, \$8,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by Section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That

contractors participating in the test program established by section 854 of Public Law 101-189 (15 U.S.C. 637 note) shall be eligible for the program established by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544).

(b) Section 8024 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 105-56) is amended by striking out "That these payments" and all that follows through "Provided further,".

**MCCONNELL (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3459**

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MCCONNELL for himself, Mr. FORD, and Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Out of the funds available for the Department of Defense under title VI of this Act for chemical agents and munitions, Defense, or the unobligated balances of funds available for chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense, under any other Act making appropriations for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for any fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may use not more than \$25,000,000 for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment to complete the demonstration of alternatives to baseline incineration for the destruction of chemical agents and munitions and to carry out the pilot program under section 8065 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (section 101(b) of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-101; 50 U.S.C. 1521 note). The amount specified in the preceding sentence is in addition to any other amount that is made available under title VI of this Act to complete the demonstration of the alternatives and to carry out the pilot program: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be taken from any ongoing operational chemical munition destruction programs.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 3460

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

Findings:
child experts estimate that as many as 250,000 children under the age of 18 are currently serving in armed forces or armed groups in more than 30 countries around the world;

contemporary armed conflict has caused the deaths of 2,000,000 minors in the last decade alone, and has left an estimated 6,000,000 children seriously injured or permanently disabled;

children are uniquely vulnerable to military recruitment because of their emotional and physical immaturity, are easily manipulated, and can be drawn into violence that they are too young to resist or understand;

children are most likely to become child soldiers if they are poor, separated from their families, displaced from their homes, living in a combat zone, or have limited access to education;

orphans and refugees are particularly vulnerable to recruitment;

one of the most egregious examples of the use of child soldiers is the abduction of some 10,000 children, some as young as 8 years of age, by the Lord's Resistance Army (in this

resolution referred to as the "LRA") in northern Uganda;

the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1997 reports that in Uganda the LRA kills, maims, and rapes large numbers of civilians, and forces abducted children into "virtual slavery as guards, concubines, and soldiers";

children abducted by the LRA are forced to raid and loot villages, fight in the front line of battle against the Ugandan army and the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA); serve as sexual slaves to rebel commanders, and participate in the killing of other children who try to escape;

former LRA child captives report witnessing Sudanese government soldiers delivering food supplies, vehicles, ammunition, and arms to LRA base camps in government-controlled southern Sudan;

children who manage to escape from LRA captivity have little access to trauma care and rehabilitation programs, and many find their families displaced, unlocatable, dead, or fearful of having their children return home;

Graca Machel, the former United Nations expert on the impact of armed conflict on children, identified the immediate demobilization of all child soldiers as an urgent priority, and recommended the establishment through an optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 18 as the minimum age for recruitment and participation in armed forces; and

the International Committee of the Red Cross, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, and the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights, as well as many nongovernmental organizations, also support the establishment of 18 as the minimum age for military recruitment and participation in armed conflict:

SEC. 1. (a) The Senate hereby—
(1) deplores the global use of child soldiers and supports their immediate demobilization;

(2) condemns the abduction of Ugandan children by the LRA;

(3) calls on the Government of Sudan to use its influence with the LRA to secure the release of abducted children and to halt further abductions; and

(4) encourages the United States delegation not to block the drafting of an optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child that would establish 18 as the minimum age for participation in armed conflict.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the President and the Secretary of State should—

(1) support efforts to end the abduction of children by the LRA, secure their release, and facilitate their rehabilitation and reintegration into society;

(2) not block efforts to establish 18 as the minimum age for participation in conflict through an optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child; and

(3) provide greater support to United Nations agencies and nongovernmental organizations working for the rehabilitation and reintegration of former child soldiers into society.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and the Secretary of State.

FAIRCLOTH AMENDMENT NO. 3461

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. FAIRCLOTH) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense shall obligate the funds provided for Counterterrorism Technical Support in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (under title IV of Public Law 105-56) for the projects and in the amounts provided for in House Report 105-265 of the House of Representatives, 105th Congress, first session: *Provided*, That the funds available for the Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis Project should be executed through cooperation with the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

BENNETT AMENDMENT NO. 3462

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BENNETT) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, insert in the appropriate place the following new general provision:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", up to \$1,000,000 may be made available only for the development and testing of alternate turbine engines for missiles.

GRAMM AMENDMENT NO. 3463

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GRAMM) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . VOTING RIGHTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL.

(a) GUARANTEE OF RESIDENCY.—Article VII of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. 590 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 704. (a) For purposes of voting for an office of the United States or of a State, a person who is absent from a State in compliance with military or naval orders shall not, solely by reason of that absence—

"(1) be deemed to have lost a residence or domicile in that State;

"(2) be deemed to have acquired a residence or domicile in any other State; or

"(3) be deemed to have become resident in or a resident of any other State.

"(b) In this section, the term 'State' includes a territory or possession of the United States, a political subdivision of a State, territory, or possession, and the District of Columbia."

(b) STATE RESPONSIBILITY TO GUARANTEE MILITARY VOTING RIGHTS.—(1) REGISTRATION AND BALLOTING.—Section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-1) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(a) ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICES.—" before "Each State shall—"; and

by adding at the end the following:
(b) ELECTIONS FOR STATE AND LOCAL OFFICES.—Each State shall—

"(1) permit absent uniformed services voters to use absentee registration procedures and to vote by absentee ballot in general, special, primary, and run-off elections for State and local offices; and

"(2) accept and process, with respect to any election described in paragraph (1), any otherwise valid voter registration application from an absent uniformed services voter if the application is received by the appropriate State election official not less than 30 days before the election."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for title I of such Act is amended by striking out "FOR FEDERAL OFFICE".

MOSELEY-BRAUN AMENDMENT NO. 3464

Mr. INOUE (for Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8014. From amounts made available by this Act, up to \$10,000,000 may be available to convert the Eighth Regiment National Guard Armory into a Chicago Military Academy: *Provided*, That the Academy shall provide a 4 year college preparatory curriculum combined with a mandatory JROTC instruction program.

DURBIN AMENDMENT NO. 3465

Mr. DURBIN proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to initiate or conduct offensive military operations by United States Armed Forces except in accordance with Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, which vests in Congress the power to declare war and take certain other related actions.

D'AMATO AMENDMENT NO. 3466

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. D'AMATO) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Air National Guard shall, during the period beginning on April 15, 1999, and ending on October 15, 1999, provide support at the Francis S. Gabreski Airport, Hampton, New York, for seasonal search and rescue mission requirements of the Coast Guard in the vicinity of Hampton, New York.

(b) The support provided under subsection (a) shall include access to and use of appropriate facilities at Francis S. Gabreski Airport, including runways, hangars, the operations center, and aircraft berthing and maintenance spaces.

(c)(1) The adjutant general of the National Guard of the State of New York and the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the support to be provided under subsection (a).

(2) Not later than December 1, 1998, the adjutant general and the Commandant shall jointly submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a copy of the memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1).

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 3467

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may carry out a program to distribute surplus dental equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to DoD Indian Health Service facilities and to Federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(1)(2)(B))).

(b) Not later than March 15, 1999, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a

report on the program, including the actions taken under the program.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 3468

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Not later than March 15, 1999, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and on National Security of the House of Representatives a report on the policies, practices, and experience of the uniformed services pertaining to the furnishing of dental care to dependents of members of the uniformed services on active duty who are 18 years of age and younger.

(b) The report shall include (1) the rates of usage of various types of dental services under the health care system of the uniformed services by the dependents, set forth in categories defined by the age and the gender of the dependents and by the rank of the members of the uniformed services who are the sponsors for those dependents, (2) an assessment of the feasibility of providing the dependents with dental benefits (including initial dental visits for children) that conform with the guidelines of the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry regarding infant oral health care, and (3) an evaluation of the feasibility and potential effects of offering general anesthesia as a dental health care benefit available under TRICARE to the dependents.

DODD AMENDMENT NO. 3469

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Of the total amount appropriated for the Army, the Army Reserve, and the Army National Guard under title I, \$1,700,000 may be available for taking the actions required under this section to eliminate the backlog of unpaid retired pay and to submit a report.

(b) The Secretary of the Army may take such actions as are necessary to eliminate, by December 31, 1998, the backlog of unpaid retired pay for members and former members of the Army (including members and former members of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard).

(c) Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to Congress a report on the backlog of unpaid retired pay. The report shall include the following:

- (1) The actions taken under subsection (b).
- (2) The extent of the remaining backlog.
- (3) A discussion of any additional actions that are necessary to ensure that retired pay is paid in a timely manner.

HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 3470

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense may take such actions as are necessary to ensure the elimination of the backlog of incomplete actions on requests of former members of the

Armed Forces for replacement medals and replacements for other decorations that such personnel have earned in the military service of the United States.

(b)(1) The actions taken under subsection (a) may include, except as provided in paragraph (2), allocations of additional resources to improve relevant staffing levels at the Army Reserve Personnel Command, the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and the Air Force Personnel Center, allocations of Department of Defense resources to the National Archives and Records Administration, and any additional allocations of resources that the Secretary considers necessary to carry out subsection (a).

(2) An allocation of resources may be made under paragraph (1) only if and to the extent that the allocation does not detract from the performance of other personnel service and personnel support activities within the Department of Defense.

HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 3471

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Beginning no later than 60 days after enactment, effective tobacco cessation products and counseling may be provided for members of the Armed Forces (including retired members), former members of the Armed Forces entitled to retired or retainer pay, and dependents of such members and former members, who are identified as likely to benefit from such assistance in a manner that does not impose costs upon the individual.

FRIST AMENDMENT NO. 3472

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. FRIST) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) Of the amounts appropriated by title II of this Act under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS", \$5,000,000 may be available for procurement of lightweight maintenance enclosures (LME).

(b) Of the amounts appropriated by title III of this Act under the heading "OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY", \$2,000,000 may be available for procurement of light-weight maintenance enclosures (LME).

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 3473

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 10, line 15, before the period, insert the following: " *Provided further*, that out of the funds available under this heading, \$300,000 may be available for the abatement of hazardous substances in housing at the Finley Air Force Station, Finley, North Dakota".

DEWINE AMENDMENT NO. 3474

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DEWINE) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. Of the funds available for Drug Interdiction, up to \$8,500,000 may be made

available to support restoration of enhanced counter-narcotics operations around the island of Hispaniola, for operation and maintenance for establishment of ground-based radar coverage at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base, Cuba, for procurement of 2 Schweizer observation/spray aircraft, and for upgrades for 3 UH-1H helicopter for Colombia.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 3475

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall study the policies, procedures, and practices of the military departments for protecting the confidentiality of communications between—

(1) a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces who—

(A) is a victim of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or intrafamily abuse; or

(B) has engaged in such misconduct; and
(2) a therapist, counselor, advocate, or other professional from whom the victim seeks professional services in connection with effects of such misconduct.

(b)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe in regulations the policies and procedures that the Secretary considers necessary to provide the maximum possible protections for the confidentiality of communications described in subsection (a) relating to misconduct described in that subsection.

(2) The regulations shall provide the following:

(A) Complete confidentiality of the records of the communications of dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

(B) Characterization of the records under family advocacy programs of the Department of Defense as primary medical records for purposes of the protections from disclosure that are associated with primary medical records.

(C) Facilitated transfer of records under family advocacy programs in conjunction with changes of duty stations of persons to whom the records relate in order to provide for continuity in the furnishing of professional services.

(D) Adoption of standards of confidentiality and ethical standards that are consistent with standards issued by relevant professional associations.

(3) In prescribing the regulations, the Secretary shall consider the following:

(A) Any risk that the goals of advocacy and counseling programs for helping victims recover from adverse effects of misconduct will not be attained if there is no assurance that the records of the communications (including records of counseling sessions) will be kept confidential.

(B) The extent, if any, to which a victim's safety and privacy should be factors in determinations regarding—

(i) disclosure of the victim's identity to the public or the chain of command of a member of the Armed Forces alleged to have engaged in the misconduct toward the victim; or

(ii) any other action that facilitates such a disclosure without the consent of the victim.

(C) The eligibility for care and treatment in medical facilities of the uniformed services for any person having a uniformed services identification card (including a card indicating the status of a person as a dependent of a member of the uniformed services) that is valid for that person.

(D) The appropriateness of requiring that so-called Privacy Act statements be pre-

sented as a condition for proceeding with the furnishing of treatment or other services by professionals referred to in subsection (a).

(E) The appropriateness of adopting the same standards of confidentiality and ethical standards that have been issued by such professional associations as the American Psychiatric Association and the National Association of Social Workers.

(4) The regulations may not prohibit the disclosure of information to a Federal or State agency for a law enforcement or other governmental purpose.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Attorney General in carrying out this section.

(d) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the actions taken under this section. The report shall include a discussion of the results of the study under subsection (a) and the comprehensive discussion of the regulations prescribed under subsection (b).

ROBB AMENDMENT NO. 3476

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. ROBB) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

Findings:

On the third of February a United States Marine Corps jet aircraft, flying a low-level training mission out of Aviano, Italy, flew below its prescribed altitude and severed the cables supporting a gondola at the Italian ski resort near Cavalese, resulting in the death of twenty civilians;

The crew of the aircraft, facing criminal charges, is entitled to a speedy trial and is being provided that and all the other protections and advantages of the U.S. system of justice;

The United States, to maintain its credibility and honor amongst its allies and all nations of the world, should make prompt reparations for an accident clearly caused by a United States military aircraft;

A high-level delegation, including the U.S. Ambassador to Italy, recently visited Cavalese and, as a result, 20 million dollars was promised to the people in Cavalese for their property damage and business losses;

Without our prompt action, these families continue to suffer financial agonies, our credibility in the European community continues to suffer, and our own citizens remain puzzled and angered by our lack of accountability;

Under the current arrangement we have with Italy in the context of our Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), civil claims arising from the accident at Cavalese must be brought against the Government of Italy, in accordance with the laws and regulations of Italy, as if the armed forces of Italy had been responsible for the accident;

Under Italian law, every claimant for property damage, personal injury or wrongful death must file initially an administrative claim for damages with the Ministry of Defense in Rome which is expected to take 12-18 months, and, if the Ministry's offer in settlement is not acceptable, which it is not likely to be, the claimant must thereafter resort to the Italian court system, where civil cases for wrongful death are reported to take up to ten years to resolve;

While under the SOFA process, the United States—as the "sending state"—will be responsible for 75 percent of any damages awarded, and the Government of Italy—as the "receiving state"—will be responsible for

25 percent, the United States has agreed to pay all damages awarded in this case;

It is the Sense of the Congress that the United States should resolve the claims of the victims of the February 8, 1998 U.S. Marine Corps aircraft incident in Cavalese, Italy as quickly and fairly as possible.

LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 3477

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. TRAINING AND OTHER PROGRAMS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that a member of such unit has committed a gross violation of human rights, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) MONITORING.—Not more than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish procedures to ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in paragraph (a), full consideration is given to all information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in paragraph (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under paragraph (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

KERREY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3478

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. KERREY, for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. BREAU) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2132, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PAYROLL TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The payroll tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) is the biggest, most regressive tax paid by working families.

(2) The payroll tax constitutes a 15.3 percent tax burden on the wages and self-employment income of each American, with 12.4 percent of the payroll tax used to pay social security benefits to current beneficiaries and 2.9 percent used to pay the medicare benefits of current beneficiaries.

(3) The amount of wages and self-employment income subject to the social security portion of the payroll tax is capped at \$68,400. Therefore, the lower a family's income, the more they pay in payroll tax as a percentage of income. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that for those families who pay payroll taxes, 80 percent

pay more in payroll taxes than in income taxes.

(4) In 1996, the median household income was \$35,492, and a family earning that amount and taking standard deductions and exemptions paid \$2,719 in Federal income tax, but lost \$5,430 in income to the payroll tax.

(5) Ownership of wealth is essential for everyone to have a shot at the American dream, but the payroll tax is the principal burden to savings and wealth creation for working families.

(6) Since 1983, the payroll tax has been higher than necessary to pay current benefits.

(7) Since most of the payroll tax receipts are deposited in the social security trust funds, which masks the real amount of Government borrowing, those whom the payroll tax hits hardest, working families, have shouldered a disproportionate share of the Federal budget deficit reduction and, therefore, a disproportionate share of the creation of the Federal budget surplus.

(8) Over the next 10 years, the Federal Government will generate a budget surplus of \$1,550,000,000,000, and all but \$32,000,000,000 of that surplus will be generated by excess payroll taxes.

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

(1) if Congress decides to provide tax relief, reducing the burden of payroll taxes should be a top priority; and

(2) Congress and the President should work to reduce this payroll tax burden on American families.

CURT FLOOD ACT OF 1998

HATCH AMENDMENT NO. 3479

Mr. JEFFORDS (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 53) to require the general application of the antitrust laws to major league baseball, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Curt Flood Act of 1998."

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this legislation to state that major league baseball players are covered under the antitrust laws (i.e., that major league baseball players will have the same rights under the antitrust laws as do other professional athletes, e.g., football and basketball players), along with a provision that makes it clear that the passage of this Act does not change the application of the antitrust laws in any other context or with respect to any other person or entity.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS TO PROFESSIONAL MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL.

The Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. § 12 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 27. (a) Subject to subsections (b) through (d) below, the conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional major league baseball directly relating to or affecting employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level are subject to the antitrust laws to the same extent such conduct, acts, practices or agree-

ments would be subject to the antitrust laws if engaged in by persons in any other professional sports business affecting interstate commerce.

"(b) No court shall rely on the enactment of this section as a basis for changing the application of the antitrust laws to any conduct, acts, practices or agreements other than those set forth in subsection (a). This section does not create, permit or imply a cause of action by which to challenge under the antitrust laws, or otherwise apply the antitrust laws to, any conduct, acts, practices or agreements that do not directly relate to or affect employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level, including but not limited to:

"(1) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons engaging in, conducting or participating in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affecting employment to play baseball at the minor league level, any organized professional baseball amateur or first-year player draft, or any reserve clause as applied to minor league players;

"(2) the agreement between organized professional major league baseball teams and the teams of the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, commonly known as the "Professional Baseball Agreement," the relationship between organized professional major league baseball and organized professional minor league baseball, or any other matter relating to organized professional baseball's minor leagues;

"(3) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons engaging in, conducting or participating in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affecting franchise expansion, location or relocation, franchise ownership issues, including ownership transfers, the relationship between the Office of the Commissioner and franchise owners, the marketing or sales of the entertainment product of organized professional baseball and the licensing of intellectual property rights owned or held by organized professional baseball teams individually or collectively;

"(4) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements protected by Public Law 87-331 (15 U.S.C. § 1291 et seq.) (commonly known as "the Sports Broadcasting Act of 1961");

"(5) the relationship between persons in the business of organized professional baseball and umpires or other individuals who are employed in the business of organized professional baseball by such persons; or

"(6) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons not in the business of organized professional major league baseball.

"(c) Only a major league baseball player has standing to sue under this section. For the purposes of this section, a major league baseball player is:

"(1) a person who is a party to a major league player's contract, or is playing baseball at the major league level; or

"(2) a person who was a party to a major league player's contract or playing baseball at the major league level at the time of the injury that is the subject of the complaint; or

"(3) a person who has been a party to a major league player's contract or who has played baseball at the major league level, and who claims he has been injured in his efforts to secure a subsequent major league player's contract by an alleged violation of the antitrust laws, provided however, that for the purposes of this paragraph, the alleged antitrust violation shall not include

any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affect employment to play baseball at the minor league level, including any organized professional baseball amateur or first-year player draft, or any reserve clause as applied to minor league players; or

"(4) a person who was a party to a major league player's contract or who was playing baseball at the major league level at the conclusion of the last full championship season immediately preceding the expiration of the last collective bargaining agreement between persons in the business of organized professional major league baseball and the exclusive collective bargaining representative of major league baseball players.

"(d)(1) As used in this section, "person" means any entity, including an individual, partnership, corporation, trust or unincorporated association or any combination or association thereof. As used in this section, the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, its member leagues and the clubs of those leagues, are not "in the business of organized professional major league baseball."

"(2) In cases involving conduct, acts, practices or agreements that directly relate to or affect both employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level and also relate to or affect any other aspect of organized professional baseball, including but not limited to employment to play baseball at the minor league level and the other areas set forth in subsection (b) above, only those components, portions or aspects of such conduct, acts, practices or agreements that directly relate to or affect employment of major league players to play baseball at the major league level may be challenged under subsection (a) and then only to the extent that they directly relate to or affect employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level.

"(3) As used in subsection (a), interpretation of the term 'directly' shall not be governed by any interpretation of 29 U.S.C. § 151 et seq. (as amended).

"(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the application to organized professional baseball of the nonstatutory labor exemption from the antitrust laws.

"(5) The scope of the conduct, acts, practices or agreements covered by subsection (b) shall not be strictly or narrowly construed.

IDENTITY THEFT AND ASSUMPTION DETERRENCE ACT OF 1998

KYL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3480

Mr. JEFFORDS (for Mr. KYL for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. ROBB) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 512) to amend chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. IDENTITY THEFT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFENSE.—Section 1028(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by adding “or” at the end;

(3) in the flush matter following paragraph (6), by striking “or attempts to do so.”; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) knowingly transfers or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person with the intent to commit, or otherwise promote, carry on, or facilitate any unlawful activity that constitutes a violation of Federal law, or that constitutes a felony under any applicable State or local law.”;

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 1028(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by adding “or” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) an offense under paragraph (7) of such subsection that involves the transfer or use of 1 or more means of identification if, as a result of the offense, any individual committing the offense obtains anything of value aggregating \$1,000 or more during any 1-year period.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or transfer of an identification document or” and inserting “transfer, or use of a means of identification, an identification document, or a”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or (7)” after “(3)”;

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

“(3) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, if the offense is committed—

“(A) to facilitate a drug trafficking crime (as defined in section 929(a)(2)); or

“(B) after a prior conviction under this section becomes final;

“(4) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 25 years, or both, if the offense is committed—

“(A) to facilitate an act of international terrorism (as defined in section 2331(1)); or

“(B) in connection with a crime of violence (as defined in section 924(c)(3)).”;

(4) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (4) (as added by paragraph (3) of this subsection) the following:

“(5) in the case of any offense under subsection (a), forfeiture to the United States of any personal property used or intended to be used to commit the offense; and”.

(c) CIRCUMSTANCES.—Section 1028(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) either—

“(A) the production, transfer, possession, or use prohibited by this section is in or affects interstate or foreign commerce; or

“(B) the means of identification, identification document, false identification document, or document-making implement is transported in the mail in the course of the production, transfer, possession, or use prohibited by this section.”.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) DOCUMENT-MAKING IMPLEMENT.—The term ‘document-making implement’ means any implement, impression, electronic device, or computer hardware or software, that is specifically configured or primarily used for making an identification document, a false identification document, or another document-making implement.

“(2) IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENT.—The term ‘identification document’ means a document made or issued by or under the authority of the United States Government, a State, political subdivision of a State, a foreign government, political subdivision of a foreign government, an international governmental or an international quasi-governmental organization which, when completed with information concerning a particular individual, is of a type intended or commonly accepted for the purpose of identification of individuals.

“(3) MEANS OF IDENTIFICATION.—The term ‘means of identification’ means any name or number that may be used, alone or in conjunction with any other information, to identify a specific individual, including any—

“(A) name, social security number, date of birth, official State or government issued driver’s license or identification number, alien registration number, government passport number, employer or taxpayer identification number;

“(B) unique biometric data, such as fingerprint, voice print, retina or iris image, or other unique physical representation;

“(C) unique electronic identification number, address, or routing code; or

“(D) telecommunication identifying information or access device (as defined in section 1029(e)).

“(4) PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.—The term ‘personal identification card’ means an identification document issued by a State or local government solely for the purpose of identification.

“(5) PRODUCE.—The term ‘produce’ includes alter, authenticate, or assemble.

“(6) STATE.—The term ‘State’ includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other commonwealth, possession, or territory of the United States.”.

(e) ATTEMPT AND CONSPIRACY.—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) ATTEMPT AND CONSPIRACY.—Any person who attempts or conspires to commit any offense under this section shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the attempt or conspiracy.”.

(f) FORFEITURE PROCEDURES.—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) FORFEITURE PROCEDURES.—The forfeiture of property under this section, including any seizure and disposition of the property and any related judicial or administrative proceeding, shall be governed by the provisions of section 413 (other than subsection (d) of that section) of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 853).”.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purpose of subsection (a)(7), a single identification document or false identification document that contains 1 or more means of identification shall be construed to be 1 means of identification.”.

(h) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1028, by striking “or attempts to do so.”;

(2) in the heading for section 1028, by adding “and information” at the end; and

(3) in the analysis for the chapter, in the item relating to section 1028, by adding “and information” at the end.

SEC. 3. RESTITUTION.

Section 3663A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end and inserting “or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) an offense described in section 1028 (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with means of identification or identification documents); and”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) FRAUD AND RELATED ACTIVITY IN CONNECTION WITH IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION.—Making restitution to a victim under this section for an offense described in section 1028 (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with means of identification or identification documents) may include payment for any costs, including attorney fees, incurred by the victim, including any costs incurred—

“(1) in clearing the credit history or credit rating of the victim; or

“(2) in connection with any civil or administrative proceeding to satisfy any debt, lien, or other obligation of the victim arising as a result of the actions of the defendant.”.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES FOR OFFENSES UNDER SECTION 1028.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and the policy statements of the Commission, as appropriate, to provide an appropriate penalty for each offense under section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act.

(b) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the United States Sentencing Commission shall consider, with respect to each offense described in subsection (a)—

(1) the extent to which the number of victims (as defined in section 3663A(a) of title 18, United States Code) involved in the offense, including harm to reputation, inconvenience, and other difficulties resulting from the offense, is an adequate measure for establishing penalties under the Federal sentencing guidelines;

(2) the number of means of identification, identification documents, or false identification documents (as those terms are defined in section 1028(d) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act) involved in the offense, is an adequate measure for establishing penalties under the Federal sentencing guidelines;

(3) the extent to which the value of the loss to any individual caused by the offense is an adequate measure for establishing penalties under the Federal sentencing guidelines;

(4) the range of conduct covered by the offense;

(5) the extent to which sentencing enhancements within the Federal sentencing guidelines and the court’s authority to sentence above the applicable guideline range are adequate to ensure punishment at or near the maximum penalty for the most egregious conduct covered by the offense;

(6) the extent to which Federal sentencing guidelines sentences for the offense have been constrained by statutory maximum penalties;

(7) the extent to which Federal sentencing guidelines for the offense adequately achieve the purposes of sentencing set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code; and

(8) any other factor that the United States Sentencing Commission considers to be appropriate.

SEC. 5. CENTRALIZED COMPLAINT AND CONSUMER EDUCATION SERVICE FOR VICTIMS OF IDENTITY THEFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall establish procedures to—

(1) log and acknowledge the receipt of complaints by individuals who certify that they have a reasonable belief that 1 or more of their means of identification (as defined in section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act) have been assumed, stolen, or otherwise unlawfully acquired in violation of section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act;

(2) provide informational materials to individuals described in paragraph (1); and

(3) refer complaints described in paragraph (1) to appropriate entities, which may include referral to—

(A) the 3 major national consumer reporting agencies; and

(B) appropriate law enforcement agencies for potential law enforcement action.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) TECHNICAL CORRECTION RELATING TO CRIMINAL FORFEITURE PROCEDURES.—Section 982(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "(1) The forfeiture of property under this section, including any seizure and disposition of the property and any related judicial or administrative proceeding, shall be governed by the provisions of section 413 (other than subsection (d) of that section) of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 853)."

(b) ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE AND THEFT OF TRADE SECRETS AS PREDICATE OFFENSES FOR WIRE INTERCEPTION.—Section 2516(1)(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "chapter 90 (relating to protection of trade secrets)," after "to espionage,".

BORDER IMPROVEMENT AND IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1998

ABRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 3481

Mr. JEFFORDS (for Mr. ABRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1360) to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM AND IMMIGRANT RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 110(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1221 note) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) SYSTEM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall develop an automated entry and exit control system that will—

"(A) collect a record of departure for every alien departing the United States and match the record of departure with the record of the alien's arrival in the United States; and

"(B) enable the Attorney General to identify, through on-line searching procedures, lawfully admitted nonimmigrants who remain in the United States beyond the period authorized by the Attorney General.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—The system under paragraph (1) shall not collect a record of arrival or departure—

"(A) at a land border or seaport of the United States for any alien; or

"(B) for any alien for whom the documentary requirements in section 212(a)(7)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act have been waived by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State under section 212(d)(4)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-546).

SEC. 3. REPORT ON AUTOMATED ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL SYSTEM.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit a report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the feasibility of developing and implementing an automated entry-exit control system that would collect a record of departure for every alien departing the United States and match the record of departure with the record of the alien's arrival in the United States, including departures and arrivals at the land borders and seaports of the United States.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Such report shall—

(1) assess the costs and feasibility of various means of operating such an automated entry-exit control system, including exploring—

(A) how, if the automated entry-exit control system were limited to certain aliens arriving at airports, departure records of those aliens could be collected when they depart through a land border or seaport; and

(B) the feasibility of the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State, negotiating reciprocal agreements with the governments of contiguous countries to collect such information on behalf of the United States and share it in an acceptable automated format;

(2) consider the various means of developing such a system, including the use of pilot projects if appropriate, and assess which means would be most appropriate in which geographical regions;

(3) evaluate how such a system could be implemented without increasing border traffic congestion and border crossing delays and, if any such system would increase border crossing delays, evaluate to what extent such congestion or delays would increase; and

(4) estimate the length of time that would be required for any such system to be developed and implemented.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL REPORTS ON ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL AND USE OF ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL DATA.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL AT AIRPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year until the fiscal year in which Attorney General certifies to Congress that the entry-exit control system required by section 110(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as amended by section 2 of this Act, has been developed, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) provides an accurate assessment of the status of the development of the entry-exit control system;

(2) includes a specific schedule for the development of the entry-exit control system that the Attorney General anticipates will be met; and

(3) includes a detailed estimate of the funding, if any, needed for the development of the entry-exit control system.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS ON VISA OVERSTAYS IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL SYSTEM.—Not later than June 30 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report that sets forth—

(1) the number of arrival records of aliens and the number of departure records of aliens that were collected during the preceding fiscal year under the entry-exit control system under section 110(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as so amended, with a separate accounting of such numbers by country of nationality;

(2) the number of departure records of aliens that were successfully matched to records of such aliens' prior arrival in the United States, with a separate accounting of such numbers by country of nationality and by classification as immigrant or non-immigrant; and

(3) the number of aliens who arrived as nonimmigrants, or as visitors under the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for whom no matching departure record has been obtained through the system, or through other means, as of the end of such aliens' authorized period of stay, with an accounting by country of nationality and approximate date of arrival in the United States.

(c) INCORPORATION INTO OTHER DATABASES.—Information regarding aliens who have remained in the United States beyond their authorized period of stay that is identified through the system referred to in subsection (a) shall be integrated into appropriate databases of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of State, including those used at ports-of-entry and at consular offices.

SEC. 5. BORDER CROSSING-RELATED VISAS.

(a) WAIVER OF FEES FOR CERTAIN VISAS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State or the Attorney General may waive all or part of any fee or fees for the processing of any application for the issuance of a combined border crossing identification card and nonimmigrant visa under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act where the application is made in Mexico on behalf of a Mexican national under 15 years old at the time of application.

(2) PERIOD OF VALIDITY OF VISAS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if the fee for a combined border crossing card and nonimmigrant visa issued under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act has been waived under paragraph (1) for a child under 15 years of age, the visa shall be issued to expire on the earlier of—

(i) the date that is 10 years after the date of issuance; or

(ii) the date on which the child attains the age of 15.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—At the request of the parent or guardian of any alien under 15 years of age otherwise covered by subparagraph (A), the Secretary of State or the Attorney General may charge a fee for the processing of an application of the issuance of a combined border crossing card and nonimmigrant visa under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provided that the visa is issued to expire as of the same date as is usually provided for visas issued under that section.

(3) **LEVEL OF FEES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, fees authorized pursuant to section 140(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (8 U.S.C. 1351 note) may be set at a level that will ensure recovery of the full cost to the Department of State of providing machine readable nonimmigrant visas and machine readable combined border crossing identification cards and nonimmigrant visas, including the cost of such combined cards and visas for which the fee is waived pursuant to this subsection.

(b) **MODIFIED SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF BORDER CROSSING RESTRICTIONS.—**

(1) **MODIFIED SCHEDULE.**—Paragraph (2) of section 104(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-555; 8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) **CLAUSE B.**—Clause (B) of such sentence shall apply to the extent that inspections personnel and technology in operation at the port of entry can verify information from the card. For the replacement of existing border crossing identification cards, clause (B) of such sentence shall apply in accordance with the timetable as follows:

“(A) As of October 1, 2000, to not less than 25 percent of the border crossing identification cards in circulation as of April 1, 1998.

“(B) As of October 1, 2001, to not less than 50 percent of such cards in circulation as of April 1, 1998.

“(C) As of October 1, 2002, to not less than 75 percent of such cards in circulation as of April 1, 1998.

“(D) As of October 1, 2003, to all such cards in circulation as of April 1, 1998.”

(2) **EARLIER DEADLINES.**—Such section 104(b) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **EARLIER DEADLINES.**—If the Secretary of State and the Attorney General jointly determine that sufficient capacity exists to replace border crossing identification cards in advance of any of the deadlines otherwise provided for under paragraph (2), the Secretary and the Attorney General may by regulation advance such deadlines.”

(c) **PROCESSING IN MEXICAN BORDER CITIES.**—The Secretary of State shall continue, until at least October 1, 2000, to process applications for visas under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act at the following cities in Mexico located near the international border with the United States: Nogales, Nuevo Laredo,

Ciudad Acuna, Piedras Negras, Agua Prieta, and Reynosa.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BORDER CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—In order to enhance enforcement and inspection resources on the land borders of the United States, enhance investigative resources for anticorruption efforts and efforts against drug smuggling and money-laundering organizations, reduce commercial and passenger traffic waiting times, and open all primary lanes during peak hours at major land border ports of entry on the Southwest and Northern land borders of the United States, in addition to any other amounts appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated for salaries, expenses, and equipment for the Immigration and Naturalization Service for purposes of carrying out this section—

(1) \$119,604,000 for fiscal year 1999;

(2) \$123,064,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

(3) such sums as may be necessary in each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) **USE OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1999 FUNDS.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a)(1) for fiscal year 1999 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, \$19,090,000 shall be available until expended for acquisition and other expenses associated with implementation and full deployment of narcotics enforcement and other technology along the land borders of the United States, including—

(1) \$11,000,000 for 5 mobile truck x-rays with transmission and backscatter imaging to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints and in secondary inspection areas of land border ports-of-entry;

(2) \$200,000 for 10 ultrasonic container inspection units to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints and in secondary inspection areas of land border ports-of-entry;

(3) \$240,000 for 10 Portable Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS) terminals to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints;

(4) \$5,000,000 for 20 remote watch surveillance camera systems to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints and at secondary inspection areas of land border ports-of-entry;

(5) \$180,000 for 36 AM radio “Welcome to the United States” stations located at permanent border patrol checkpoints and at secondary inspection areas of land border ports-of-entry;

(6) \$875,000 for 36 spotter camera systems located at permanent border patrol checkpoints and at secondary inspection areas of land border ports-of-entry; and

(7) \$1,600,000 for 40 narcotics vapor and particle detectors to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints and at secondary inspection areas of land border ports-of-entry.

(c) **USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 1999.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) for the Immigration and Naturalization Service for fiscal year 2000 and each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,773,000 shall be for the maintenance and support of the equipment and training of personnel to maintain and support the equipment described in subsection (b), based on an estimate of 25 percent of the cost of such equipment.

(d) **USE OF FUNDS FOR NEW TECHNOLOGIES.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may use the amounts authorized to be appropriated for equipment under this section for equipment other than the equipment speci-

fied in subsection (b) if such other equipment—

(A)(i) is technologically superior to the equipment specified in subsection (b); and

(ii) will achieve at least the same results at a cost that is the same or less than the equipment specified in subsection (b); or

(B) can be obtained at a lower cost than the equipment authorized in subsection (b).

(2) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Attorney General may reallocate an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the amount specified in paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b) for any other equipment specified in subsection (b).

(e) **PEAK HOURS AND INVESTIGATIVE RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) for the Immigration and Naturalization Service for fiscal years 1999 and 2000, \$100,514,000 in fiscal year 1999 and \$121,555,000 for fiscal year 2000 shall be for—

(1) a net increase of 535 inspectors for the Southwest land border and 375 inspectors for the Northern land border, in order to open all primary lanes on the Southwest and Northern borders during peak hours and enhance investigative resources;

(2) in order to enhance enforcement and reduce waiting times, a net increase of 100 inspectors and canine enforcement officers for border patrol checkpoints and ports-of-entry, as well as 100 canines and 5 canine trainers;

(3) 100 canine enforcement vehicles to be used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service for inspection and enforcement at the land borders of the United States;

(4) a net increase of 40 intelligence analysts and additional resources to be distributed among border patrol sectors that have jurisdiction over major metropolitan drug or narcotics distribution and transportation centers for intensification of efforts against drug smuggling and money-laundering organizations;

(5) a net increase of 68 positions and additional resources to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to enhance investigative resources for anticorruption efforts; and

(6) the costs incurred as a result of the increase in personnel hired pursuant to this section.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BORDER CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—In order to enhance border investigative resources on the land borders of the United States, enhance investigative resources for anticorruption efforts, intensify efforts against drug smuggling and money-laundering organizations, process cargo, reduce commercial and passenger traffic waiting times, and open all primary lanes during peak hours at certain ports on the Southwest and Northern borders, in addition to any other amount appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated for salaries, expenses, and equipment for the United States Customs Service for purposes of carrying out this section—

(1) \$161,248,584 for fiscal year 1999;

(2) \$185,751,328 for fiscal year 2000; and

(3) such sums as may be necessary in each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) **USE OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1999 FUNDS.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a)(1) for fiscal year 1999 for the United States Customs Service, \$48,404,000 shall be available until expended for acquisition and other expenses

associated with implementation and full deployment of narcotics enforcement and cargo processing technology along the land borders of the United States, including—

(1) \$6,000,000 for 8 Vehicle and Container Inspection Systems (VACIS);

(2) \$11,000,000 for 5 mobile truck x-rays with transmission and backscatter imaging;

(3) \$12,000,000 for the upgrade of 8 fixed-site truck x-rays from the present energy level of 450,000 electron volts to 1,000,000 electron volts (1-MeV);

(4) \$7,200,000 for 8 1-MeV pallet x-rays;

(5) \$1,000,000 for 200 portable contraband detectors (busters) to be distributed among ports where the current allocations are inadequate;

(6) \$600,000 for 50 contraband detection kits to be distributed among border ports based on traffic volume and need as identified by the Customs Service;

(7) \$500,000 for 25 ultrasonic container inspection units to be distributed among ports receiving liquid-filled cargo and ports with a hazardous material inspection facility, based on need as identified by the Customs Service;

(8) \$2,450,000 for 7 automated targeting systems;

(9) \$360,000 for 30 rapid tire deflator systems to be distributed to those ports where port runners are a threat;

(10) \$480,000 for 20 Portable Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS) terminals to be moved among ports as needed;

(11) \$1,000,000 for 20 remote watch surveillance camera systems at ports where there are suspicious activities at loading docks, vehicle queues, secondary inspection lanes, or areas where visual surveillance or observation is obscured, based on need as identified by the Customs Service;

(12) \$1,254,000 for 57 weigh-in-motion sensors to be distributed among the ports on the Southwest border with the greatest volume of outbound traffic;

(13) \$180,000 for 36 AM radio "Welcome to the United States" stations, with one station to be located at each border crossing point on the Southwest border;

(14) \$1,040,000 for 260 inbound vehicle counters to be installed at every inbound vehicle lane on the Southwest border;

(15) \$950,000 for 38 spotter camera systems to counter the surveillance of Customs inspection activities by persons outside the boundaries of ports where such surveillance activities are occurring;

(16) \$390,000 for 60 inbound commercial truck transponders to be distributed to all ports of entry on the Southwest border;

(17) \$1,600,000 for 40 narcotics vapor and particle detectors to be distributed to each border crossing on the Southwest border; and

(18) \$400,000 for license plate reader automatic targeting software to be installed at each port on the Southwest border to target inbound vehicles.

(c) USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 1999.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) for the United States Customs Service for fiscal year 2000 and each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,840,400 shall be for the maintenance and support of the equipment and training of personnel to maintain and support the equipment described in subsection (b), based on an estimate of 10 percent of the cost of such equipment.

(d) USE OF FUNDS FOR NEW TECHNOLOGIES.—(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of Customs may use the amounts authorized to be appropriated for equipment under this section for equipment other than the equipment

specified in subsection (b) if such other equipment—

(A)(i) is technologically superior to the equipment specified in subsection (b); and

(ii) will achieve at least the same results at a cost that is the same or less than the equipment specified in subsection (b); or

(B) can be obtained at a lower cost than the equipment authorized in paragraphs (1) through (18) of subsection (b).

(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Commissioner of Customs may reallocate an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the amount specified in paragraphs (1) through (18) of subsection (b) for any other equipment specified in such paragraphs.

(e) PEAK HOURS AND INVESTIGATIVE RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) for the United States Customs Service for fiscal years 1999 and 2000, \$112,844,584 in fiscal year 1999 and \$180,910,928 for fiscal year 2000 shall be for—

(1) a net increase of 535 inspectors and 60 special agents for the Southwest border and 375 inspectors for the Northern border, in order to open all primary lanes on the Southwest and Northern borders during peak hours and enhance investigative resources;

(2) a net increase of 285 inspectors and canine enforcement officers to be distributed at large cargo facilities as needed to process and screen cargo (including rail cargo) and reduce commercial waiting times on the land borders of the United States;

(3) a net increase of 360 special agents, 40 intelligence analysts, and additional resources to be distributed among offices that have jurisdiction over major metropolitan drug or narcotics distribution and transportation centers for intensification of efforts against drug smuggling and money-laundering organizations;

(4) a net increase of 50 positions and additional resources to the Office of Internal Affairs to enhance investigative resources for anticorruption efforts; and

(5) the costs incurred as a result of the increase in personnel hired pursuant to this section.

COMMERCIAL SPACE ACT OF 1998

FRIST AMENDMENT NO. 3482

Mr. JEFFORDS (for Mr. FRIST) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1702) to encourage the development of a commercial space industry in the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 46, between lines 1 and 2, strike the item relating to section 306 and insert the following:

Sec. 306. National launch capability study.

On page 87, beginning in line 21, strike "Government, if except as provided in paragraph (2), at least 30 days before such conversion" and inserting "Government if, except as provided in paragraph (2) and at least 30 days before such conversion."

On page 88, beginning in line 3, strike "shall ensure in writing" and insert "a certification."

On page 89, line 7, strike "CAPABILITY" and insert "CAPABILITY STUDY."

On page 91, strike lines 9 through 16 and insert the following:

(1) the ability to support commercial launch-on-demand on short notification at national launch sites or test ranges;

On page 91, line 18, insert "and" after the semicolon.

On page 91, line 23, strike "(A);" and insert "(A)."

On page 91, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(3) QUINQUENNIAL UPDATES.—The Secretary shall update the report required by paragraph (1) quinquennially beginning with 2012.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Based on the reports under subsection (c), the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Commerce, and representatives from interested private sector entities, States, and local governments, shall—

Reset the matter appearing on page 91, beginning with line 24 through line 22 on page 92, 2 ems closer to the left margin.

On page 91, line 24, strike "(E)" and insert "(1)".

On page 92, line 5, strike "(F)" and insert "(2)".

On page 92, beginning in line 6, strike "subparagraph (D)," and insert "subsection (c)(2)(D)."

On page 92, line 12, strike "(i)" and insert "(A)".

On page 92, line 13, strike "(ii)" and insert "(B)".

On page 92, line 15, strike "(iii)" and insert "(C)".

On page 92, line 17, strike "(iv)" and insert "(D)".

On page 92, line 18, strike "clauses (i) through (iii);" and insert "subparagraphs (A) through (C)."

On page 92, line 19, strike "(G)" and insert "(3)".

On page 92, beginning in line 21, strike "launch sites in the United States cost-competitive on an international level." and insert "national ranges in the United States viable and competitive."

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on Friday, July 31, 1998 at 9:00 a.m. in SR-328A. The purpose of this meeting will be to review pending nominations to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 1998. The purpose of this meeting will be to examine a recent concept release by CFTC on over-the-counter derivatives and related legislation proposed by the Treasury Department, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the SEC.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 1998, to conduct a mark-up of S. 1405, the "Financial Regulatory Relief and Economic Efficiency Act of 1997".

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public Works be granted permission to conduct a hearing to receive testimony from Romulo L. Diaz, Jr., nominated by the President to be an Assistant Administrator for Administration and Resources Management of the Environmental Protection Agency, and J. Charles Fox, nominated by the President to be an Assistant Administrator for Water of the Environmental Protection Agency, Thursday, July 30, 1998, 2:00 p.m., Hearing Room (SD-406).

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Finance Committee requests unanimous consent to conduct a hearing on Thursday, July 30, 1998 beginning at 10:00 a.m. in room 215 Dirksen.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Committee on Governmental Affairs to meet on Thursday, July 30, 1998, at 10:00 a.m. for a hearing on Observations on the Census Dress Rehearsal and Implications for Census 2000.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to hold an executive business meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 1998, at 9:30 a.m., in room 226, of the Senate Dirksen Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 1998 at 1:00 p.m. in room 226 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building to hold a hearing on: "Judicial Nominations."

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 30, 1998 at 2:15 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR, WETLANDS, PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety be granted permission to conduct an oversight hearing on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Thursday, July 30, 1998, at 9:00 a.m., Hearing Room (SD-406).

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, July 30, 1998, at 9:30 a.m. on international satellite reform.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HARNESSING AMERICAN IDEALS

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I submit an article to be printed in the RECORD. I thought it would be beneficial for my colleagues to learn about the success that the AmeriCorps program has had among my constituents in Illinois. These are only a few stories about the positive impact that this program has had on people who live in often underserved communities in the Chicago area.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, July 3, 1998]

HARNESSING AMERICAN IDEALS

[By Michael Gillis]

In Uptown, they teach Asian immigrants English and help them adjust to life in the United States.

In Ford Heights, they help low-income parents become better teachers of their own children.

In neighborhoods throughout the Chicago area, they teach adults how to read, tutor students after school, counsel battered women, teach first aid and help communities right themselves.

Four years after President Clinton's AmeriCorps project was launched amid a flurry of publicity, its workers are toiling away in relative obscurity. While some still criticize the program for its cost, supporters say it is changing the city in small, but important, ways.

"We never say we're going to change a community in a year," said Craig Huffman, executive director of City Year Chicago, which employed about 50 AmeriCorps workers last year and this week received funding to hire about 55 workers starting in the fall.

"But far too many people use the excuse that problems are insurmountable. . . . You

have to think about solving a problem, even when everyone else is saying it can't be solved."

AmeriCorps workers say they're more than worth the money they're paid.

"I realized the impact that one person can have in a lot of lives," said Lisa Novak, 23, of Flossmoor, who taught CPR and first aid to thousands of Chicago public school students in the last year as one of the 13 AmeriCorps workers for the American Red Cross of Greater Chicago.

That's the kind of idealism Clinton sought to harness when he proposed the AmeriCorps program during his 1992 presidential campaign. Lawmakers passed Clinton's pet project in 1993, and Clinton signed the bill using the pens Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy used to create the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Peace Corps.

Under the program, which is run by a public-private partnership called the Corporation for Public Service, students earn \$4,725 to apply toward college tuition or student loans by completing a year of community service work. They also earn living allowances of about \$7,400 a year and health care and child day care benefits.

About 90,000 people have served in the program since it started in 1993. More than \$1.7 billion has been spent on or committed to the program so far, including \$400 million set aside for education awards.

This year, Illinois has about 500 AmeriCorps workers. About 450 are expected next year.

According to the Corporation for National Service, AmeriCorps workers last year tutored more than 500,000 youth, mentored 95,000 more, created 3,100 safety patrols, built or rehabilitated 5,600 homes, placed 32,000 homeless people in permanent housing and recruited more than 300,000 volunteers.

Many Republicans, including House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), oppose the national service program. Gingrich told Newsweek magazine in 1995 that he was "totally, unequivocally opposed to national service. . . . It is coerced volunteerism. It's a gimmick."

Critics also question whether the program is worth the expense, but officials at the corporation say they try to fund programs that get the most bang for the buck. The program uses strict standards to ensure funded programs produce results that can be measured—say, the number of children tutored or the number of homes rehabilitated.

And they argue that the program represents a way for Washington to help communities help themselves—an argument tailor-made for Republicans who advocate decentralizing government.

"Right now there is a consensus in Washington that Washington cannot solve every problem and that we have to look at ways to strengthen local communities so they can take on the needs that are specific to their communities," said Tara Murphy, the director of public affairs for the corporation. "That's exactly what this program does." Two-thirds of the funds go straight to state commissions, made up of members appointed by the governors, she said. Those commissions decide which agencies get the money, and the agencies recruit and deploy the workers, she said.

Agencies that were awarded grants this week to hire AmeriCorps workers don't question whether the program is worth the expense.

"It's definitely worth it," said Pat Clay, the director of the program at the Aunt Martha's Youth Services Center of Park Forest,

where 10 Americorps workers teach low-income parents how to instruct their preschool children.

"To see the smile on a child's face, to hear a parent say, 'My child tested very well in a preschool screening test'—that makes it worthwhile. You are investing in a child's future for life.

Aunt Martha's hires its Americorps workers from the communities the program serves—in this case, Ford Heights and Chicago Heights.

The Uptown-based Asian Human Services agency, which will hire about 14 workers to aid Asian refugees and immigrants this year, does the same.

Ralph Hardy, the director of programs at Asian Human Services, said he believes the program is inspiring Americorps workers to a career in public service.

"The outcome of the program will be best seen down the road, say 10 or 15 years from now, after a whole generation has gone through it," he said. "We've seen it here—we have workers who will go into some sort of community-based career."

That's what Trina Poole, 25, plans to do. Poole, one of six Americorps workers at Family Rescue, a community service agency in South Shore for victims of domestic violence, answers the agency's crisis line and helps arrange services for callers.

A victim of domestic violence herself, Poole said she hopes to be hired for a permanent position to continue providing to women and children the services she never received.

"It's a healing process for me to help as many women as possible," she said. "I'm not doing this for the money. I'm doing it to help the community."

Becky Nieves, 21, of Hanover Park, an Americorps worker for City Year who helped run an after-school program on gardening and environment, said she learned how much she meant to her students at the end of the year.

"When it's over and you say your good-byes, and the kids tell you what they learned, that's when you know you've made a difference," she said.●

CBO COST ESTIMATE ON S. 1283

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs reported S. 1283, the "Little Rock Nine Congressional Gold Medal Act" on Friday, June 26, 1998. The Committee report, S. 105-245, was filed on Friday, July 10, 1998.

The Congressional Budget Office cost estimate required by Senate Rule XXVI, section 11(b) of the Standing Rules of the Senate and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Impoundment and Control Act, was not available at the time of filing and, therefore, was not included in the Committee Report. Instead, the Committee indicated the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate would be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when it became available.

Mr. President, I ask that the full statement and cover letter from the Congressional Budget Office regarding S. 1283 be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 23, 1998.

Hon. ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing,
and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 1283, an act to award congressional gold medals to the "Little Rock Nine" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the integration of the Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is John R. Righter.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL, Director.

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 1283—An act to award congressional gold medals to the "Little Rock Nine" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the integration of the Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas

S. 1283 would authorize the President to present gold medals to Jean Brown Trickey, Carlotta Walls LaNier, Melba Pattillo Beals, Terrence Roberts, Gloria Ray Karlmark, Thelma Mothershed Wair, Ernest Green, Elizabeth Eckford, and Jefferson Thomas, referred to as the "Little Rock Nine," on behalf of the Congress. To help recover the costs of the gold medals, the legislation would authorize the U.S. Mint to strike and sell bronze duplicates of the medals at a price that covers production costs for both the medals and the duplicates.

Based on the costs of recent medals produced by the Mint, CBO estimates that authorizing the gold medals would increase direct spending from the U.S. Mint Public Enterprise Fund by about \$65,000 in fiscal year 1999, largely to cover the cost of the gold for each medal. The Mint could recoup some of those costs by selling bronze duplicates to the public; however, based on the sales of duplicates in previous cases, we expect that the proceeds from the duplicates would not cover the cost of the medals.

In addition to authorizing the gold medals, the legislation would allow the Mint to continue selling coins commemorating Jackie Robinson through the end of this calendar year. CBO estimates that extending the time by which the Mint can sell these coins would increase collections to the Mint by about \$1 million over fiscal years 1998 and 1999. (The Mint's authority to sell the coins expired on July 1.) According to the Mint, it has close to 80,000 coins in its inventory. If the Mint were to sell all of its remaining inventory, it would generate between \$3 million and \$5 million in additional collections, net of surcharges that must be paid to the Jackie Robinson Foundation, a nonprofit organization. That range depends on whether the Mint would sell some or all of the coins in bulk at a discounted price. Based on the sales of previous commemorative coin programs and because the coins were available already for purchase by the public, CBO expects that the Mint would sell far less than the amount of its remaining inventory. In any event, because the Mint can retain and spend the additional collections on other commercial activities, CBO estimates that the provision would have no net budgetary impact over time.

S. 1283 would affect direct spending, so pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. S. 1283 contains no intergovernmental or pri-

vate-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact is John R. Righter. This estimate was approved by Paul N. Van de Water, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.●

CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE EQUITABLE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1998

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support as a cosponsor of S. 1905, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act of 1998. This extremely important issue is the highest priority for the Cheyenne River Sioux tribe and will have a positive and lasting impact on the Cheyenne River reservation community and the entire State of South Dakota. I have worked closely with the Indian Affairs Committee to insure that this legislation protects the future interests of tribal members, and I am pleased that the bill reported by the Committee reflects these concerns. I am committed to seeing that the bill receive strong Senate support, and look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that the bill moves forward for approval by the full Senate.

The Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act would establish a trust fund within the Department of the Treasury for the development of certain tribal infrastructure projects for the Cheyenne River Tribe as compensation for lands lost to federal public works projects. The trust fund would be capitalized from a small percentage of hydropower revenues and would be capped at \$290 million. Independent research has concluded that the economic loss to the tribe justifies such a compensation fund. The tribe would then receive the interest from the fund to be used according to a development plan based on legislation previously passed by Congress, and prepared in conjunction with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

This type of funding mechanism has seen unanimous support in the Congress though recent passage of the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe Infrastructure Development Trust Fund Act as well as the Crow Creek legislation passed last Congress. Precedent for these infrastructure development trust funds capitalized through hydro-power revenue was established with the Three Affiliated Tribes and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act of 1992, which set up a recovery fund financed entirely from a percentage of Pick-Sloan power revenues to compensate the tribes for lands lost to Pick-Sloan.

I believe it is important for the Senate to understand the historic context of this proposed compensation. As you may know, the Flood Control Act of

1944 created five massive earthen dams along the Missouri River. Known as the Pick-Sloan Plan, this public works project has since provided much-needed flood control, irrigation, and hydro-power for communities along the Missouri. Four of the Pick-Sloan dams are located in South Dakota and the benefits of the project have proven indispensable to the people of my State.

Unfortunately, construction of the Big Bend and Fort Randall dams was severely detrimental to economic and agricultural development for several of South Dakota's tribes, including Cheyenne River. Over 100,000 acres of the tribe's most fertile and productive land, the basis for the tribal economy, were inundated, forcing the relocation of roughly 30 percent of the tribe's population, including four entire communities.

The Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act of 1998 will enable the Cheyenne River Tribe to address and improve their infrastructure and will provide the needed resources for further economic development within the Cheyenne River reservation community. However, the damage caused by the Pick-Sloan projects touched every aspect of life in South Dakota, on and off reservation. The economic development goal targeted in this approach is a pressing issue for surrounding communities off reservation as well, because every effort toward healthy local economies in rural South Dakota resonates throughout the State.

Language included in this bill would prohibit any increase in power rates in connection with the trust fund. This legislation has broad support in South Dakota. South Dakota Governor Bill Janklow has endorsed this type of funding mechanism for the compensation of South Dakota tribes, and fully supports S. 1905.

Mr. President, the tribes in my State experience some of the most extreme poverty and unemployment in this country. Under the current Chairman, Gregg Bourland, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe has been a leader in economic development initiatives within the reservation community and I believe this bill will reinforce and further the economic development successes of the tribe. I look forward to educating my colleagues about the importance of this bill to the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and I encourage swift Senate action on this bill. ●

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE'S LEASE PROCUREMENT

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to set the record straight about the Patent and Trademark Office's lease procurement for a new or remodeled facility. There is a continuing misinformation campaign being waged to delay the Patent and Trademark Of-

ice's lease procurement or put it back to square one.

Allegations are being made that, to the taxpayer's detriment, the new facility is vastly overpriced and that a new federal construction option has not been considered.

The fact is that the procurement has been conducted by the book and has undergone several, impartial reviews, all of which conclude that the project is on the right track, competitively sound and should continue.

Mr. President, we all know that funding is not available to support the federal construction of a new headquarters for PTO because of the limitations of the Balanced Budget Act. We also know that the new lease, authorized by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee in Fall of 1995, will result in cost savings of \$72 million over the life of the lease. That cost savings will accrue in spite of moving costs, an upgraded work environment, new furniture and other improvements designed to enable the PTO to more effectively do its job.

The PTO is fully fee funded and does not receive any taxpayer support. All lease and moving costs will be borne by PTO's customers in the normal course of business.

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure intends to have a hearing on this matter in September. In the meantime, I am submitting a number of points regarding the procurement, in addition to a letter sent to me by Bruce A. Lehman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.

I urge you to take time to hear the real story of the PTO project. The clear facts are that failure to take action to consolidate PTO space will result in wasteful use of funds and prevents PTO from modernizing services for its customers.

The material follows:

THE FACTS ON THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE PROCUREMENT

No taxpayer funds are being spent on the project. PTO is fully user fee funded.

PTO's largest user groups support the project. The American Intellectual Property Law Association, the Intellectual Property Owner's Association and the Intellectual Property Section of the ABA have all expressed strong support in numerous Congressional letters for continuation of the ongoing procurement.

Federal construction is not a viable option. The Administration and PTO's Appropriations Committees agree that a competitive lease is the only viable option since neither user fees nor taxpayer funding are available to construct or purchase a facility for PTO.

Consolidated project will save the PTO at least \$72 million. Whether the project proceeds or the PTO remains at its current leased, unconsolidated locations, the PTO will spend approximately \$1.3 billion in lease costs over the next 20 years to house the agency. Delaying consolidation will prevent PTO from passing this \$72 million in savings on to its fee-paying customers.

Senate Bill already caps build-out costs. The Senate Appropriations Bill (S. 2260), as passed, would cap interior office build-out at \$36.69 per square foot, the Government-wide standard rate. Moreover, these costs are included in the new rent amount.

PTO's projected moving costs are reasonable. All moving costs were taken into account in computing the \$72 million in savings. PTO's projected costs are comparable to those spent by other recently consolidated agencies.

PTO will not purchase \$250 shower curtains, etc. Estimates for \$250 shower curtains for the fitness facility, \$750 cribs for the child care center, \$309 ash cans for smoking rooms, and \$1,000 coat racks for training facilities were intentionally "worst case" estimates used for the purpose of calculating the cost savings that would result from consolidation. Standardization, mass buys and competitive furniture purchases will generate lower actual costs. PTO has not yet made any requested appropriations of user fees for furniture purchases. Proceeding with the procurement and applying a sharp pencil to PTO's future appropriations requests for furniture can only enhance the \$72 million in savings.

Any environmental costs will be totally funded by the developer. All three sites competing for PTO's lease already house Federal employees. The Government just constructed a federal courthouse on the Carlyle site, the Defense Department has occupied the Eisenhower site for over 20 years, and the PTO has occupied the Crystal City site for over 25 years. There is no evidence that developers cannot accomplish any environmental work that may be required to further develop these sites.

DOC's IG concluded that the project should proceed. The IG's key conclusion was that PTO will benefit from the project and will realize long-term cost savings. Both the IG and an independent consultant to the DOC Secretary (Jefferson Solutions) found that enhanced building capability, which is the goal of planned interior upgrades, is not unreasonable in terms of cost and purpose. And S. 2260, as passed, would place the ceiling on build-out that the IG recommends.

Two of the PTO's three unions fully support the project. National Treasury Employees Union locals 243 (representing clerical and administrative staff) and 245 (representing trademark examining attorneys) have already signed a partnership agreement supporting PTO's plans for the project. The PTO is continuing talks with the third union.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 29, 1998.

Hon. JOHN W. WARNER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: In light of recent reports on the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office's (PTO) on-going procurement process to competitively acquire new, consolidated space for the PTO, I want to assure you that this procurement is based on sound principles.

These reports are focused on estimates of furniture costs mentioned in our Deva and Associates business case study. This study was undertaken to compare our present, unconsolidated space with a worst-case scenario of moving to a new, consolidated facility under the GSA prospectus.

Many of the dollar amounts cited in the Deva report are being touted as what the

PTO is spending for furniture at a new facility. Nothing is farther from the truth. I personally assure you, we have never contemplated nor will we spend \$250 for a shower curtain, \$750 for a crib, or \$1,000 for a coat rack. I agree that some of these furniture estimates are too high even for a worst-case scenario. However, it must be kept in mind that even with these extremely high estimates, this procurement project still shows savings of at least \$72 million. No one is disputing this fact.

I look forward to working with you and our appropriators to ensure that any expenditures for furniture are prudent and responsible. Delaying or stopping this procurement will only increase space costs for our fee-paying customers.

Sincerely,

BRUCE A. LEHMAN,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce and
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.●

AUNG SAN SUU KYI THE INDOMITABLE

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, for eight years Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi has battled the military junta in an indomitable, peaceful way which deserves the admiration of us all. For five of these years she was held under house arrest. This is no longer the case, though events of the last week show that her freedom continues to be limited, as is the freedom of all Burmese citizens.

Last Friday, Aung San Suu Kyi began a journey to meet with members of her National League for Democracy in Nyaungdon township, outside of the capital. She never made it. The thugs who run the military junta blocked her passage. She spent six days in her car surrounded by soldiers who prevented her from crossing a bridge about 30 miles outside of the capital.

These actions were rightly criticized by many of the foreign ministers attending the annual meeting of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), including our own Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright. As Keith B. Richburg reported in the Washington Post yesterday, "the foreign ministers of six nations and the European Union confronted a top Burmese official today with a blunt message: No harm must come to the Nobel Peace Prize winner." I think it is clear that we in the Senate share this sentiment. We hold the leaders of the military junta in Burma responsible for the safety of Aung San Suu Kyi. Period.

She has demonstrated uncommon restraint and valor in her often tense encounters with the junta. This last week has been no exception. She sat in her car for days, yet when she spoke, she did so firmly and without rancor. She called for dialogue between the NLD and the junta and consistently speaks of upholding the rule of law. She has recently called for the true parliament of Burma—the one elected in 1990—to be convened by August 21. Perhaps this will be an opportunity for the junta to step aside.

The junta has failed miserably. Burma is a country rich in resources which has been run into the ground by an irresponsible junta. Its elected leaders have been censored, jailed, and worse. The junta has no legitimacy and should step aside and let the rightful and elected government of Burma take control. The people of Burma made clear their preference. Eight years is long enough to wait.●

I-90 LAND EXCHANGE

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on July 23, the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management held a hearing on legislation I have introduced to complete an important land exchange in my state. The bill, S. 2136, would authorize and direct the Forest Service to conclude an exchange with Plum Creek Timber Company which has been under formal discussion for several years.

The exchange is in an area of Washington surrounding the Interstate 90 corridor through the central Cascades. This area is characterized by a "checkerboard" ownership pattern of intermingled ownership between Plum Creek and the Forest Service. These lands are among the most studied not only in my state but the Nation.

The problems of checkerboard ownership are well recognized and understood in the west and northwest. This exchange, trading 60,000 of Plum Creek land for 40,000 acres of Forest Service land, would help resolve many management issues for both owners. It would make management more efficient, especially on an ecosystem basis.

I introduced my bill to provide impetus to complete this exchange by year's end because of the need for a speedy resolution. If the exchange is not completed by the end of this year, Plum Creek will have no choice but to resume logging their land in 1999. The company has deferred harvests on 90 percent of the exchange lands for the past 2 years and they have firmly stated they cannot continue to do so.

There is broad public support for the exchange and for completing it in a timely fashion. Our governor, Gary Locke, and the Lands Commissioner, Jennifer Belcher, have endorsed the exchange—urging it's completion by the end of 1998. The State Legislature unanimously approved a resolution in support of the I-90 exchange. Major newspapers in Seattle and other cities have recognized the need to finish this exchange. Many environmental groups support a land exchange.

Mr. President, our subcommittee hearing pointed out the difficult problems we face in Washington when we try to resolve issues. There always seems to be a controversy, no matter how worthy the purpose. My legislation and the I-90 exchange are no different.

Representatives from the environmental community, Plum Creek and

the Forest Service testified on July 23. While mainstream environmental groups heartily support an exchange, they would prefer to see changes in the lands package identified in a draft Environmental Impact Statement released earlier this spring. Environmental groups are concerned about legislation circumventing appeals and litigation.

The Forest Service wants to complete the exchange, but opposes legislation. I am disappointed that the Administration, having worked on this proposal for so long, would oppose a bill designed to enact a land exchange it has negotiated. Each party has spent over \$1 million getting to this point. Must we spend more, only to run the risk of seeing the entire exchange fall apart as a result of the heavy weight of appeals and litigation?

The I-90 exchange has been proposed in various shapes and sizes for more than a decade. Since it was first considered, the Northern Spotted Owl has been listed under the Endangered Species Act and the President has put his Northwest Forest Plan in effect. Plum Creek has even completed a massive Habitat Conservation Plan on 170,000 acres of its lands—including those in this exchange. This Plan, now two years old, was negotiated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. With this background and the resulting studies, I am confident we can complete an exchange on these lands that represents a consensus.

Mr. President, I recognize and support the idea of getting it right. We have been at this exchange too long not to do just that. When I introduced S. 2136, I indicated it was simply a place holder. The final Environmental Impact Statement will be completed later this summer. It has been my intention to amend the legislation to incorporate necessary changes based on the final EIS.

After hearing the testimony of all parties, I have urged them to work together to identify a lands package that can be incorporated in the final EIS. Further I am asking the Forest Service to move up the deadline for completing a final EIS to September 10 and forwarding it to the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands Management. Such a document—presented to Congress in a timely manner—will leave all options open this year. I continue to believe legislating this exchange is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, there are many who question why Congress should legislate this or any land exchange. This is common practice. Congress has not shied away from passing land trades in the past and we should not in this instance when a consensus may be eminent.

In an editorial on the exchange The Seattle Times stated, "The perfect as enemy of the good is a common phrase these days, but it remains appropriate

to this situation. A transfer of 100,000 acres with a net gain of 20,000 to the public has a long-term ring to it that future generations may see as prescient. Those are powerful reasons to walk toward this agreement with eyes open, but keep walking."•

TRIBUTE TO THE PROCTOR FIRE DEPARTMENT/SUTHERLAND FALLS HOSE COMPANY ON THEIR 100TH BIRTHDAY

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, August 15, 1998, will be a great day for Vermont as we celebrate the centennial of the Proctor Fire Department/Sutherland Falls Hose Company. On behalf of all Vermonters, I want to wish the department a very happy birthday.

For a century, the Proctor Fire Department has been a vital part of its community. The firefighters continually risk their lives to protect the welfare of their neighbors. One such person was Firefighter Maurice "Sonny" Wardwell, a twenty-three year veteran of the department. He gave his life on January 23, 1994, while at the scene of a mutual aid fire in Pittsford, Vermont. Mr. Wardwell is a true hero and his sacrifice serves as a reminder to us all of dedication and selflessness of this profession.

Mr. President, the 100th birthday of the Proctor Fire Department/Sutherland Falls Hose Company is a monumental occasion. The department is a vital part of the town and provides prompt and reliable service to people in the most distressing situations. This tribute recognizes the importance of the Proctor Fire Department/Sutherland Falls Hose Company and, more importantly, the courageous firefighters who commit their time and service to the community.•

IN MEMORY OF MR. CLYDE RAYMOND BARROW

• Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to the passing of Clyde Raymond Barrow. He was a dear friend, a devoted family man, and a committed community member. His life enriched the lives of countless people. I would like to take a few moments to reflect on this special person.

Clyde Barrow was born on March 3, 1923 in Belize, British Honduras. He passed just a few weeks ago at the age of 75 on July 9, 1998 in Chicago. He is survived by his wife of 54 years, the Reverend Willie Taplin Barrow; his adopted children, Dr. Patricia Carey and John Kirby, Jr.; his two sisters, Avis Barrow McKay and Peggy Barrow Foster; ninety eight Godchildren; many nieces and nephews; as well as friends and relatives too numerous to count. The Barrows are also the parents of Keith Errol Barrow, who preceded his father in death in 1983.

To Reverend Barrow, and Clyde's surviving family and friends, I wish there was some way that I could lift this burden of loss from your shoulders. We must take comfort in the fact that Clyde lived his life with tremendous courage, dignity, and kindness. Clyde Barrow's life is an example of righteousness for us all to follow.

Although Clyde Barrow is no longer with us, he has left scores of memories and a legacy of kindness and compassion that will live on forever. He was the strong, silent partner of the little warrior, Reverend Barrow, supporting her in her many civil rights battles and her stewardship of Operation Push.

A welder by trade, Clyde also labored countless hours to build and strengthen his community by volunteering his considerable time and talents. Clyde's involvement with organizations such as the Doctors Hospital of Hyde Park and the Vernon Park Church of God's MAST (Men Achieving Success and Training) Homeless Ministry represent his well earned reputation as a good Samaritan. As one who cherished children, Clyde Barrow went out of his way to know the name of each child in his church and neighborhood. Without a doubt, Clyde Barrow was the embodiment of the neighbor we all want living next door to us: a rock and a conscience within the community.

In times such as these, it is comforting to remember the words of our Lord: "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy comes with the dawn." Clyde Raymond Barrow was a fine man, dedicated to his family, his community, and his God. The Barrows are in my thoughts and prayers during this time of sorrow, and I trust that they are in the prayers of the Senate as well.•

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN IRAN

• Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, on December 10, 1948—nearly 50 years ago—the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and called on member nations "to cause it to be disseminated, displayed, read and expounded . . . "Since that time, the Universal Declaration has become the bedrock document for human rights standards and aspirations for signatory governments.

One government, however, the government of Iran, is distinguished as an egregious violator of a central principle this document expounds—namely, that of religious freedom. Article 18 of the Universal Declaration explicitly states: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance."

On Tuesday, July 21st, the Iranian government summarily executed an Iranian Baha'i for the single alleged act of converting a Muslim to the Baha'i faith. The Baha'is are Iran's largest religious minority with about 300,000 adherents and suffer continuous persecution for their faith.

The executed, Mr. Ruhollah Rowhani, a medical equipment salesman with four children, had been picked-up near the northern Iranian city of Mashad by the Iranian authorities in September 1997. He was held in solitary confinement during that extended period until final execution.

The facts are stark in their cruelty. His family was allowed to visit him briefly the day before his execution but, amazingly and cynically, they were not notified that his execution was set for the next day. They finally discovered the death only after they were given one hour to arrange for his burial. With brutal disregard, the Iranian government refused to divulge any information to this grieving family who were forced to conclude from the rope marks that their beloved relative had been executed by hanging.

It is safe to say that Mr. Rowhani was accorded no due process nor afforded a lawyer prior to his execution. He died alone at the end of a rope for the alleged sin of sharing his sincerely held faith. I will state this very clearly—Mr. Rowhani was the victim of the most extreme form of religious persecution. Mr. Rowhani died for his faith and this is an outrage which must be denounced.

Mr. President, this barbarous act flies in the face of the Universal Declaration to which Iran is party. Mr. Rowhani had a fundamental right to practice his religion. Iran denied him that right. Mr. Rowhani had a fundamental right to a public trial. Iran denied him that right. Mr. Rowhani had a fundamental right to counsel. Iran denied him that right. Mr. Rowhani had a fundamental right to NOT be hung at the end of a rope for holding minority religious beliefs.

My deepest concern now rests with the fifteen other Baha'is now being held by the government of Iran for essentially the same charges that resulted in Mr. Rowhani's execution. As I speak now, at least three Baha'i men in the city of Mashad presently sit on death row, facing imminent execution because they dared to quietly celebrate their faith. I speak as much for them today as I do in protest to the brutal killing of their fellow-believer.

This hour, I call on the Government of Iran to ensure the safety of these individuals. Better yet, I call for the release of these individuals whose only crime was the sincere expression of their faith, which happens to be a minority religion. Most importantly, I call upon the government of Iran to

provide freedom of religion to its people, including the famously peaceful yet brutalized Baha'is community.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the international community for its swift response to Mr. Rowhani's execution and urge other governments and organizations to vigilantly monitor the fate of the 15 jailed Baha'is, particularly the 3 jailed in Mashad presently facing the death penalty.

Religious persecution demands a tireless counter response; it demands a vigilant defense. If we hold the principle of religious freedom to be a precious and fundamental right, something worth protecting, then we must always defend those who are wrongfully and brutally crushed for their faith by hostile national governments.

We cannot bring Mr. Rowhani back or right the wrong that was done to him and his family, but we can advocate against this happening again. Iran must abide by global human rights principles. Accordingly, Iran must release the fifteen Bahai who have been incarcerated for their faith. Iran must preserve the lives of those facing execution for their faith. Iran must honor its commitment to the religious freedom principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and set these prisoners free. ●

NURSING SCHOOL ADMINISTERED PRIMARY CARE CLINICS

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an health issue of great importance now and in future years. As our population continues to increase, our elderly live longer, and healthcare technology advances, the need for access to care will undoubtedly also increase.

Because of these monumental increases in the need for healthcare access for many Americans, I wish to take a few minutes to discuss the need for support of nursing school administered primary care centers.

Nursing centers are university or nonprofit entity primary care centers developed (primarily) in collaboration with university schools of nursing and the communities they serve. These centers are staffed by faculty and staff who are public health nurses and nurse practitioners. Students supplement patient care while receiving preceptorships provided by colleges of nursing faculty and primary care physicians, often associated with academic institutions, who serve as collaborators with nurse practitioners.

Nurse practitioners, and public health nurses, in particular, are educated through programs which offer advanced academic and clinical experiences, with a strong emphasis on primary and preventive health care. In fact, schools of nursing that have established these primary health care centers blend service and education

goals, resulting in considerable benefit to the community at large.

Nursing centers are rooted in health care models established in the early part of the 20th century. Lillian Wald in the Henry Street Settlement and Margaret Sanger, who opened the first birth control clinic, provided the earliest models of service.

Since the late 1970's, in conjunction with the development of educational programs for nurse practitioners, college of nursing faculties have established nursing centers. There are currently 250 centers nationwide, affiliated with universities and colleges of nursing in Arizona, Utah, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Hawaii, Virginia, and New York. The Regional Nursing Centers Consortium, an association of eighteen nursing centers in New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware, was established in 1996 to foster greater recognition of, and support for, nursing centers in their pursuit of providing quality care to underserved populations.

Nursing centers tend to be located in or near areas with a shortage of health professionals or areas that are medically underserved. The beneficiaries of their services have traditionally been the underserved and those least likely to engage in ongoing health care services for themselves or their family members. In the 1970's, I sponsored legislation that would give nurses the right to reimbursement for independent nursing services, under various federal healthcare programs. At the same time, one of the first academic nursing centers was delivering primary care services in Arizona.

As the Vice Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I am pleased to note that the University of South Carolina College of Nursing has established a Primary Care Tribal Practice Clinic, under contract with the Catawba Indian nation, which provides primary and preventive services to those populations. The University also has a Women's Health Clinic and Student Health Clinic, which are both managed by nurse practitioners.

Another prime example of services provided by nurse practitioners is the Utah Wendover Clinic. This clinic, in existence since 1994, provides interdisciplinary rural primary health services to more than 10,000 patients annually. The clinic now has telehealth capabilities that provide interactive links from the clinic to the university hospital, 120 miles away. This technology allows practitioners direct access to medical support for primary care, pediatrics, mental health, potential abuse, and emergency trauma treatment.

To date, nursing centers have demonstrated quality outcomes which, when compared to conventional primary health care, indicate that their comprehensive models of care have re-

sulted in significantly fewer emergency room visits, fewer hospital inpatient days, and less use of specialists. The Lasalle Neighborhood Nursing Center, for example, reported for 1997 that fewer than 0.02 percent of their primary care clients reported hospitalization for asthma; fewer than 4 percent of expectant mothers who enrolled delivered low birth rate infants; 90 percent of infants and young children were immunized on time; 50 percent fewer emergency room visits; and the clinic achieved a 97 percent patient satisfaction rate.

What makes the concept of nurse managed practices exciting and promising for the 21st century is their ability to provide care in a "spirit of serving" to underserved people in desperate need of health care services. Interestingly, nurse practitioners have consistently provided Medicaid sponsored primary care in urban and rural communities for a number of years, and have consistently demonstrated their commitment to these underserved areas.

The 1997 Balanced Budget Act (P.L. 105-33) included a provision that for the first time ever allowed for direct Medicare reimbursement of all nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists, regardless of the setting in which services were performed. This provision built upon previous legislation that allowed direct reimbursement to individual nurse practitioners for services provided in rural health clinics throughout America. The law effectively paved the way for an array of clinical practice arrangements for these providers; however, per visit payments to nurse run centers, as opposed to individual practitioners, was not formally included in the law.

Federal law now also mandates independent reimbursement for nurse practitioners under the Civilian Health and Medical Programs of Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS), the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP) and in Department of Defense Medical Treatment Facilities.

As the Ranking Member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, my distinguished colleagues and I have listened to the testimonies of the three Service Chief Nurses each year, during the Defense Medical hearings. I am proud to report that the military services have taken the lead in ensuring the advancement of the profession of nursing. Military advanced practice nurses provide care to service members and their families at all of the treatment facilities. The Graduate School of Nursing at the Uniformed University of the Health Sciences (USUHS), which has a very successful nurse practitioner program, was recently recognized in the top 100 graduate schools in the United States. The Commanding General at Tripler Army Medical Center, a two star position, is a nurse. This is a first ever accomplishment for

nurses in the military. I hope to see more nurse officers in these leadership roles, even at the three star level.

At the beginning of this session of Congress, I proposed legislation to amend Title XIX of the Social Security Act to expressly provide for coverage of services by nursing school administered centers under state Medicaid programs, similar to payments provided to rural health clinics. Today, as we debate a number of health care issues, I urge us to consider creative avenues for expanding health care access for all Americans, particularly the poor and underserved. Nursing centers, as new models of health care providers, offer quality services for lower payments.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that nurse practitioners provide cost effective, preventive care in underserved areas across America. Their educational programs emphasize the provision of care to patients with limited resources, financial and otherwise. A recent article in U.S. News and World Report showcased the successful Columbia Advanced Practice Nurse Associates (CAPNA), a nurse run primary care clinic in New York City. Dr. Mary Munding, the Dean of the Columbia School of Nursing and a Robert Wood Johnson Health Policy Fellow in 1984, was the catalyst for the center, which she envisions as a "prototype of a new branch of primary care."

Nurse practitioners have proven themselves to be well trained providers of high quality, cost effective care.

Nursing school administered centers offer viable alternatives to health care access for the poor and underserved, and allow Americans more choices in their selection of cost effective, quality care services. The issues surrounding quality, access and the provision of patient care services are, Mr. President, at the crux of our current debates over health care reform. We owe it to each and every American to provide the very best options for quality health care available.

Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to address my colleagues on this most important topic. I ask that an article on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, July 27, 1998]

FOR NURSES, A BARRIER BROKEN—IT'S A TEST INSURERS ARE BACKING: CAN PRIMARY CARE WORK WITHOUT DOCTORS?

(By James Lardner)

Seems like everybody's been trying to take a bite out of doctors' paychecks lately—the federal government, employers, insurers, and now, of all people, nurses. In New York City, Medicare and eight private health plans have given their enrollees permission to get primary care from a group of nurse practitioners or NPs, who diagnose, treat, prescribe, refer, and bill very much as if they were M.D.'s.

About 250 New Yorkers have signed up with the 10-month-old practice, known as CAPNA

(for Columbia Advanced Practice Nurse Associates), and though it's still a tiny operation—just four NPs—business is growing by six or seven new patients a week. Supporters think the idea of a nurse-run form of primary care has a lot of potential. Many doctors are dubious.

The New York State Medical Society's chief lobbyist, Anthony Santomauro, sees a threat to the well-being of physicians as well as of patients. "Your action," Santomauro warned his colleagues recently, "could decide whether nurse practitioners . . . continue to serve under your direction and supervision or . . . become independent practitioners in direct competition." To Robert Graham, executive vice president of the American Academy of Family Physicians, what the nurses are doing "comes very close to practicing medicine, which of course, requires a medical degree and a license."

The law aside, critics argue that primary care entails subtle diagnostic decisions that physicians are uniquely qualified to make. "The four years in medical school and three years in residency training and many hours of continuing education that physicians receive are very different from the 500 to 700 hours of training that most nurse-practitioner programs call for," says Nancy Dickey, a Texas physician who recently became president of the American Medical Association. (There are roughly 140,000 nurses with advanced degrees in the United States; as a rule, NPs have master's degrees that entail two years of classroom and clinical training.)

While physicians stress the possibility of confusion about who is or isn't an M.D., they may be up against a bigger problem: a widespread longing for a slower-paced, more personal form of health care than many people feel they can get from physicians these days. "If you spend 10 minutes with a doctor in New York City, you're doing well," says Doris Ward, a 77-year-old former nonprofit executive. Ward came to CAPNA's offices on East 60th Street seeking treatment for high cholesterol and anxious to find "someone who would sit down and talk to me for a little while." Her NP, Marlene McHugh, devoted an hour to the initial appointment and recommended a dietary rather than a medical approach to her problem.

Thomas Becker, a 36-year-old marketing manager, was confused about whom he was seeing. He didn't know that Edwidge Thomas was not a doctor when he picked her from a list supplied by his health plan; in fact, he didn't realize his mistake until his first visit. But Thomas asked such insightful questions that "it didn't really matter to me," Becker says. After three appointments, two for sports-related injuries and one for flu, he rates CAPNA "absolutely excellent."

Bedside manner. Mary O'Neil Munding, dean of the Columbia University School of Nursing and the driving force behind CAPNA, sees it as the prototype of a new branch of primary care. She spent 17 years as a bedside nurse before getting a doctorate in public health, and she dismisses the suggestion that nurses are likely to overlook symptoms or botch diagnoses ("We don't miss things," she says crisply). But physicians, she argues, overemphasize diagnosing and prescribing, and tend to consider their work over once they have recommended a program of treatment; nurses, she says, are better at getting patients to follow the program.

Two studies seem to bolster her case. Nurse practitioners have long provided primary care to those who might otherwise have gone unserved, such as residents of

rural areas, and a 1986 study by the Office of Technology Assessment concluded that the care they provided was equivalent to that offered by physicians. When it came to communication and prevention, the OTA found NPs more adept.

In addition, a 1993 analysis of studies comparing care offered by physicians with that provided by NPs found that nurses spent about 25 minutes with a patient; doctors spent 17. The two groups were about equal in their rates of prescribing drugs, but the nurses provided more patient education and stressed exercise more often than the doctors.

While the debate may seem to pit nurses against doctors, the more important division exposed by CAPNA may be between two types of physician, primary-care providers and specialists. Critics of the CAPNA model fear that NPs, because they have less training than physicians, will rely too much on specialists. Many specialists respond that in the age of managed care, overreferral by nurses is far less of a danger than underreferral by doctors, who are torn between the interests of patients and, as Eric Rose, the chief of surgery at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center, puts it, "the care of their bankbooks and the HMOs' bankbooks." (CAPNA has been referring surgery cases to Columbia-Presbyterian.)

CAPNA's acceptance by insurers as a legitimate primary-care alternative to a practice run by physicians is clearly a breakthrough for nurses, who were long defined as hospital workers who existed to do the bidding of physicians. As recently as the 1970s, nursing-school curricula included elaborate protocols of respect (surrendering one's chair, for example) that a nurse was supposed to follow when a physician entered a room.

The power of physicians is also under attack from market-oriented critics, who see them as attempting to carve out a monopoly at the consumer's expense. In the past, physicians' organizations have used their clout to beat back proposals to give quasi-medical powers to nonphysicians. But CAPNA was created with no change in the law; Munding reasoned that the kind of health care she hoped to offer affluent patients in midtown Manhattan was already the norm in much of rural and inner-city America. New York itself allowed NPs to write prescriptions—otherwise, health care in many areas of the state would have ground to a halt. "As long as it was just poor folks, nobody was paying any attention," Munding says.

The groundwork was laid in 1993, when Columbia-Presbyterian sought the nursing school's help in expanding health care services in two poor, upper-Manhattan neighborhoods. Spotting an opportunity, Munding asked in return for something that earlier partnerships of nurse practitioners had lacked: hospital admitting privileges—the ability to get patients into Columbia-Presbyterian and supervise their care there. Two new primary-care practices were created, one with doctors and nurse practitioners working as equals, the other run entirely by NPs.

Munding's next brainstorm was to see if the concept would work in an affluent neighborhood. This time, in a move with widespread implications for health care, she went after managed-care plans for the right of reimbursement.

Equal treatment. For the HMOs—under constant pressure from employers to cut costs—a nurse-run practice had obvious appeal if it meant lower payments for the same

services. But Munding rejected support that was conditioned on reduced reimbursement, insisting that would open the HMOs to the charge of chiseling and cast her practice as a cheap substitute for real medicine. After months of discussions, Oxford Health Plans agreed to go along. Seven more health plans followed suit, all giving the nurses the same fee-for-service rates as doctors.

Munding's admirers say she has not only created a significant new model of health care but, in doing so, has called the medical profession's bluff. Say Uwe Reinhardt, a health economist who teaches at Princeton University, "Doctors always say the are rugged individualists, for free enterprise and such, and now at the first sight of a nurse they run to the government and say, 'Please use your coercive powers to protect us!'"

Even some supporters, however, fear that Munding's model, for all its noble objectives, will appeal to the basest motives of insurers and employers, leaving patients, in the end, with less-trained people who are in just as much of a hurry. There is some reason for doubting this: A study in the April Nurse Practitioner, for example, found NPs more consistent than gynecologists in adhering to medical standards in evaluating cervical dysplasia, a precursor to cervical cancer. And as Robert Brook, a Rand analyst who is conducting an internal assessment for CAPNA, puts it: "It's not like we started out with a perfect system.●"

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL KEVIN "SPANKY" KIRSCH, USAF

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Lieutenant Colonel Kevin "Spanky" Kirsch, United States Air Force, on the occasion of his retirement after over twenty years of exemplary service to our nation. Colonel Kirsch's strong commitment to excellence will leave a lasting impact on the vitality of our nation's military procurement and information technology capabilities. His expertise in these areas will be sorely missed by his colleagues both in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill.

Before embarking on his Air Force career, Colonel Kirsch worked as an estimator/engineer for Penfield Electric Co. in upstate New York, where he designed and built electrical and mechanical systems for commercial construction. In 1978, Colonel Kirsch received his commission through the Officer Training School at Lackland AFB in San Antonio, TX. Eagerly traveling to Williams AFB in Arizona for flight training, Colonel Kirsch earned his pilot wings after successful training in T-37 and T-38 aircraft.

In 1980, Colonel Kirsch was assigned to Carswell AFB, in Fort Worth, TX, as a co-pilot in the B-52D aircraft. While serving in this capacity on nuclear alert for the next five years, he earned his Masters degree, completed Squadron Officer School and Marine Corps Command and Staff School by correspondence, and earned an engineering specialty code with the Civil Engineering Squadron.

An experienced bomber pilot serving with the 7th Bomb Wing, Colonel

Kirsch, then a First Lieutenant, served as the Resource Manager for the Director of Operations—a position normally filled by an officer much more senior in rank. He was selected to the Standardization Evaluation (Stan-Eval) Division and became dual-qualified in the B-52H. Subsequently, he was selected ahead of his peers to be an aircraft commander in the B-52H.

Colonel Kirsch was selected in 1985 as one of the top 1% of the Air Force's captains to participate in the Air Staff Training (ASTRA) program at the Pentagon. His experience during that tour, working in Air Force contracting and legislative affairs, would serve him well in later assignments.

In 1986, Colonel Kirsch returned to flying in the FB-111 aircraft at Plattsburgh AFB, NY. He joined the 529th Bomb Squadron as an aircraft commander and was designated a flight commander shortly thereafter. He employed his computer skills to help automate the scheduling functions at the 380th Bomb Wing and was soon designated chief of bomber scheduling.

Following his tour with the 529th, Colonel Kirsch was assigned to Strategic Air Command (SAC) Headquarters at Offutt AFB, NE. As Chief of the Advanced Weapons Concepts Branch, he served as a liaison with the Department of Energy on nuclear weapons programs and worked on development of new strategic systems—including the B-2 bomber. Colonel Kirsch was one of four officers chosen to be part of the commander-in-chief's (CINC's) staff group to facilitate the transition of SAC to Strategic Command (STRATCOM). Originally picked as a technical advisor for weapon systems, he soon became the legislative liaison for STRATCOM. In this capacity, Colonel Kirsch organized congressional delegations to visit STRATCOM, and managed CINC STRATCOM's interaction with Capitol Hill.

In 1994, Col Kirsch traveled here, to Washington, to begin his final assignment on active duty. Initially serving as a military assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, Colonel Kirsch once again quickly distinguished himself and was designated the special assistant for acquisition and C3 policy. Representing the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for C3I, Colonel Kirsch managed a myriad of critical initiatives including acquisition reform and information assurance. He also served as the principal architect for the organization's web page, computer network, and many of the custom applications used to automate the office's administrative functions.

Colonel Kirsch's numerous military awards include the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster,

the Air Force Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Air Force Achievement Award.

Following his retirement, Colonel Kirsch and his wife Carol will continue to reside in Springfield, VA with their children Alicia and Benjamin.

Mr President, our nation, the Department of Defense, the United States Air Force, and Lieutenant Colonel Kirsch's family can truly be proud of this outstanding officer's many accomplishments. His honorable service will be genuinely missed in the Department of Defense and on Capitol Hill. I wish Lieutenant Colonel Spanky Kirsch the very best in all his future endeavors.●

D.A.R.E. MICHIGAN OFFICER OF THE YEAR 1998

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Officer Kimberly Sivyer of the Redford Township Police Department. He has been named the D.A.R.E. Officer of the Year for 1998 in the state of Michigan.

Officer Sivyer started with the Redford Police Department in 1981. He has dedicated his time and service to D.A.R.E. since 1990. Over the course of these eight years he has touched many students' lives educating them about the dangers of drugs and violence. He has and continues to be an excellent role model for the youth of his community. His colleagues at the Redford Township Police Department and the members of his community recognize this and it is for these reasons that he is very deserving of this award.

I want to once again express my sincerest appreciation and congratulations to Officer Sivyer for being named D.A.R.E. Officer of the Year 1998. He should be very proud of this achievement.●

THE COUNTRY OF GEORGIA

● Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about Georgia and the recent events which have taken place in this impressive country. Several days ago, Georgia reaffirmed its commitment to full participatory democracy when the Minister of State requested the resignation of all cabinet ministers, and then resigned himself. His resignation was accepted, and President Eduard Shevardnadze has vowed to reconstitute a new government by the middle of August. This transition, so reminiscent of the ebb and flow of governments in great parliamentary democracies, has been accomplished without violence or bloodshed, without chaos or confusion, and with the support of the Georgian people. Truly Georgia is an inspiration to peoples everywhere who long for democracy and who struggle against the freedom-stifling legacy of the communist experiment.

Georgia is impressive in other ways as well. Its economy continues to grow in a positive direction, unlike the economies of some of its neighbors; Georgia is not perfect, and it is not pristine. But it is progressive. With a growth rate of nearly 8 percent in 1997 and projected growth of 11-13 percent in 1998, Georgia is on track to a significant economic turn-around.

This turn-around and the prosperity that will inevitably flow from it, still involve many hurdles. Georgians have bravely faced these challenges, and they face more still. Probably none is so painful as the ongoing conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia's most northwestern province bordering Russia. This brutal brushfire war has now claimed lives unnecessarily on both sides, and it must be ended. Mr. President, the CIS peacekeepers are a major part of the problem and the reason the war continues.

As the Times of London noted on July 27th, Georgia accepted the CIS peacekeepers only under duress, because the UN blinked. These CIS peacekeepers, the Times points out, have not exactly distinguished themselves by their impartiality. They are "entirely drawn from the Russian Army, and commanded from Russian, not CIS, headquarters. Of its four battalions, one fought the Georgians in the 1992-93 war, while another two are recruited from anti-Georgia nationalities." It is hard to imagine that this formula can create anything but conflict, and indeed, there have been constant complaints from Georgia that these so-called peacekeepers are merely part of a Russian strategy to destabilize Georgia, a strategy that includes several assassination attempts on President Shevardnadze.

From the beginning, the Abkhaz conflict has been widely acknowledged to be Russia's doing. The separatists who want to break off Abkhazia from Georgia are provoked, fueled and encouraged by the Russians. Georgia has offered Abkhazia full autonomy, an offer that has been answered by Russian guns.

As early as 1992 Russia provided the Abkhazians with weapons to conduct the war, and the Russian government today supports the Abkhaz leadership in its unwillingness to bring the conflict to a close through negotiation. One member of the Abkhaz leadership wrote in the Russian nationalist press in 1992 that "Abkhazia is Russia." Since then, Russia has managed to scuttle all budding negotiations, even while serving as the putative "mediator" at the recent Geneva talks between the Georgians and Abkhazians, and it has unfailingly sided with the Abkhaz against Georgia at the infrequent bargaining tables and on the battlefield.

Let us be frank: These Russian peacekeepers do not want peace. Rather, they seek to extend the hostilities so

that Georgia will find it difficult to consolidate its hold over this break-away region. These so-called peacekeepers have helped to create thousands of dead on both sides; they have created massive flows of Georgian refugees by turning a blind eye toward some of the most blatant ethnic cleansing anywhere in the world; and they have allowed the devastation of what is arguably one of the richest and most beautiful parts of the Georgian state.

Abkhaz leaders, with Russia's help, have perpetrated one of the world's most egregious examples of ethnic cleansing. Tens of thousands of Georgians have been forced out of their homes in Abkhazia and turned into homeless, hungry refugees. Georgia's many requests in recent years to the United Nations to condemn this blatant genocide have fallen on deaf ears, and most Georgians now attribute the Abkhazians' continued use of ethnic cleansing to UN inaction. Georgia has once again asked the UN to intervene in Abkhazia, but its willingness to do so, especially with Russia holding a seat on the Security Council, is in doubt.

How is it possible that ethnic cleansing can high behind a transparent veil of "peacekeeping"? Why has the UN shirked its duty to protect these vulnerable Georgians, when it seems willing, even eager, to condemn genocide elsewhere in the world? Where is the indignation and outrage from our statesmen? Where are the legions of human rights advocates that usually visit the corridors of our departments and ministries?

The Abkhazians (who constitute less than 20 percent of the population of the region they claim as their own) and their Russian supporters, should harbor no illusions about the ultimate outcome of this struggle: Abkhazia will remain part of Georgia. The Georgian government will never acquiesce in territorial claims on its historic territory, and the US government will never support such claims. Meanwhile, Abkhazians are poised to miss what could be one of the most exciting periods in the development of the South Caucasus. The opening of energy pipelines from the Caspian will create unprecedented opportunities for growth and development, and the forging of the Eurasian Transport Corridor, the New Silk Road, which originates in Georgia, foretells a future in which all Georgians, including Abkhazians, should prosper.

Those of my colleagues who have traveled to Georgia know of the immense beauty of the country, and the kindness and generosity of its people. They know of the Georgians' will in the face of numerous obstacles and barriers. And, increasingly, they understand why and where Georgia's interests intersect with America's interests.

Put simply, Georgia is a key strategic ally for America in a region in

which America has few strategic anchors. America has a strong national interest in encouraging a close and multifaceted relationship with Georgia. Though small, poor and weak, Georgia has the potential to be small, yet rich and strong. It is in our best interest to promote this transition with American aid, American power and American prayers. •

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING THE HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN SITUATION FACING THE WOMEN AND GIRLS OF AFGHANISTAN

(The text of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 97), with its preamble, as agreed to by the Senate on July 29, 1998, is as follows:)

S. CON. RES. 97

Whereas the legacy of the war in Afghanistan has had a devastating impact on the civilian population, and a particularly negative impact on the rights and security of women and girls;

Whereas the current environment is one in which the rights of women and girls are routinely violated, leading the Department of State in its 1997 Country Report on Human Rights, released January 30, 1998, to conclude that women are beaten for violating increasingly restrictive Taliban dress codes, which require women to be covered from head to toe, women are strictly prohibited from working outside the home, women and girls are denied the right to an education, women are forbidden from appearing outside the home unless accompanied by a male family member, and beatings and death result from a failure to observe these restrictions;

Whereas the Secretary of State stated, in November 1997 at the Nasir Bagh Refugee Camp in Pakistan, that if a society is to move forward, women and girls must have access to schools and health care, be able to participate in the economy, and be protected from physical exploitation and abuse;

Whereas Afghanistan recognizes international human rights conventions such as the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Covenant on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, which espouses respect for basic human rights of all individuals without regard to race, religion, ethnicity, or gender;

Whereas the use of rape as an instrument of war is considered a grave breach of the Geneva Convention and a crime against humanity;

Whereas people who commit grave breaches of the Geneva Convention are to be apprehended and subject to trial;

Whereas there is significant credible evidence that warring parties, factions, and powers in Afghanistan are responsible for numerous human rights violations, including the systematic rape of women and girls;

Whereas in recent years Afghan maternal mortality rates have increased dramatically, and the level of women's health care has declined significantly;

Whereas there has been a marked upswing in human rights violations against women and girls since the Taliban coalition seized

Kabul in 1996, including Taliban edicts denying women and girls the right to an education, employment, access to adequate health care, and direct access to humanitarian aid; and

Whereas peace and security in Afghanistan are conducive to the full restoration of all human rights and fundamental freedom, the voluntary repatriation of refugees to their homeland in safety and dignity, the clearance of mine fields, and the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Afghanistan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) deplores the continued human rights violations by all parties, factions, and powers in Afghanistan;

(2) condemns targeted discrimination against women and girls and expresses deep concern regarding the prohibitions on employment and education;

(3) strongly condemns the use of rape or other forms of systematic gender discrimination by any party, faction, or power in Afghanistan as an instrument of war;

(4) calls on all parties, factions, and powers in Afghanistan to respect international norms and standards of human rights;

(5) calls on all Afghan parties to bring an end without delay to—

(A) discrimination on the basis of gender; and

(B) deprivation of human rights of women;

(6) calls on all Afghan parties in particular to take measures to ensure—

(A) the effective participation of women in civil, economic, political, and social life throughout the country;

(B) respect for the right of women to work;

(C) the right of women and girls to an education without discrimination, reopening schools to women and girls at all levels of education;

(D) respect for the right of women to physical security;

(E) those responsible for physical attacks on women are brought to justice;

(F) respect for freedom of movement of women and their effective access to health care; and

(G) equal access of women to health facilities;

(7) supports the work of nongovernmental organizations advocating respect for human rights in Afghanistan and an improvement in the status of women and their access to humanitarian and development assistance and programs;

(8) calls on the international community to provide, on a nondiscriminatory basis, adequate humanitarian assistance to the people of Afghanistan and Afghan refugees in neighboring countries pending their voluntary repatriation, and requests all parties in Afghanistan to lift the restrictions imposed on international aid and to cease any action which may prevent or impede the delivery of humanitarian assistance;

(9) welcomes the appointment of Ambassador Lakhdar Brahimi as special envoy of the United Nations Secretary General for Afghanistan, and encourages United Nations efforts to produce a durable peace in Afghanistan consistent with the goal of a broad-based national government respectful of human rights; and

(10) calls on all warring parties, factions, and powers to participate with Ambassador Brahimi in an intra-Afghan dialogue regarding the peace process.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL ACTION BY PRESIDENT.
It is the sense of Congress that the President and Secretary of State should—

(1) work with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the international community to—

(A) guarantee the safety of, and provide international development assistance for, Afghan women's groups in Pakistan and Afghanistan;

(B) increase support for refugee programs in Pakistan providing assistance to Afghan women and children with an emphasis on health, education, and income-generating programs; and

(C) explore options for the resettlement of those Afghan women, particularly war widows and their families, who are under threat or who fear for their safety or the safety of their families;

(2) establish an Afghanistan Women's Initiative, based on the successful model of the Bosnian Women's Initiative and the Rwandan Women's Initiative, that is targeted at Afghan women's groups, in order to—

(A) facilitate organization among Afghan women's groups in Pakistan and Afghanistan;

(B) provide humanitarian and development services to the women and the families most in need; and

(C) promote women's economic security;

(3) make a policy determination that—

(A) recognition of any government in Afghanistan by the United States should depend, among other things, on the human rights policies towards women adopted by that government;

(B) the United States should not recognize any government which systematically maltreats women; and

(C) any nonemergency economic or development assistance will be based on respect for human rights; and

(4) call for the creation of—

(A) an international commission to establish a record of the criminal culpability of any individual or party in Afghanistan employing rape or other crimes against humanity considered a grave breach of the Geneva Convention as an instrument of war; and

(B) an ad hoc international criminal tribunal by the United Nations for the purposes of indicting, prosecuting, and imprisoning any individual responsible for crimes against humanity in Afghanistan.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should submit a report to Congress not later than 6 months after the date of the adoption of this resolution regarding actions that have been taken to implement this resolution.

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1385 to consolidate, coordinate, and improve employment, training, literacy, and vocational rehabilitation programs in the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1385), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of July 29, 1998.)

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be adopted, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and other statements relating to this conference report be printed in the RECORD.

Before you proceed, Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Ohio would like to make some comments, and I invite him to do so.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I thank the chairman of the committee, Senator JEFFORDS, for yielding to me and thank him also for the tremendous work he has done on this bill. He has been working on this for a number of years. This is the culmination of a great deal of work.

We are about to pass the conference report. Once the bill is sent on to the President and signed by the President, it will represent a major accomplishment of this Congress. This bill consolidates over 70 federally funded job training related programs—over 70 of them consolidated. This bill will make job training, federally funded job training, in this country much more accountable. It will also involve the business community much more in the development and design of job training.

The one thing Chairman JEFFORDS and I have learned as we have held hearings on this matter over the years is that if you want job training to work, it has to be run locally and it has to have great input from the local business community. This bill will make sure that we have that local input. We have to remember who the consumers are. When you are talking about job training, there are two consumers. One is the person who wants the job and wants to be trained for the job. But the other, equally as important, is the company or the individual who wants to hire that person, and so you have to involve them both in the design of job training.

That is what this bill does. This bill also dramatically reforms Job Corps. Job Corps is a Great Society-era job training program, residential, that is run by the Federal Government. It costs over \$1 billion a year. It is targeted at our most at-risk young people in this country, people who desperately need our help, desperately need our assistance. What this bill does is make sure that \$1 billion will be correctly spent. And again, we do that by measuring the results.

One of the things that Chairman JEFFORDS and I, I think, and the rest of the committee, were so shocked about when we held hearings several years ago on this—actually former Senator Kassebaum was chairman—was that

Job Corps did not really measure success or failure of the young people. It didn't measure the success or failure of a particular job training program. They looked at it and saw whether or not a person had a job for 2 weeks. If they kept a job for 2 weeks after graduating from the program—and it didn't matter what the job was—the program was considered a success. The contractor who was in charge of getting that person a job got paid, and then no one ever looked back.

What we do with this bill is say we are going to measure success or failure after 6 months. We are going to measure success or failure after 12 months. And then we are going to be able to tell which programs work and which do not work in regard to Job Fair.

Another change we are making in Job Corps is to involve the local business community. Too often Job Corps has herded young people from 500, 600, 700 miles a way. They go to the Job Corps. They stay there for awhile, they complete their program, and then they go back home, and it is very difficult to involve the local business community when they know that person is not going to be there to work for them. And so we change those priorities in regard to Job Corps as well.

We also in this bill make a major step forward to link the regular job training programs of this country with vocational rehabilitation. We do that by closing the gap. We do that by preserving the dedicated flow of money that will go for this targeted population, targeted population that is in need of our assistance, who wants to help themselves. We preserve that dedicated fund, those dedicated funds. But we give that recipient, that client, more resources. We empower that client to go to the vocational rehabilitation site or, if the services are not there, to make sure that the client has the legal right to go across the street or across the county, wherever that is, to get help and assistance from the regular system as well. It integrates the two.

In conclusion, let me say this bill is a bill for workers. It is a bill for people who want to be workers. It is a bill for young people. It is a bill that literally empowers the person who is seeking the job training. It gives them a lot more, many more rights. It gives them a lot more flexibility. It puts them into the ball game as far as choosing what is the job training that is best for them. So it makes a significant difference.

This bill also has a very significant component aimed directly at children. We set aside a significant sum of money for those young people between the ages of 14 and 21. We do it; we target it; we say it is important. There is nothing, I think, more important in this country than what we do with our young people and the assistance we try

to provide for them. We have many young people in this country who we call at-risk youth. This bill will go a long way to give them direct assistance. However, even though we target it in this bill and say these funds are dedicated for these young people, we also at the same time give all the flexibility to the local community, States and local communities to allow them to design the specific program that will actually work for their young people in their local communities.

This is a revolutionary bill. It is a bill that dramatically changes the status quo. It is a bipartisan bill. It is a bill that Senator WELLSTONE worked on with me in the subcommittee. It is a bill on which Senator KENNEDY worked with Senator JEFFORDS. It is a bill that Secretary Alexis Herman has been very, very much involved in. She has been involved in it up until the last 10 minutes, as we have negotiated the final portions of this bill.

So, it is a bipartisan bill. It is a bill we can all be very proud of. It is a bill that will truly make a difference for our young people and for those who need to be trained in this country.

Again, I thank my chairman for the tremendous work that he has done; for his persistence. One of the qualities I think you have to have in the U.S. Senate is perseverance and persistence, as well as patience. He has demonstrated all three very well. The culmination is what we see tonight, which is a bill we are about to send to the President of the United States for his signature.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague from Ohio for his very eloquent description of the legislation, which makes it entirely unnecessary for me to go further. I appreciate the kind comments he made.

As he pointed out, this is an example of bipartisanship as well. Senator WELLSTONE and Senator KENNEDY, on the other side of the aisle, participated always in a constructive way and allowed us to come up with an excellent piece of legislation.

On the House side, Congressman GOODLING, my good friend and colleague for many years, as chairman of the committee, and Congressman CLAY, whom I also worked with in the past and to the present, Congressman MCKEON of California, and Congressman KILDEE of Michigan—all participated in this conference report.

It could not have been done without the fantastic help of our staff. The committee personnel, CRS, and legislative counsel, and DOL, Department of Education, the White House—all participated in bringing to fruition a piece of legislation which has been struggling for 4 years to be able to get there.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, final passage of the Workforce Investment

Act is a landmark achievement in which we can all take pride. For years, Congress has struggled to design an employment training system that would provide America's workers with the skills they need to succeed in the 21st century workplace. I believe this legislation will accomplish that enormous task. Few bills which we consider will have a greater impact on more Americans than the Workforce Investment Act we pass today.

An educated workforce has become the most valuable resource in the modern economy. Our nation's long term economic vitality depends on the creation of an effective, accessible, and accountable system of job training and career development which is open to all our citizens. Schools must assume more responsibility for preparing their students to meet the challenges of the 21st century workplace. Disadvantaged adults and out of school youth need the opportunity to develop job skills which will make them productive members of the community. Dislocated workers who have been displaced by the rapid pace of technological change deserve the chance to pursue new careers. Individuals with disabilities need the opportunity to fully develop their career potential. The way in which we respond to these challenges today will determine how prosperous a nation we are in the next century.

The importance of highly developed employment skills has never been greater. The gap in earnings between skilled and unskilled workers is steadily widening. For those who enter the workforce with good academic training and well-developed career skills, this new economy offers almost unlimited potential. However, for those who lack basic proficiency in language, math and science and who have no career skills, the new economy presents an increasingly hostile environment.

Over three million young men and women between the ages of 16 and 24 in this country did not complete high school and are not enrolled in school. Many more graduate from high school without the level of knowledge and skill that a high school diploma should represent. They will require more education and job training in order to obtain stable, well-paying employment. Without it, they are in danger of becoming a lost workforce generation.

Effective job training is also essential to the success of welfare reform. More than 40 percent of those in the JTPA program for disadvantaged adults have come from the welfare rolls. Under the welfare reform legislation, an additional 1.7 million people will be entering the job market. Most of these individuals have little or no work background and very limited employment skills. In many cases, they are also the sole support of young children. They are making urgent new demands on a job training system that is already burdened beyond its capacity.

In addition, the combination of rapidly changing technology and the shift of manufacturing jobs overseas is creating an alarming number of dislocated workers. These individuals have extensive work experience, but their skills are no longer in demand. We must give them the opportunity for retraining, and for the development of new skills to enable them to compete in the 21st century workplace.

The accelerating pace of technological change has made much of the existing job training system obsolete. Broad reforms are clearly needed to meet the demands of the modern workplace.

The Workforce Investment Act will provide employment training opportunities for millions of Americans. It responds to the challenge of the changing workplace by enabling men and women to acquire the skills required to enter the workforce and to upgrade their skills throughout their careers. It will provide them with access to the educational tools that will enable them not only to keep up, but to get ahead.

The legislation is the product of a true bipartisan collaboration. I want to publicly commend Senators JEFFORDS and DEWINE for the genuine spirit of bipartisanship which has made this effort possible. Senator WELLSTONE and I appreciate it. This spirit of collaboration was also shared by the House conferees. The resulting legislation will, I believe, truly expand career options, encourage greater program innovation, and facilitate cooperative efforts amongst business, labor, education and state and local government.

I also want to recognize the important role President Clinton has played in bringing about this dramatic reform of our current job training system. He has consistently emphasized the need for greater individual choice in the selection of career paths and training providers. The philosophy behind his skill grant proposal is reflected in our legislation.

The Workforce Investment Act is designed to provide easy access to state of the art employment training programs which are geared to real job opportunities in the community through a single, customer-friendly system of One Stop Career Centers. Over 700 such Centers are already operating successfully across the country. This legislation will ensure that every individual in need of employment services will have access to such a facility. The cornerstones of this new system are individual choice and quality labor market information. In the past, men and women seeking new careers often did not know what job skills were most in demand and which training programs had the best performance record. All too often, they were forced to make one of the most important decisions of their lives based on anecdotes and late-night advertisements.

No training system can function effectively without accurate and timely information. The frequent unavailability of quality labor market information is one of the most serious flaws in the current system. This legislation places a strong emphasis on providing accurate and timely information about what area industries are growing, what skills those jobs require, and what earning potential they have. Extensive business community and organized labor participation are encouraged in developing a regional plan based on this information. Once a career choice is made, the individual must still select a training provider. At present, many applicants make that choice with a little or no reliable information. Under this bill, each training provider will have to publicly report graduation rates, job placement and retention rates, and average earnings of graduates.

Because of the extensive information which will be available to each applicant, real consumer choice in the selection of a career and of a training provider will be possible. The legislation establishes individual training accounts for financially eligible participants, which they can use to access career education and skill training programs. Men and women seeking training assistance will no longer be limited to a few predetermined options. As long as there are real job opportunities in the field selected and the training provider meets established performance standards, the individual will be free to choose which option best suits his or her needs.

An essential element of the new system we have designed is accountability. As I noted earlier, each training provider will have to monitor and report the job placement and retention achieved by its graduates and their average earnings. Only those training programs that meet an acceptable performance standard will remain eligible for receipt of public funds. The same principle of accountability is applied to those agencies administering state and local programs. They are being given wide latitude to innovate under this legislation. But they too will be held accountable if their programs fail to meet challenging performance targets.

The rapid pace of technological change in the workplace has produced an alarming number of workers who have become dislocated in mid-career. The dislocation has been compounded by the increasing number of labor intensive production employers relocating their businesses abroad. This trend has been particularly acute in the manufacturing sector. We have a special obligation to these dislocated workers who have long and dedicated work histories and now are unemployed through no fault of their own. The Workforce Investment Act makes a commitment to them by maintaining

a special dislocated worker program, supported by a separate funding stream, which is geared to their retraining needs. The current dislocated worker program served approximately 540,000 dislocated workers nationwide in the most recent year. Of those who completed the program during that year, 71 percent were employed when they left the program, earning on average 93 percent of their previous wages. America's dislocated workers have earned the right to assistance in developing new skills which will allow them to be full participants in the 21st century economy.

There is no challenge facing America today which is tougher or more important than providing at-risk, often out-of-school, youth with meaningful education and employment opportunities. Far too many of our teenagers are being left behind without the skills needed to survive in the 21st century economy. I am particularly pleased with the commitment which the Workforce Investment Partnership Act makes to these young men and women. This legislation authorizes a new initiative focused on teenagers living in poverty in communities offering them few constructive employment opportunities. Each year, the Secretary of Labor will award grants from a \$250 million fund to innovative programs designed to provide opportunities to youth living in these areas. The programs will emphasize mentoring, strong links between academic and worksite learning, and job placement and retention. It will encourage broad based community participation from local service agencies and area employers. These model programs will, we believe, identify the techniques which are most effective in reaching those youth at greatest risk.

Another important program for young people who face the highest barriers to employment is Job Corps. Most of the participants grow up in extreme poverty. Their educational opportunities are limited. Job Corps, at its best, moves them from deprivation to opportunity. But, for many of them, it is an extremely difficult transition. As a result, critics of the program are always able to point to failures. But for each story of failure, there are many stories of success. Job Corps is a program worth preserving and worth expanding too. Our legislation decisively rejects the view that Job Corps should be dismantled. Instead, it strengthens the program in several ways. It establishes closer ties between individual Job Corps Centers and the communities they serve. It ensures that training programs correspond with the area's labor market needs. It extends follow-up counseling for participants up to 12 months and established detailed performance standards to hold programs accountable.

The legislation also provides for the continuation of summer jobs as an essential element of the youth grant. For many youth, summer jobs are their first opportunity to work and their first critical step in learning the work ethic. The summer jobs program also provides many youth with quality learning experiences and follow up during the school year. Studies by the Department of Labor's Office of the Inspector General and research by Westat, Inc. have reported positive findings regarding the program, concluding that work sites are well-supervised and disciplined, that jobs provide useful work, that the education component teaches students new skills that they apply in school, and that students learn the value of work.

I believe that the summer jobs program needs to continue to be available on a significant scale with sufficient funding. This bill recognizes the critical importance of the summer youth program by requiring that it be a part of each local area's youth program and allowing local communities to determine the number of summer jobs to be created.

The Workforce Investment Act includes titles reauthorizing major vocational rehabilitation and adult literacy programs. Both programs will continue to be separately funded and independently administered. We have incorporated them in the Workforce Act because they must be integral components of any comprehensive strategy to prepare people to meet the demands of the 21st century workplace.

Vocational rehabilitation offers new hope to individuals with disabilities, allowing them to reach their full potential and actively participate in their communities. The Rehabilitation Title of the Act will ensure that all working-aged individuals with disabilities, even those with the most significant disabilities, have realistic opportunities to obtain the resources and support they need to reach their employment goals.

Adult literacy programs are essential for the 27% of the adult population who have not earned a high school diploma or its equivalent. Learning to read and communicate effectively are the first steps to career advancement. This legislation will increase access to educational opportunities for those people most in need of assistance and enhance the quality of services provided.

The Workforce Investment Partnership Act will make it possible for millions of Americans to gain the skills needed to compete in a global economy. In doing so, we are also enabling them to realize their personal American dreams.

I would like to recognize the substantial contributions made by several individuals to this enormous legislative effort. On my staff, Jeffrey Teitz has worked on the development of the

workforce and education titles of this bill for nearly eighteen months and done an outstanding job. Connie Garner has devoted a comparable effort to the vocational rehabilitation title. Jane Oates' assistance throughout the conference process has also been invaluable. I am proud of their work.

I also want to call the Senate's attention to the role of my longtime friend, William Spring of Boston. Bill is a leader on training and education issues in Massachusetts and his creative recommendations are incorporated throughout this legislation. There is one further person who deserves special mention. Steven Spinner worked for me during the 104th Congress until his tragic and untimely death. His invaluable efforts helped to lay the groundwork for our success in reforming the workforce system.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in support of the Workforce Investment Act Conference Report. This is a truly bipartisan bill. As a conferee, I would like to commend Senators JEFFORDS, KENNEDY, DEWINE, and WELLSTONE, as well as the House conferees, for shepherding this bill through the conference.

Few issues that we vote on in Congress are as important to the future of this country as the lifelong education and training of our workforce. We live in an era of a global economy, emerging industries and company downsizing. It is imperative that our delivery of services meets the employment and educational needs of the 21st century.

The current maze of more than 160 programs which are administered by 15 separate federal agencies has failed. The Workforce Investment Act streamlines these programs by giving more authority to state and local representatives of government, business, labor, education, and youth activities. The bill establishes a true collaborative process between the state and local representatives to ensure that training and educational services will be held to high standards. This bill also gives more flexibility to individuals seeking training assistance. Individuals will no longer be limited to a predetermined set of services.

I am especially pleased that the cornerstone of the Workforce Investment Act is streamlined service delivery through one-stop career centers. My state of Connecticut is nearing completion of implementation of its one-stop system, called Connecticut Works. This network has reformed the delivery of job training services in the state. I have had the privilege of visiting many of these centers and can attest to their success.

While I applaud the new system of providing training assistance incorporated in this bill, I am pleased that the bill retains some direct federal in-

volvement in order to ensure that disadvantaged youth, veterans and displaced workers receive the training assistance and support they need.

For many years, the Connecticut economy was dependent on defense-oriented industries. The Workforce Investment Act ensures that employees who are adversely affected by base closures and military downsizing will have access to job training and supportive services in order to acquire the skills needed for employment in the technology-driven economy of the 21st century.

This legislation also provides for the coordination of adult education systems, allowing adult education to play a crucial role in a participant's professional training program. In the area of adult education and literacy, this legislation specifically targets those communities that demonstrate significant illiteracy rates to receive adult education programs as a first priority. I am pleased that this legislation also includes a provision that will direct funds designated to support English as a Second Language (ESL) programs to those ESL programs in communities with designated need. This means that ESL programs with waiting lists—those in communities with the greatest need for the valuable services these programs provide—will receive funds on a prioritized basis.

Mr. President, in order to better assist nonnative English speakers and fully assimilate them into our society, we must help them become more fluent in English. I can think of few more important factors in determining whether or not someone new to this society will successfully make this difficult transition than their ability to speak English.

A clear and effective grasp of the English language is still the best indicator of success for nonnative English speakers. The ability to speak English for anyone in today's marketplace represents an "open door," Mr. President. This "open door" can lead to greater employment and advancement opportunities for those whose first language is not English.

Additionally, Mr. President, this legislation reauthorizes the Rehabilitation Act. This critically important legislation provides comprehensive vocational rehabilitation services designed to help individuals with disabilities become more employable and achieve greater independence and integration into society.

Under the Rehabilitation Act, states, with assistance provided by the federal government in the manner of formula-derived grants, provide a broad array of services to individuals with disabilities that includes assessment, counseling, vocational and other educational services, work related placement services, and rehabilitation technology services. More than 1.25 million Americans with

disabilities were served by vocational rehabilitation programs in 1995 alone, Mr. President.

I am particularly pleased that a provision dealing with assistive technology was included in this legislation. This provision, Section 508, will require the federal government to provide assistive technology to Federal employees with disabilities. This provision will put into place for the first time regulations requiring the federal government to provide its employees with disabilities access to appropriate technology suited to their individual needs.

This legislation would allow the federal government to take the lead in providing critical access to information technology to all federal employees with disabilities in this country. It strengthens the federal requirement that electronic and information technology purchased by federal agencies be accessible to their employees with disabilities.

Electronic and information technology accessibility is essential for federal employees to maintain a meaningful employment experience, as well as to meet their full potential. We live in a world where information and technology are synonymous with professional advancement. Increasingly, essential job functions have come to involve the use of technology, and where it is inaccessible, job opportunities that others take for granted are foreclosed to people with disabilities.

Presently, there are approximately 145,000 individuals with disabilities in the federal workforce. Roughly 61 percent of these employees hold permanent positions in professional, administrative, or technical occupations. Nationally, there are 49 million Americans who have disabilities, nearly half of them have a severe disability. Yet most mass market information technology is designed without consideration for their needs.

Section 508, Mr. President, is the first step in an effort to ensure that all individuals with disabilities have access to the assistive technology providing them the ability to reach their full capability. Though Section 508 will presently only affect federal employees, it is my hope that one day all individuals with disabilities will have the same access to assistive technology now afforded federal employees because of this important legislation. The federal government must truly be an equal opportunity employer, and this equal opportunity must apply fully to individuals with special needs.

Finally, Mr. President, I would again like to commend Senators JEFFORDS, DEWINE, KENNEDY, and WELLSTONE, as well as Chairman GOODLING, Congressman CLAY, KILDEE, and MARTINEZ for the important role they each played in making this conference agreement a reality. They all worked closely with myself and my staff to address numer-

ous concerns and for that I would like to thank them.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased we are about to pass this important conference report. I look forward to its enactment upon signature by the President, which I hope can occur very soon. It is my understanding that the House is prepared to act on the conference bill during the coming days.

I have spoken on numerous occasions regarding the subject. As the Ranking Democrat on the Senate Labor Subcommittee on Employment and Training, I have worked hard with my colleagues Senator DEWINE, Senator JEFFORDS and Senator KENNEDY to help bring us to where we are this evening. I thank them and the many Minnesotans who have worked directly with me and my staff during the months of hearings, preparations, debate and drafting.

The conference bill preserves important policy principles contained in the Senate bill. It will help coordinate, streamline and decentralize our federal job training system. At the same time, it will make that system more accountable to real performance measures. It gives private sector employers—the people who have jobs to offer and who need workers with the right skills—a greater role in directing policy at the state and local level, which is where most decision-making power resides in this bill. The bill retains crucial federal priorities, then allows state and local authorities to decide how best to address their needs.

And it will move the country to where Minnesota and a number of other states have already moved decisively: to a system of One-Stop service centers where people can get all the information they need in one location. It will replace currently over-bureaucratized systems in many states and localities with systems driven more by the needs of those who utilize them. Adults seeking training will receive Individual Training Accounts to give them direct control over their own careers. High quality labor market information will be accessible through the One-Stops, and training providers will be required to report publicly on their performance. Men and women will have the ability to make their own choices based on the best information about which profession they should pursue, about the skills and training they'll need, and about the best place to get those skills and that training.

This week in Minneapolis, concluding today, the U.S. Department of Labor and Minnesota's Department of Economic Security hosted a national conference on One-Stop Workforce centers. It is with some pride that I note that my state has been a real leader in innovation with respect to One-Stops. Minnesota has also been a national leader when it comes to workforce system performance.

The conference bill ensures that states such as Minnesota, and the localities within them, can continue to innovate within the new system created. Good-performing service delivery areas will be allowed to continue to perform successfully. The same is true of current collaborative one-stop structures and local workforce boards which currently successfully undertake a range of activities, such as what the bill calls core services and training services. We have intentionally built flexibility into the bill.

Veterans will be served both in State-administered training programs and the national veterans workforce investment programs. Veterans also will have a strong role in the policy processes established in the bill. Community-based organizations are assured an appropriate role in setting policy. Labor organizations, too, retain a prominent role. Crucial provisions regarding the federal employment service are protected.

Mr. President, it has been a very busy week. I have given longer speeches on this topic in the past and may yet again. For now, I am extremely satisfied with our accomplishment in this bill. I hope we will soon be able to celebrate its enactment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Conference Report on H.R. 1385, the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

In a world where economic activity knows no national boundaries, it is crucial we ensure that we have the most knowledgeable and best trained workers in the world.

As a member of the Conference Committee on H.R. 1385, I am pleased that the Conference Agreement before us today will help us reach this goal by streamlining and reforming job training, adult education, and vocational rehabilitation programs, while enhancing federal support and investment in these critical areas.

The Conference Agreement will help states implement a more coherent, performance-driven system to ensure that Americans receive the training and education they need throughout their lives.

The Conference Agreement will streamline services by establishing a one-stop delivery system; enhance accountability by requiring states, local boards, and training providers to meet higher performance measures; provide more reliable information on local career opportunities and training programs and providers; empower individuals to use individual training accounts to choose their own training programs and providers; and increase flexibility to allow states and local areas to implement innovative job training programs.

I am also particularly pleased that this Conference Agreement includes provisions which will benefit my home

state of Rhode Island, such as preserving the state's successful service delivery area structure.

In addition to job training reform, the Conference Agreement also improves the accessibility and quality of adult literacy and education programs. Indeed, more aggressive adult literacy programs are essential if we are to ensure that everyone in the workforce has an ability to read.

Lastly, the Conference Agreement reauthorizes the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. In doing so, it links vocational rehabilitation to the new workforce system, while maintaining a separate funding stream for vocational rehabilitation. This will provide improved training and employment services to individuals with disabilities.

I want to thank Chairman JEFFORDS, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DEWINE, and Senator WELLSTONE, and their staffs, for their efforts on this important legislation and for working with me to address issues affecting Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I now renew my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

PATRIOTIC AND NATIONAL OBSERVANCES, CEREMONIES, AND ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 477, H.R. 1085.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1085) to revise, codify and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to patriotic and national observances, ceremonies, and organizations, as title 36, United States Code, "Patriotic and National Observances, Ceremonies and Organizations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 1085) was ordered a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF COPIES OF THE PUBLICATION ENTITLED "THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 115, submitted earlier by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 115) to authorize the printing of copies of the publication entitled "The United States Capitol" as a Senate document.

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 115) was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. CON. RES. 115

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That (a) a revised edition of the publication entitled "The United States Capitol" (referred to as "the pamphlet") shall be reprinted as a Senate document.

(b) There shall be printed 2,000,000 copies of the pamphlet in the English language at a cost not to exceed \$100,000 for distribution as follows:

(1)(A) 206,000 copies of the publication for the use of the Senate with 2,000 copies distributed to each Member;

(B) 886,000 copies of the publication for the use of the House of Representatives, with 2,000 copies distributed to each Member; and

(C) 908,000 of the publication for distribution to the Capitol Guide Service; or

(2) if the total printing and production costs of copies in paragraph (1) exceed \$100,000, such number of copies of the publication as does not exceed total printing and production costs of \$100,000, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as in paragraph (1).

(c) In addition to the copies printed pursuant to subsection (b), there shall be printed at a total printing and production cost of not to exceed \$70,000—

(1) 50,000 copies of the pamphlet in each of the following 5 languages: German, French, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese; and

(2) 100,000 copies of the pamphlet in Spanish;

to be distributed to the Capitol Guide Service.

AUTHORIZING THE PAYMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SENATE ATTENDING THE FUNERAL OF A SENATOR

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consider-

ation of S. Res. 263, submitted earlier by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 263) to authorize the payment of the expenses of representatives of the Senate attending the funeral of a Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 263) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 263

Resolved, That, upon approval by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the representatives of the Senate who attend the funeral of a Senator, including the funeral of a retired Senator. Expenses of the Senate representatives attending the funeral of a Senator shall be processed on vouchers submitted by the Secretary of the Senate and approved by the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CURT FLOOD ACT OF 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 231, S. 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 53) to require the general application of the antitrust laws to major league baseball, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Curt Flood Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this legislation to clarify that major league baseball players are covered under the antitrust laws (i.e., that major league players will have the same rights under the antitrust laws as do other professional athletes, e.g., football and basketball players), along with a provision that makes it clear that the passage of this Act does not change the application of the antitrust laws in any other context or with respect to any other person or entity.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS TO PROFESSIONAL MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL.

The Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 27. (a) The conduct, acts, practices, or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional major league baseball relating

to or affecting employment to play baseball at the major league level are subject to the antitrust laws to the same extent such conduct, acts, practices, or agreements would be subject to the antitrust laws if engaged in by persons in any other professional sports business affecting interstate commerce: Provided, however, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed as providing the basis for any negative inference regarding the caselaw concerning the applicability of the antitrust laws to minor league baseball.

"(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to change the application of the antitrust laws to the conduct, acts, practices, or agreements by, between, or among persons engaging in, conducting, or participating in the business of organized professional baseball, except the conduct, acts, practices, or agreements to which subsection (a) of this section shall apply. More specifically, but not by way of limitation, this section shall not be deemed to change the application of the antitrust laws to—

"(1) the organized professional baseball amateur draft, the reserve clause as applied to minor league players, the agreement between organized professional major league baseball teams and the teams of the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, commonly known as the 'Professional Baseball Agreement', the relationship between organized professional major league baseball and organized professional minor league baseball, or any other matter relating to professional organized baseball's minor leagues;

"(2) any conduct, acts, practices, or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional baseball relating to franchise expansion, location or relocation, franchise ownership issues, including ownership transfers, and the relationship between the Office of the Commissioner and franchise owners;

"(3) any conduct, acts, practices, or agreements protected by Public Law 87-331 (15 U.S.C. 1291 et seq.) (commonly known as the 'Sports Broadcasting Act of 1961'); or

"(4) the relationship between persons in the business of organized professional baseball and umpires or other individuals who are employed in the business of organized professional baseball by such persons.

"(c) As used in this section, 'persons' means any individual, partnership, corporation, or unincorporated association or any combination or association thereof."

AMENDMENT NO. 3479

Mr. JEFFORDS. Senator HATCH has a substitute amendment at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], for Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 3479.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Curt Flood Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this legislation to state that major league baseball players are covered under the antitrust laws (i.e., that major league baseball players will have the same rights under the antitrust laws as do other professional athletes, e.g., football and basketball players), along with a provision that makes it clear that the passage of this

Act does not change the application of the antitrust laws in any other context or with respect to any other person or entity.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS TO PROFESSIONAL MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL.

The Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. §12 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"Sec. 27(a) Subject to subsections (b) through (d) below, the conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional major league baseball directly relating to or affecting employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level are subject to the antitrust laws to the same extent such conduct, acts, practices or agreements would be subject to the antitrust laws if engaged in by persons in any other professional sports business affecting interstate commerce.

"(b) No court shall rely on the enactment of this section as a basis for changing the application of the antitrust laws to any conduct, acts, practices or agreements other than those set forth in subsection (a). This section does not create, permit or imply a cause of action by which to challenge under the antitrust laws, or otherwise apply the antitrust laws to, any conduct, acts, practices or agreements that do not directly relate to or affect employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level, including but not limited to—

"(1) any conduct acts, practices or agreements of persons engaging in, conducting or participating in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affecting employment to play baseball at the minor league level, any organized professional baseball amateur or first-year player draft, or any reserve clause as applied to minor league players.

"(2) the agreement between organized professional major league baseball teams and the teams of the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, commonly known as the 'Professional Baseball Agreement,' the relationship between organized professional major league baseball and organized professional minor league baseball, and organized professional minor league baseball, or any other matter relating to organized professional baseball's minor leagues;

"(3) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons engaging in, conducting or participating in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affecting franchise expansion, location or relocation, franchise ownership issues, including ownership transfers, the relationship between the Office of the Commissioner and franchise owners, the marketing or sales of the entertainment product of organized professional baseball and the licensing of intellectual property rights owned or held by organized professional baseball teams individually or collectively;

"(4) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements protected by Public Law 87-331 (15 U.S.C. §1291 et seq.) (commonly known as the 'Sports Broadcasting Act of 1961'); or

"(5) the relationship between persons in the business of organized professional baseball and umpires or other individuals who are employed in the business of organized professional baseball by such persons; or

"(6) any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons not in the business of organized professional major league baseball.

"(c) Only a major league baseball player has standing to sue under this section. For

the purposes of this section, a major league baseball player is—

"(1) a person who is a party to a major league player's contract, or is playing baseball at the major league level; or

"(2) a person who is a party to a major league player's contract or playing baseball at the major league level at the time of the injury that is the subject of the complaint; or

"(3) a person who has been a party to a major league player's contract or who has played baseball at the major league level, and who claims he has been injured in his efforts to secure a subsequent major league player's contract by an alleged violation of the antitrust laws, provided however, that for the purposes of this paragraph, the alleged antitrust violation shall not include any conduct, acts, practices or agreements of persons in the business of organized professional baseball relating to or affecting employment to play baseball at the minor league level, including any organized professional baseball amateur or first-year player draft, or any reserve clause as applied to minor league players; or

"(4) a person who was a party to a major league player's contract or who was playing baseball at the major league level at the conclusion of the last full championship season immediately preceding the expiration of the last collective bargaining agreement between persons in the business of organized professional major league baseball and the exclusive collective bargaining representative of major league baseball players.

"(d)(1) As used in this section, 'person' means any entity, including an individual, partnership, corporation, trust or unincorporated association or any combination or association thereof. As used in this section, the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, its member leagues and the clubs of those leagues, are not 'in the business of organized professional major league baseball.'

"(2) In cases involving conduct, acts, practices or agreements that directly relate or affect both employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level and also relate to or affect any other aspect of organized professional baseball, including but not limited to employment to play baseball at the minor league level and the other areas set forth in subsection (b) above, only those components, portions or aspects of such conduct, acts, practices or agreements that directly relate to or affect employment of major league baseball players to play baseball at the major league level.

"(3) As used in subsection (a), interpretation of the term 'directly' shall not be governed by any interpretation of 29 U.S.C. §151 et seq. (as amended).

"(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the application to organized professional baseball of the nonstatutory labor exemption from the antitrust laws.

"(5) The scope of the conduct, acts, practices or agreements covered by subsection (b) shall not be strictly or narrowly construed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I offer on behalf of myself and Senator LEAHY, the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, an amendment to the nature of a substitute to S. 53, the Curt Flood Act of 1997. This bill, which was reported out of the Judiciary Committee on July 31, 1998, by a vote of 12-6, clarifies that the antitrust laws

apply to labor relations at the major league level, but does not have any effect on any other persons or circumstances. Given our limited time, I will only make a few brief comments, and would ask unanimous consent that my full statement be entered into the RECORD.

In a baseball season that is likely to set records in a number of different categories, I am extremely pleased to be able to report that a truly historic milestone in the history of professional baseball has been reached. People said it would never happen, but today I can tell you that major league baseball players, along with both major and minor league club owners, have reached an agreement on a bill clarifying that the antitrust laws apply to major league professional baseball labor relations. This agreed upon language is reflected in the substitute we are offering today.

With this historic agreement, I am confident that Congress will, once and for all, make clear that professional baseball players have the same rights as other professional athletes, and will help assure baseball fans across the United States that our national pastime will not again be interrupted by strikes. With the home run battles and exciting pennant races, baseball is enjoying a resurgence. And, as fans are returning to the ballparks, they deserve to know that players will be on the field, not mired in labor disputes. I am pleased that Congress will, it now appears, be able to help guarantee that this is the case.

Due to an aberrant Supreme Court decision in 1922, labor relations in major league baseball have not been subject to antitrust laws, unlike any other industry in America. In every other professional sport, antitrust laws serve to stabilize relations between the team owners and players unions. That is one of the principal reasons why, in recent years, baseball has experienced more work stoppages, including the disastrous strike of 1994-95, than professional basketball, hockey and football combined.

In the 103d Congress, the House Judiciary Committee took the first important step by approving legislation which would have ensured that the antitrust laws apply to major league baseball labor relations, without impacting the minor leagues or team relocation issues. During the 104th Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee approved and reported S. 627, The Major League Baseball Antitrust Reform Act, to apply federal antitrust laws to major league baseball labor relations. None of these bills were passed, however, as many Members of Congress were reluctant to take final action while there was an ongoing labor dispute.

With the settling of the labor dispute and with the signing of a long term

agreement between the major league baseball team owners and the players union, the time was right this Congress finally to address this matter. In fact, in the new collective bargaining agreement, the owners pledged to work with the players to pass legislation that makes clear that major league baseball is subject to the federal antitrust laws with regard to owner-player relations.

At the beginning of this Congress, we introduced S. 53, a bill which was specifically supported by both the players and owners and which was reported out of the Judiciary Committee almost exactly one year ago. At the Committee markup, however, several Members indicated a concern that the bill might inadvertently have a negative impact on the Minor Leagues. Although both Senator LEAHY and myself were firmly of the view that the bill as reported adequately protected the minor leagues against such a consequence, we pledged to work with the minor leagues' representatives, in conjunction with the major league owners and players, to make certain that their concerns were fully addressed.

Although this process took much longer, and much more work, than I had anticipated, I am pleased to report that it has been completed. I have in my hand a letter from the minor leagues, and a letter co-signed by Don Fehr and Bud Selig, indicating that the major league players, and major and minor league owners, all support a new, slightly amended version of S. 53. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL LEAGUES, INC.,
Washington, DC, July 27, 1998.

Re: baseball legislation.

HON. ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S.
Senate, Senate Dirksen Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, Inc. ("NAPBL") objected to S. 53 as it was reported out of the Judiciary Committee last year. Since that time, we have been consulted about proposals to amend the bill to assure the continued survival of minor league baseball. We understand that a draft of an amended bill has been put forth by the major leagues and the Players' Association (copy attached) that I believe addresses the concerns of the NAPBL which we support in its final form.

Respectfully yours,

STANLEY M. BRAND.

July 21, 1998.

HON. ORRIN HATCH, Chairman,
Hon. PATRICK LEAHY, Ranking Member, Senate
Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH AND SENATOR LEAHY: As requested by the Committee, the parties represented below have met and agreed to the attached substitute language for S. 53. In particular, we believe the substitute lan-

guage adequately addresses the concerns expressed by some members of the Judiciary Committee that S. 53, as reported, did not sufficiently protect the interests of the minor leagues. We understand that the minor leagues will advise you that they agree with our assessment by a separate letter.

We thank you for your leadership and patience. Although, obviously, you are under no obligation to use this language in your legislative activities regarding S. 53, we hope that you will look favorably upon it in light of the agreement of the parties and our joint commitment to work together to ensure its passage.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FEHR,
Executive Director,
Major League Baseball
Players Association.

ALLAN H. "BUD" SELIG,
Commissioner, Major
League Baseball.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL,
July 21, 1998.

DONALD M. FEHR, Esquire,
Executive Director and General Counsel, Major
League Baseball Players Association, New
York, NY.

DEAR DON: As you know, in our efforts to address the concerns of the minor leagues with S. 53, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, several changes in the bill were agreed to by the parties, i.e., the Major League Clubs, the Major League Baseball Players Association and the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues (minor leagues). Among those changes was the addition of the word "directly" immediately before "relating to" in new subsection (a) of the bill.

This letter is to confirm our mutual understanding that the addition of that word was something sought by the Minor leagues and is intended to indicate that this legislation is not meant to allow claims by non major league players. By using "directly" we are not limiting the application of new subsection (a) to matters which would be considered mandatory subjects of bargaining in the collective bargaining context. Indeed, that is the reason we agreed to add paragraph (d)(3). There is no question that, under this Act, major league baseball players may pursue the same actions as could be brought by athletes in professional football and basketball with respect to their employment at the major league level.

I trust you concur with this intent and interpretation.

Very truly yours,

ALLAN H. SELIG,
Commissioner of Baseball.

Mr. HATCH. This new bill specifically precludes courts from relying on the bill to change the application of the antitrust laws in areas other than player-owner relations; clarifies who has standing under the new law; and adds several provisions which ensure that the bill will not harm the minor leagues.

Senator LEAHY and I have incorporated these changes into our substitute, which, given its support across the board, we hope and expect to be passed today without objection. I urge my colleagues to adopt this substitute.

This amendment, while providing major league players with the anti-trust protections of their colleagues in the other professional sports, such as basketball and football, is absolutely neutral with respect to the state of the antitrust laws between all entities and in all circumstances other than in the area of employment as between major league owners and players. Whatever the law was the day before this bill passes in those other areas it will continue to be after the bill passes. Let me emphasize that the bill affects no pending or decided cases except to the extent a court would consider exempting major league clubs from the antitrust laws in their dealings with major league players.

But because of the complex relationship between the major leagues and their affiliated minor leagues, it was necessary to write the bill in a way to direct a court's attention to only those practices, or aspects of practices, that affect major league players. It is for that reason, that a bill that ought to be rather simple to write goes to such lengths to emphasize its neutrality. And, although much of the Report filed by the Committee with respect to S. 53 is still applicable to this substitute, there have been some changes.

Section 2 states the bill's purpose. As originally contained in S. 53, the purpose section used the word "clarify" instead of the word "state" as used in this substitute. That language had been taken verbatim from the collective bargaining agreement signed in 1997 between major league owners and major league players. When the minor leagues entered the discussions, they objected to the use of the word "clarify" on the grounds that using this term created an inference regarding the current applicability of the antitrust laws to professional baseball. The parties therefore agreed to insert in lieu thereof the word "state." Both the parties and the Committee agree that Congress is taking no position on the current state of the law one way or the other. It is also for that reason that subsection (b) was inserted, as will be discussed.

Section 3 amends the Clayton Act to add a new section 27. As was the case with S.53, as reported, new subsection 27(a) states that the antitrust laws apply to actions relating to professional baseball players' employment to play baseball at the major league level and as in S.53 is intended to incorporate the entire jurisprudence of the antitrust laws, as it now exists and as it may develop.

In order to accommodate the concerns of the minor leagues however, new subsection (a) has been changed by adding the word "directly" immediately before the phrase "relating to or affecting employment" and the phrase "major league players" has been added before the phrase "to play

baseball." These two changes were also made at the behest of the minor leagues in order to ensure that minor league players, particularly those who had spent some time in the major leagues, did not use new subsection (a) as a bootstrap by which to attack conduct, acts, practices or agreements designed to apply to minor league employment. This is in keeping with the neutrality sought by the Committee with respect to parties and circumstances not between major league owners and major league players.

Additionally, the new draft adds a new paragraph (d)(3) that states that the term directly is not to be governed by interpretations of the labor laws. This paragraph was added to ensure that no court would use the word "directly" in too narrow a fashion and limit matters covered in subsection (a) to those that would otherwise be known as mandatory subjects of bargaining in the labor law context. The use of directly is related to the relationship between the major leagues and the minor leagues, not the relationship between major league owners and players. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Commissioner of Baseball, Mr. Allan H. "Bud" Selig, to the Executive Director of the Major League Baseball Players Association, confirming this interpretation of the use of the word "directly" and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

As in S. 53, as reported, new subsection (b) is the subsection which implements the portion of the purpose section stating that the "passage of the Act does not change the application of the antitrust laws in any other context or with respect to any other person or entity." In other words, with respect to areas set forth in subsection (b), whatever the law was before the enactment of this legislation, it is unchanged by the passage of the legislation. With the exception of the express statutory exemption in the area of television rights recognized in paragraph (d)(4), each of the areas set forth depend upon judicial interpretation of the law. But Congress at this time seeks only to address the specific question of the application of the antitrust laws in the context of the employment of major league players at the major league level.

Thus, as to any matter set forth in subsection (b), a plaintiff will not be able to allege an antitrust violation by virtue of the enactment of this Act. Nor can the courts use the enactment of this Act to glean congressional intent as to the validity or lack thereof of such actions.

New subsection "c" deals specifically with the issue of standing. Although normally standing under such an act would be governed by the standing provision of the antitrust laws, 15 U.S.C. Sec. 15, the minor leagues again ex-

pressed concern that without a more limited standing provision, minor league players or amateurs would be able to attack what are in reality minor league issues by bootstrapping under this Act through subsection (a). The subsection sets forth the zone of persons to be protected from alleged antitrust violations by major league owners under this Act.

New paragraph (d)(1) defines "person" for the purposes of the Act, but includes a provision expressly recognizing that minor league clubs and leagues are not in the business of major league baseball. This addition was requested by the minor leagues to ensure that they would not be named as party defendants in every action brought against the major leagues pursuant to subsection (a).

New paragraph (d)(2) was added to give the courts direction in cases involving matters that relate to both matters covered by subsection (a) and to those matters as to which the Act is neutral as set forth in subsection (b). In such a case, the acts, conducts or agreements may be challenged under this Act as they directly relates to the employment of major league players at the major league level, but to the extent the practice is challenged as to its effect on any issue set forth in subsection (b), it must be challenged under current law, which may or may not provide relief.

New paragraph (d)(5) merely reflects the Committee's intention that a court's determination of which fact situations fall within subsection (b) should follow ordinary rules of statutory construction, and should not be subject to any exceptions or departures from these rules.

As stated in the Committee Report, nothing in this bill is intended to affect the scope or applicability of the "non-statutory" labor exemption from the antitrust laws. See, e.g., *Brown v. Pro Football*, 116 S.Ct. 2116 (1996).

Before yielding to my good friend from Vermont, I would like to thank him for his hard work on this bill. His bipartisan efforts have been vital to the process. I would also like to thank our original cosponsors, Senators THURMOND and MOYNIHAN. I urge the quick adoption of this bill, which will help restore stability to major league baseball labor relations.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this summer we are being treated to an exceptional season of baseball, from the record breaking pace of the New York Yankees and the resurgence of the Boston Red Sox, to a number of inspiring individual achievements, including the perfect game of David Wells and the home run displays of McGwire, Griffey and Sosa. Such are the exploits that childhood memories are made of—and which we all thought could be counted on, that is until the summer of 1994.

Now finally, after years of turmoil, major league baseball is just beginning

to emerge from the slump it inflicted upon itself, by returning to that which makes the game great—the game and the players on the field. And, last weekend, Larry Doby and others at long last were inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame. These are steps in the right direction.

Today, the Senate will give baseball another nudge in the right direction by passing S. 53, the "Curt Flood Act of 1998." Murray Chass, a gifted reporter writing for *The New York Times* noted that on this issue we have finally "moved into scoring position with a bill that would alter the antitrust exemption Major League Baseball has enjoyed since 1922."

I am gratified that 76 years after an aberrant Supreme Court decision, we are finally making it clear that with respect to the antitrust laws, major league baseball teams are no different than teams in any other professional sport. For years, baseball was the only business or sport, of which I am aware, that claimed an exemption from antitrust laws, without any regulation in lieu of those laws. The Supreme Court refused to undue its mistake with respect to major league baseball made in the 1922 case of *Federal Baseball*. Finally, in the most well-known case on the issue, *Flood v. Kuhn*, the Court reaffirmed the *Federal Baseball* case on the basis of the legal principle of *stare decisis* while specifically finding that professional baseball is indeed an activity of interstate commerce, and thereby rejecting the legal basis for the *Federal Baseball* case.

Mr. President, as a result of that and subsequent decisions, and with the end of the major league reserve clause as the result of an arbitrator's ruling in 1976, there has been a growing debate as to the continued vitality, if any, of any antitrust exemption for baseball. It is for precisely this reason that this bill is limited in its scope to employment relations between major league owners and major league players. That is what is at the heart of turmoil in baseball and what is at the heart of the breach of trust with the fans that marked the cancellation of the 1994 World Series. At least we can take this small step toward ensuring the continuity of the game and restoring public confidence in it.

When David Cone testified at our hearing three years ago, he posed a most perceptive question. He asked: If baseball were coming to Congress to ask us to provide a statutory antitrust exemption, would such a bill be passed? The answer to that question is a resounding no. Nor should the owners, sitting at the negotiating table in a labor dispute, think that their anti-competitive behavior cannot be challenged. That is an advantage enjoyed by no other group of employers.

The certainty provided by this bill will level the playing field, making

labor disruptions less likely in the future. The real beneficiaries will be the fans. They deserve it.

Mr. President, I just wanted to comment briefly on a couple of changes made in the substitute from the bill as reported by the Committee. First, the changes in the language in subsection (a) are not intended to limit in any way the rights of players at the major league level as they would be construed under the language of the bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee last July. The additional language was added to ensure that a minor league player, or someone who had played at the major league level and returned to the minor leagues, cannot use subsection (a), concerned with play at the major league level, to attack what is really a minor league employment issue only. Alternatively, neither can the major leagues use the wording of subsection (a) and that of subsection (d) to subvert the purpose of subsection (a) merely by linking a major league practice with a minor league practice. That linkage itself may be an antitrust violation and be actionable under this Act. It cannot be used as a subterfuge by which to subject players at the major league level to acts, practices or agreements that teams or owners in other sports could not subject athletes to.

Finally, the practices set forth in subsection (b) are not intended to be affected by this Act. While this is true, it should be remembered that although the pure entrepreneurial decisions in this area are unaffected by the Act, if those decisions are made in such a way as to implicate employment of major league players at the major league level, once again, those actions may be actionable under subsection (a). More importantly, we are making no findings as to how, under labor laws, those issues are to be treated.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to thank all those involved in this undertaking: Chairman HATCH, of course, without whose unflinching efforts this result would not be possible; our fellow cosponsors, Senators THURMOND and MOYNIHAN, and other members of our Committee; and JOHN CONYERS, the Ranking Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, for making this bill a priority. And I want to commend the interested parties for working to find a solution they can all support. Not only have they done a service to the fans, but they may find, on reflection, that they have done a service to themselves by working together for the good of the game.

Finally, Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not comment on the man for whom this legislation is named, Curt Flood. He was a superb athlete and a courageous man who sacrificed his career for perhaps a more lasting baseball legacy. When others refused, he stood up and said no to a system

that he thought un-American as it bound one man to another for his professional career without choice and without a voice in his future.

I am sad that he did not live long enough to see this day. In deference to his memory and in the interests of every fan of this great game, I hope that Congress will act quickly on this bill. I am delighted that we are moving forward today and that we are finally able to enjoy the game once again.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and agreed to, the bill be considered read a third time and passed as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 3479) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 53), as amended, was considered read a third time and passed.

INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 471, S. 1134.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1134) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest fire protection compact.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1134) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1134

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

SECTION 1. CONSENT OF CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The consent and approval of Congress is given to an interstate forest fire protection compact, as set out in subsection (b).

(b) COMPACT.—The compact reads substantially as follows:

"THE NORTHWEST WILDLAND FIRE PROTECTION AGREEMENT

"THIS AGREEMENT is entered into by and between the State, Provincial, and Territorial wildland fire protection agencies signatory hereto, hereinafter referred to as "Members".

"FOR AND IN CONSIDERATION OF the following terms and conditions, the Members agree:

"Article I

"1.1 The purpose of this Agreement is to promote effective prevention, suppression

and control of forest fires in the Northwest wildland region of the United States and adjacent areas of Canada (by the Members) by providing mutual aid in prevention, suppression and control of wildland fires, and by establishing procedures in operating plans that will facilitate such aid.

"Article II

"2.1 The agreement shall become effective for those Members ratifying it whenever any two or more Members, the States of Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Idaho, Montana, or the Yukon Territory, or the Province of British Columbia, or the Province of Alberta have ratified it.

"2.2 Any State, Province, or Territory not mentioned in this Article which is contiguous to any Member may become a party to this Agreement subject to unanimous approval of the Members.

"Article III

"3.1 The role of the Members is to determine from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances and conditions as may be found for enhancing the prevention, suppression, and control of forest fires in the area comprising the Member's territory; to coordinate the plans and the work of the appropriate agencies of the Members; and to coordinate the rendering of aid by the Members to each other in fighting wildland fires.

"3.2 The Members may develop cooperative operating plans for the programs covered by this Agreement. Operating plans shall include definition of terms, fiscal procedures, personnel contacts, resources available, and standards applicable to the program. Other sections may be added as necessary.

"Article IV

"4.1 A majority of Members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of its general business. Motions of Members present shall be carried by a simple majority except as stated in Article II. Each Member will have one vote on motions brought before them.

"Article V

"5.1 Whenever a Member requests aid from any other Member in controlling or preventing wildland fires, the Members agree, to the extent they possibly can, to render all possible aid.

"Article VI

"6.1 Whenever the forces of any Member are aiding another Member under this Agreement, the employees of such Member shall operate under the direction of the officers of the Member to which they are rendering aid and be considered agents of the Member they are rendering aid to and, therefore, have the same privileges and immunities as comparable employees of the Member to which they are rendering aid.

"6.2 No Member or its officers or employees rendering aid within another State, Territory, or Province, pursuant to this Agreement shall be liable on account of any act or omission on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith to the extent authorized by the laws of the Member receiving the assistance. The receiving Member, to the extent authorized by the laws of the State, Territory, or Province, agrees to indemnify and save-harmless the assisting Member from any such liability.

"6.3 Any Member rendering outside aid pursuant to this Agreement shall be reimbursed by the Member receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in

the operation of any equipment and for the cost of all materials, transportation, wages, salaries and maintenance of personnel and equipment incurred in connection with such request in accordance with the provisions of the previous section. Nothing contained herein shall prevent any assisting Member from assuming such loss, damage, expense or other cost or from loaning such equipment or from donating such services to the receiving Member without charge or cost.

"6.4 For purposes of the Agreement, personnel shall be considered employees of each sending Member for the payment of compensation to injured employees and death benefits to the representatives of deceased employees injured or killed while rendering aid to another Member pursuant to this Agreement.

"6.5 The Members shall formulate procedures for claims and reimbursement under the provisions of this Article.

"Article VII

"7.1 When appropriations for support of this agreement, or for the support of common services in executing this agreement, are needed, costs will be allocated equally among the Members.

"7.2 As necessary, Members shall keep accurate books of account, showing in full, its receipts and disbursements, and the books of account shall be open at any reasonable time to the inspection of representatives of the Members.

"7.3 The Members may accept any and all donations, gifts, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials and services from the Federal or any local government, or any agency thereof and from any person, firm or corporation, for any of its purposes and functions under this Agreement, and may receive and use the same subject to the terms, conditions, and regulations governing such donations, gifts, and grants.

"Article VIII

"8.1 Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to limit or restrict the powers of any Member to provide for the prevention, control, and extinguishment of wildland fires or to prohibit the enactment of enforcement of State, Territorial, or Provincial laws, rules or regulations intended to aid in such prevention, control and extinguishment of wildland fires in such State, Territory, or Province.

"8.2 Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to affect any existing or future Cooperative Agreement between Members and/or their respective Federal agencies.

"Article IX

"9.1 The Members may request the United States Forest Service to act as the coordinating agency of the Northwest Wildland Fire Protection Agreement in cooperation with the appropriate agencies for each Member.

"9.2 The Members will hold an annual meeting to review the terms of this Agreement, any applicable Operating Plans, and make necessary modifications.

"9.3 Amendments to this Agreement can be made by simple majority vote of the Members and will take effect immediately upon passage.

"Article X

"10.1 This Agreement shall continue in force on each Member until such Member takes action to withdraw therefrom. Such action shall not be effective until 60 days after notice thereof has been sent to all other Members.

"Article XI

"11.1 Nothing in this Agreement shall obligate the funds of any Member beyond those approved by appropriate legislative action."

SEC. 2. OTHER STATES.

Without further submission of the compact, the consent of Congress is given to any State to become a party to it in accordance with its terms.

SEC. 3. RIGHTS RESERVED.

The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—S. 2393

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I understand that earlier today, Senator MURKOWSKI introduced S. 2393. I now ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2393) to protect the sovereign right of the State of Alaska and prevent the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior from assuming management of Alaska's fish and game resources.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will remain at the desk.

Mr. JEFFORDS. The bill will be read a second time on the next legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this is legislation regarding the State of Alaska's sovereign right to manage its fish and game resources.

The legislation will extend a current moratorium on the federal government from assuming control of Alaska's fisheries for two years until December 1, 2000.

The language is similar to past moratoriums on this issue and is similar to language Congressman YOUNG added to the Interior Appropriations bill in the House, except that it is not conditioned upon action by the Alaska State Legislature.

To every one of my colleagues their respective state's right to manage fish and game is absolute—every other state manages its own fish and game.

In Alaska, this is not the case, and therefore, action must be taken to maintain the sovereign right of our state.

Mr. President, Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) requires the State of Alaska to provide a rural subsistence hunting and fishing preference on federal "public lands" or run the risk of losing its management authority over fish and game resources.

If the State fails to provide the required preference by state statute, the federal government can step in to manage federal lands.

The Alaska State Legislature passed such a subsistence preference law in 1978 which was upheld by referendum in 1982.

The law was slightly revised in 1986, and remained on the books until it was struck down by the Alaska Supreme Court in 1989 as unconstitutional because of the Alaska Constitution's common use of fish and game clause.

At that time, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture took over management of fish and game resources on federal public lands in Alaska.

In 1995 a decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Katie John v. United States* extended the law far beyond its original scope to apply not just to "federal lands," but to navigable waters owned by the State of Alaska. Hence State and private lands were impacted too.

The theory espoused by the Court was that the "public lands" includes navigable waters in which the United States has reserved water rights.

If implemented, the court's decision would mean all fisheries in Alaska would effectively be managed by the federal government.

Indeed in April of 1996, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture published an "advance notice of proposed rulemaking" which identified about half of the state as subject to federal authority to regulate fishing activities.

These regulations were so broad they could have affected not only fishing activities, but virtually all activities on state and federal lands that may have an impact on subsistence uses.

There is no precedent in any other state in the union for this kind of overreaching into state management prerogatives.

For that reason Congress acted in 1996 to place a moratorium on the federal government from assuming control of Alaska fisheries.

That moratorium has twice been extended and is set to expire December 1, 1998.

The State's elected leaders have worked courageously to try and resolve this issue by placing an amendment to the state constitution that would allow them to come into compliance with the federal law and provide a subsistence priority.

Unfortunately, the State of Alaska's constitution is not easily amended and these efforts have fallen short of the necessary votes needed to be placed before the Alaska voters.

In fact, the legislature—the elected representatives of the people—in the most recent special session indicated that they were not supportive of amending the State Constitution and putting the issue to a vote of the people.

Therefore we once again are in a position where we have no other alter-

native than to extend the moratorium prohibiting a federal takeover of Alaska's fisheries.

The bill I am introducing today will accomplish this. It extends the current moratorium through December 1, 2000.

I believe this will provide the State's elected leaders the needed time to work through this dilemma as they cannot finally resolve the matter of amending the State Constitution until November 2000.

Mr. President, I do not take this moratorium lightly.

I, along with most Alaskans, believe that subsistence uses of fish and game should have a priority over other uses in the state.

We have provided for such uses in the past, I hunted and fished under those regulations and I respected and supported them and continue to do so now. I believe the State can again provide for such uses without significant interruption to the sport or commercial fisherman.

I also believe that Alaska's rural residents should play a greater role in the management and enforcement of fish and game laws in Alaska.

They understand and live with the resources in rural Alaska. They see and experience the fish and game resources day in and day out. And, they are most directly impacted by the decisions made about use of those resources.

They should bear their share of the responsibility for formulating fish and game laws as well enforcing fish and game laws.

It is my hope that the State will soon provide for Alaska's rural residents to have this greater role while at the same time resolving the subsistence dilemma once and for all.

But until that happens, I cannot stand by and watch the federal government move into the State and assume control of the Alaska fish and game resources.

I have lived under territorial status and it does not work. In 1959 Alaskan's caught just 25.1 million salmon. Under State management we caught 218 million salmon in 1995.

Federal control would again be a disaster for the resources and those that depend on it.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 4059

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 629, the Texas compact, previously ordered to occur when the Senate reconvenes following the August recess, the Senate turn to consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4059, the military construction appropriations bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that the conference report be considered as

having been read; further, the Senate immediately proceed to a vote on the adoption of the conference report without any intervening action or debate.

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

BIOMATERIALS ACCESS ASSURANCE ACT OF 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 872, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 872) to establish rules governing product liability actions against raw materials and bulk component suppliers to medical device manufacturers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the effort to pass legislation dealing with biomaterials has been a long fight. I want to thank Senator LIEBERMAN, and Congressman GEKAS for their extraordinary leadership and hard work on the issue. It has been a great privilege and honor working with them over the past several years to gain passage of this vital legislation.

I want to stress to my colleagues the importance of passing the Biomaterial Access Assurance Act. Over seven million lives depend upon an ample and reliable supply of medical devices and implants, such as pace makers and brain shunts.

Unfortunately, the supply of these life-saving products is in serious danger. Those who provide the raw materials from which medical implants are fashioned have been dragged into costly litigation over claims of damage from the finished product. This is the case even though such suppliers are not involved in the design, manufacture or sale of the implant. Many suppliers are unwilling to expose themselves to this enormous and undue risk. This bill will extend appropriate protection to raw material suppliers, while assuring that medical implant manufacturers will remain liable for damages caused by their products. It would permit suppliers of biomaterials to be quickly dismissed from a lawsuit if they did not manufacture or sell the implant and if they met the contract specifications for the biomaterial.

Mr. President, as my colleagues are aware, the bill's provisions do not extend to suppliers of silicone gel and silicone envelopes used in silicone gel breast implants.

I want to be quite clear this "carve-out" as it's been called, is intended to have no effect on tort cases related to breast implants. The question of

whether and to what degree silicone breast implants are hazardous is a determination that must be made by scientific experts. The question of whether and to what degree raw material suppliers are or are not liable is a determination that the courts must render.

Determining the safety or efficacy of a medical device is not the function of the Senate nor the United States Congress. This is not our role and nothing in this legislation should be construed otherwise. So, the exemption should not be interpreted as a judgement about silicone breast implants.

Our goal in this regard remains simply to ensure that this legislation draws no conclusion about and has no impact upon pending suits.

Finally, I would like to mention that this exemption should not be considered an invitation for additional carve-outs or exemptions for other raw material or component part suppliers.

I do not wish to see suppliers, who trusting in the protections of this act, return to the medical device manufacturing marketplace only to find themselves again targeted as deep pockets in tort actions, and thereby threaten the supply of life saving products. I appreciate the opportunity to make this very important point about a bill vital to public health.

This is an important piece of legislation and it will make a great difference to millions of Americans.

Mr. President, I would now like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin regarding several aspects of this legislation.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to express my concern regarding three provisions of the Biomaterials Access Assurance Act of 1998. Although I have broader concerns with the bill including federalism issues, consumer protection issues, and evidentiary issues, I would like clarification from one of the sponsors of the bill, Senator MCCAIN, on three specific points.

First, Section 7(a) the language reads that only "after entry of a final judgment in an action by the claimant against a manufacturer" can a claimant attempt to implead a biomaterials supplier. I am concerned that this could be interpreted to mean that the manufacturer must lose the underlying suit before the claimant may implead the supplier. Is this correct?

Mr. MCCAIN. No. Although I do not believe that the situation you pose could happen very often—specifically that a supplier could be liable when the manufacturer is not—the language should be interpreted to mean that the claimant could bring a motion to implead the supplier whether or not the manufacturer is found liable in the underlying case, as long as the judgment is final.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Second, I am concerned that there would not be a suffi-

cient introduction of evidence demonstrating the liability of the supplier in the underlying suit against the manufacturer for the court to make an independent determination that the supplier was an actual and proximate cause of the harm for purposes of the impleader motion as required in Sections 7(1)(A) and 7(2)(A) of the bill.

Mr. MCCAIN. Under current FDA regulations and under current tort law, the manufacturer is responsible for the entire product they produce, including defects in the raw materials. Therefore, the claimant may enter evidence in the underlying action against the manufacturer regarding defect in the biomaterials used.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Finally, I am concerned that in a case where the manufacturer has gone bankrupt, the claimant will be unable to recover from the liable party. Does your bill address this issue?

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes it does. Section 7(a)(2)(B) provides that in a case where the claimant is unlikely to recover the full amount of its damages from the manufacturer, if the other requirements of Section 7 are satisfied, the claimant can bring an action against the supplier. This covers bankruptcy and other scenarios where the manufacturer cannot satisfy an adverse judgment.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Senator MCCAIN, I thank the Senator for addressing my concerns.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the bill we are about to take up and vote upon, the Biomaterials Access Assurance Act. I am proud to have co-sponsored the Senate version of this bill with Senator MCCAIN. We have worked together on this bill for a number of years now, and it is quite gratifying to see it now about to move toward enactment.

Mr. President, the Biomaterials bill is the response to a crisis affecting more than 7 million Americans annually who rely on implantable life-saving or life-enhancing medical devices—things like pacemakers, heart valves, artificial blood vessels, hydrocephalic shunts, and hip and knee joints. They are at risk of losing access to the devices because many companies that supply the raw materials and component parts that go into the devices are refusing to sell them to device manufacturers. Why? Because suppliers no longer want to risk having to pay enormous legal fees to defend against product liability suits when those legal fees far exceed any profit they make from supplying the raw materials for use in implantable devices.

Let me emphasize that I am speaking here about—and the bill addresses—the suppliers of raw materials and component parts—not about the companies that make the medical devices themselves. The materials these suppliers sell—things like resins and yarns—are

basically generic materials that they sell for a variety of uses in many, many different products. Their sales to device manufacturers usually make up only a very small part of their markets—often less than one percent. As a result—and because of the small amount of the materials that go into the implants—many of these suppliers make very little money from supplying implant manufacturers. Just as importantly, these suppliers generally have nothing to do with the design, manufacture or sale of the product.

But despite the fact that they generally have nothing to do with making the product, because of the common practice of suing everyone involved in any way with a product when something goes wrong, these suppliers sometimes get brought into lawsuits claiming problems with the implants. One company, for example, was hauled into to 651 lawsuits involving 1,605 implant recipients based on a total of 5 cents worth of that company's product in each implant. In other words, in exchange for selling less than \$100 of its product, this supplier received a bill for perhaps millions of dollars of legal fees it spent in its ultimately successful effort to defend against these lawsuits.

The results from such experiences should not surprise anyone. Even though not a single biomaterials supplier has ultimately been held liable so far—let me say that again: Not a single biomaterials supplier has ultimately been held liable so far—the message nevertheless is clear for any rational business. Why would any business stay in a market that yields them little profit, but exposes them to huge legal costs? An April 1997 study of this issue found that 75 percent of suppliers surveyed were not willing to sell their raw materials to implant manufacturers under current conditions. That study predicts that unless this trend is reversed, patients whose lives depend on implantable devices may no longer have access to them.

What is at stake here, let me be clear, is not protecting suppliers from liability and not even just making raw materials available to the manufacturers of medical devices. Those things in and of themselves might not be enough to bring me here. What is at stake is the health and lives of millions of Americans who depend on medical devices for their every day survival. What is at stake are the lives of children with hydrocephalus who rely on brain shunts to keep fluid from accumulating around their brains. What is at stake are the lives of adults whose hearts would stop beating without implanted automatic defibrillators. What is at stake are the lives of seniors who need pacemakers because their hearts no longer generate enough of an electrical pulse to get their heart to beat. Without implants, none of these individuals could survive.

We must do something soon to deal with this problem. We simply cannot allow the current situation to continue to put at risk the millions of Americans who owe their health to medical devices.

Senator MCCAIN, and I and the bill's sponsors in the House have crafted what we think is a reasonable response to this problem. Our bill would do two things. First, with an important exception I'll talk about in a minute, the bill would immunize suppliers of raw materials and component parts from product liability suits, unless the supplier falls into one of three categories: (1) the supplier also manufactured the implant alleged to have caused harm; (2) the supplier sold the implant alleged to have caused harm; or (3) the supplier furnished raw materials or component parts that failed to meet applicable contractual requirements or specifications.

Second, the bill would provide suppliers with a mechanism for making that immunity meaningful by obtaining early dismissal from lawsuits. By guaranteeing suppliers in advance that they will not face needless litigation costs, this bill should spur suppliers to remain in or come back to the biomaterials market, and so ensure that people who need implantable medical devices will still have access to them.

Now, it is important to emphasize that in granting suppliers immunity, we would not be depriving anyone injured by a defective implantable medical device of the right to compensation for their injuries. Injured parties still will have their full rights against anyone involved in the design, manufacture or sale of an implant, and they can sue implant manufacturers, or any other allegedly responsible party, and collect for their injuries from them if that party is at fault.

We also have added a new provision to this version of the bill, one that resulted from lengthy negotiations with representatives of the implant manufacturers, the American Trial Lawyers Association—ATLA—the White House and others. This provision responds to concerns that the previous version of the bill would have left injured implant recipients without a means of seeking compensation if the manufacturer or other responsible party is bankrupt or otherwise judgment-proof. As now drafted, the bill provides that in such cases, a plaintiff may bring the raw materials supplier back into a lawsuit after judgment if a court concludes that evidence exists to warrant holding the supplier liable.

Finally, let me add that the bill does not cover lawsuits involving silicone gel breast implants.

In short, Mr. President, the Biomaterials bill is—and I am not engaging in hyperbole when I say this—potentially a matter of life and death for the millions of Americans who rely on

implantable medical devices to survive. This bill would make sure that implant manufacturers still have access to the raw materials they need for their products, while at the same time ensuring that those injured by implants are able to get compensation for injuries caused by defective implants. This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 872) was considered read the third time and passed.

IDENTITY THEFT AND ASSUMPTION DETERRENCE ACT OF 1998

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 460, S. 512.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (S. 512) to amend chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, relating to identity fraud, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. IDENTITY THEFT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFENSE.—Section 1028(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking "or" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by adding "or" at the end;

(3) in the flush matter following paragraph (6), by striking "or attempts to do so,"; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) knowingly possesses, transfers, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person with the intent to commit, or otherwise promote, carry on, or facilitate any unlawful activity that constitutes a violation of Federal law, or that constitutes a felony under any applicable State or local law,".

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 1028(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking "or" at the end

(B) in subparagraph (C), by adding "or" at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) an offense under paragraph (7) of such subsection that involves the transfer, possession, or use of 1 or more means of identification if, as

a result of the offense, any individual committing the offense obtains anything of value aggregating \$1,000 or more during any 1-year period,";

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking "or transfer of an identification document or" and inserting "possession, transfer, or use of a means of identification, an identification document, or a";

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

"(3) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, if the offense is committed—

"(A) to facilitate a drug trafficking crime (as defined in section 929(a)(2)); or

"(B) after a prior conviction under this section becomes final;

"(4) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 25 years, or both, if the offense is committed—

"(A) to facilitate an act of international terrorism (as defined in section 2331(1)); or

"(B) in connection with a crime of violence (as defined in section 924(c)(3));";

(4) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (4) (as added by paragraph (3) of this subsection) the following:

"(5) in the case of any offense under subsection (a), forfeiture to the United States of any personal property used or intended to be used to commit the offense; and".

(c) CIRCUMSTANCES.—Section 1028(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) either—

"(A) the production, transfer, possession, or use prohibited by this section is in or affects interstate or foreign commerce; or

"(B) the means of identification, identification document, false identification document, or document-making implement is transported in the mail in the course of the production, transfer, possession, or use prohibited by this section.".

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) DOCUMENT-MAKING IMPLEMENT.—The term 'document-making implement' means any implement, impression, electronic device, or computer hardware or software, that is specifically configured or primarily used for making an identification document, a false identification document, or another document-making implement.

"(2) IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENT.—The term 'identification document' means a document made or issued by or under the authority of the United States Government, a State, political subdivision of a State, a foreign government, political subdivision of a foreign government, an international governmental or an international quasi-governmental organization which, when completed with information concerning a particular individual, is of a type intended or commonly accepted for the purpose of identification of individuals.

"(3) MEANS OF IDENTIFICATION.—The term 'means of identification' means any name or number that may be used, alone or in conjunction with any other information, to identify a specific individual, including any—

"(A) name, social security number, date of birth, official State or government issued driver's license or identification number, alien registration number, government passport number, employer or taxpayer identification number;

"(B) unique biometric data, such as fingerprint, voice print, retina or iris image, or other unique physical representation;

"(C) unique electronic identification number, address, or routing code; or

"(D) telecommunication identifying information or access device (as defined in section 1029(e)).

"(4) **PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.**—The term 'personal identification card' means an identification document issued by a State or local government solely for the purpose of identification.

"(5) **PRODUCE.**—The term 'produce' includes alter, authenticate, or assemble.

"(6) **STATE.**—The term 'State' includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other commonwealth, possession, or territory of the United States."

(e) **ATTEMPT AND CONSPIRACY.**—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) **ATTEMPT AND CONSPIRACY.**—Any person who attempts or conspires to commit any offense under this section shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the attempt or conspiracy."

(f) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—For purpose of subsection (a)(7), a single identification document or false identification document that contains 1 or more means of identification shall be construed to be 1 means of identification."

(g) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1028, by striking "or attempts to do so,";

(2) in the heading for section 1028, by adding "and information" at the end; and

(3) in the analysis for the chapter, in the item relating to section 1028, by adding "and information" at the end.

SEC. 3. RESTITUTION.

Section 3663A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking "or" at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking "and" at the end and inserting "or"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) an offense described in section 1028 (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with means of identification or identification documents); and"

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(e) **FRAUD AND RELATED ACTIVITY IN CONNECTION WITH IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION.**—Making restitution to a victim under this section for an offense described in section 1028 (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with means of identification or identification documents) may include payment for any costs, including attorney fees, incurred by the victim, including any costs incurred—

"(1) in clearing the credit history or credit rating of the victim; or

"(2) in connection with any civil or administrative proceeding to satisfy any debt, lien, or other obligation of the victim arising as a result of the actions of the defendant."

SEC. 4. AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES FOR OFFENSES UNDER SECTION 1028.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and the policy statements of the Commission, as appropriate, to provide an appropriate penalty for each offense under section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act.

(b) **FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the United States Sen-

tencing Commission shall consider, with respect to each offense described in subsection (a)—

(1) the extent to which the number of victims (as defined in section 3663A(a) of title 18, United States Code) involved in the offense, including harm to reputation, inconvenience, and other difficulties resulting from the offense, is an adequate measure for establishing penalties under the Federal sentencing guidelines;

(2) the number of means of identification, identification documents, or false identification documents (as those terms are defined in section 1028(d) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act) involved in the offense, is an adequate measure for establishing penalties under the Federal sentencing guidelines;

(3) the extent to which the value of the loss to any individual caused by the offense is an adequate measure for establishing penalties under the Federal sentencing guidelines;

(4) the range of conduct covered by the offense;

(5) the extent to which sentencing enhancements within the Federal sentencing guidelines and the court's authority to sentence above the applicable guideline range are adequate to ensure punishment at or near the maximum penalty for the most egregious conduct covered by the offense;

(6) the extent to which Federal sentencing guidelines sentences for the offense have been constrained by statutory maximum penalties;

(7) the extent to which Federal sentencing guidelines for the offense adequately achieve the purposes of sentencing set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code; and

(8) any other factor that the United States Sentencing Commission considers to be appropriate.

SEC. 5. CENTRALIZED COMPLAINT AND CONSUMER EDUCATION SERVICE FOR VICTIMS OF IDENTITY THEFT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall establish procedures to—

(1) log and acknowledge the receipt of complaints by individuals who certify that they have a reasonable belief that 1 or more of their means of identification (as defined in section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act) have been assumed, stolen, or otherwise unlawfully acquired in violation of section 1028 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act;

(2) provide informational materials to individuals described in paragraph (1); and

(3) refer complaints described in paragraph (1) to appropriate entities, which may include referral to—

(A) the 3 major national consumer reporting agencies; and

(B) appropriate law enforcement agencies for potential law enforcement action.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION RELATING TO CRIMINAL FORFEITURE PROCEDURES.**—Section 982(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "(1) The forfeiture of property under this section, including any seizure and disposition of the property and any related judicial or administrative proceeding, shall be governed by the provisions of section 413 (other than subsection (d) of that section) of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 853)."

(b) **ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE AND THEFT OF TRADE SECRETS AS PREDICATE OFFENSES FOR WIRE INTERCEPTION.**—Section 2516(1)(a) of title

18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "chapter 90 (relating to protection of trade secrets)," after "to espionage)".

AMENDMENT NO. 3480

(Purpose: To provide a substitute)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, Senator KYL has a substitute amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], for Mr. KYL, for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURKOWSKI and Mr. ROBB, proposes an amendment numbered 3480.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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. KYL. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill, "The Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act", is to address one of the fastest growing crimes in America, identity theft. Losses related to identity theft have nearly doubled in the last two years. Today, 95% of financial crimes arrests involve identity theft. Trans Union, one of the country's three major credit bureaus, says calls to its fraud division have risen from 3,000 a month in 1992 to nearly 43,000 a month this year. This is more than a troubling trend. Indeed, with increasing frequency, criminals—sometimes part of an international criminal syndicate—are misappropriating law-abiding citizens' identifying information such as names, birth dates, and social security numbers. And while the results of the theft of identification information can be devastating for the victims, often costing a citizen thousands of dollars to clear his credit or good name, today the law recognizes neither the victim nor the crime.

The bill, as reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee, does both. It recognizes the crime by making it unlawful to steal personal information and enhancing penalties against identity thieves. It recognizes victims by giving them the ability to seek restitution for all costs involved in restoring lost credit and reputation. In addition, my bill provides real time relief to victims by directing the Federal Trade Commission to set up a centralized complaint center to provide information to consumers, refer cases to law enforcement, officially acknowledge complaints, and relay that acknowledgment to credit bureaus.

And while section 1028 of title 18 currently prohibits the production and possession of false identification documents, it does not make it illegal to

steal or possess another person's personal information. By amending section 1028, this bill will help current law keep pace with criminals' exploitation of information technology.

The substitute I am offering today with Senators LEAHY, HATCH, FEINSTEIN along with Senators DEWINE, D'AMATO, GRASSLEY, ABRAHAM, FAIRCLOTH, HARKIN, WARNER, MURKOWSKI, and ROBB reflects two small but important improvements over the bill reported out of committee. Both changes were recommended by the Department of Justice. First, the substitute further refines the scope of the offense and applicable punishments by deleting the term "possession" from the offense and penalty sections of the reported bill. As explained by the Department, the term "possession" is overbroad as applied to identity theft offense added to the criminal code by this legislation. The second change simply adds standard forfeiture procedure to the existing criminal forfeiture penalty in the reported bill. Without a procedure attending the forfeiture penalty, the Department considers this penalty unenforceable.

There are numerous private entities and federal law enforcement agencies that supported and contributed to this bill through its redraftings to its present form that I would like to thank.

On the private side, thank you go to the American Bankers Association, the Associated Credit Bureaus, Visa and Mastercard, the American Society of Industrial Services, and the United States Public Interest Research Group.

Public agencies which lent important support to this legislative effort are the: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal Trade Commission, and the U.S. Postal Inspectors. Special thanks goes to the Secret Service and the Department of Justice for the great deal of time and effort they have expended to help make this bill the well drafted piece of legislation it is today.

In conclusion, I also thank Senators LEAHY, HATCH and FEINSTEIN for lending their valuable support and input to this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate today is adopting the Kyl-Leahy substitute amendment to S. 512, the "Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act."

Protecting the privacy of our personal information is a challenge, especially in this information age. Every time we obtain or use a credit card, place a toll-free phone call, surf the Internet, get a driver's license or are featured in Who's Who, we are leaving virtual pieces of ourselves in the form of personal information, which can be used without our consent or even our knowledge. Too frequently, criminals are getting hold of this information and using the personal information of innocent individuals to carry out other

crimes. Indeed, U.S. News & World Report has called identity theft "a crime of the 90's".

The consequences for the victims of identity theft can be severe. They can have their credit ratings ruined and be unable to get credit cards, student loans, or mortgages. They can be hounded by creditors or collection agencies to repay debts they never incurred, but were obtained in their name, at their address, with their social security number or driver's license number. It can take months or even years, and agonizing effort, to clear their good names and correct their credit histories. I understand that, in some instances, victims of identity theft have even been arrested for crimes they never committed when the actual perpetrators provided law enforcement officials with assumed names.

The new legislation provides important remedies for victims of identity theft. Specifically, it makes clear that these victims are entitled to restitution, including payment for any costs and attorney's fees in clearing up their credit histories and having to engage in any civil or administrative proceedings to satisfy debts, liens or other obligations resulting from a defendant's theft of their identity. In addition, the bill directs the Federal Trade Commission to keep track of consumer complaints of identity theft and provide information to victims of this crime on how to deal with its aftermath.

This is an important bill on an issue that has caused harm to many Americans. It has come a long way from its original formulation, which would have made it an offense, subject to 15 years' imprisonment, to possess "with intent to deceive" identity information issued to another person. I was concerned that the scope of the proposed offense in the bill as introduced would have resulted in the federalization of innumerable state and local offenses, such as the status offenses of underage teenagers using fake ID cards to gain entrance to bars or to buy cigarettes, or even the use of a borrowed ID card without any illegal purpose. This problem, and others, were addressed in the Kyl-Leahy substitute that was reported out of the Committee and further refined in the substitute amendment the Senate considers today.

Since Committee consideration of this bill, we have continued to consult with the Department of Justice to improve the bill in several ways. Most significantly, the Kyl-Leahy substitute amendment appropriately limits the scope of the new offense governing the illegal transfer or use of another person's "means of identification" to exclude "possession." This change ensures that the bill does not inadvertently subject innocuous conduct to the risk of serious federal criminal liability.

For example, with this change, the bill would no longer raise the possibility of criminalizing the mere possession of another person's name in an address book or Rolodex, when coupled with some sort of bad intent.

At the same time, the substitute restores the nuanced penalty structure of section 1028, so that it continues to treat most other possessory offenses involving identification documents and document-making implements as misdemeanors. Thus, in the substitute, the use or transfer of 1 or more means of identification that results in the perpetrator receiving anything of value aggregating \$1,000 or more over a 1-year period, would carry a penalty of a fine or up to 15 years' imprisonment, or both. The use or transfer of another person's means of identification that does not satisfy those monetary and time period requirements, would carry a penalty of a fine and up to three years' imprisonment, or both.

Finally, again with the support of the Department of Justice, we specified the forfeiture procedure to be used in connection with offenses under section 1028. The bill as reported created a forfeiture penalty for these offenses; the addition of a procedure simply clarifies how that penalty is to be enforced.

I am glad that Senator KYL and I were able to join forces to craft legislation that both punishes the perpetrators of identity theft and helps the victims of this crime.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I rise today in support of S. 512, the "Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act of 1998." This measure has bipartisan support, and I am pleased to be an original co-sponsor along with Senators LEAHY, FEINSTEIN, DEWINE, D'AMATO, GRASSLEY, ABRAHAM, FAIRCLOTH, HARKIN, WARNER, MURKOWSKI and ROBB.

Identity information theft is a crime that destroys the lives of thousands of innocent people each year. It occurs when an imposter, who has falsified or stolen personal information from another individual, uses the information to make financial transactions or conduct personal business in the name of another. This heinous crime often leaves victims with mountains of debt, ruins their credit history, and makes it difficult for the individuals to obtain employment. In short, it virtually takes over the lives of innocent citizens who find themselves trying to untangle an endless trail of obligations they did not make or actions they did not commit.

Many of you know individuals who have been victims of this crime. These are people whose lives have been destroyed because a con-artist gained access to and used their personal data, such as their address, date of birth, mother's maiden name, or social security number. This is information that you and I are asked to verify every day

in our society. Once that information is obtained, these con-artists use it to open bank and credit card accounts and to obtain bank and mortgage loans. These fake business and personal commitments and obligations can ruin a lifetime of hard work.

Currently, the applicable federal statute, Title 18 United States Code Section 1028, only criminalizes the possession, transfer, or production of identity documents. In other words, you have to catch the culprit with the actual documents in order to bring a prosecution for fraud. Obviously, such criminals are not always going to keep these documents once they have acquired the information they need. Many times criminals simply misappropriate the information itself to facilitate their criminal activity.

As there is no specific statute criminalizing the theft of the information, when and if these criminals are prosecuted, law enforcement must pursue more indirect charges such as check fraud, credit card fraud, mail fraud, wire fraud, or money laundering. Unfortunately, these statutes do little to compensate the victim or address the horror suffered by the individual whose life has been invaded. Often these general criminal statutes treat only affected banks, credit bureaus, and other financial institutions as the victim, leaving the primary victim, the innocent person, without recourse to reclaim his or her life and identity.

S. 512 recognizes not only that it is a crime to steal personal information, and enhances penalties for such crimes, but it also recognizes the person, whose information has been stolen, as the real victim. Moreover, it gives the victim the ability to seek restitution and relief.

I believe this bill to be an important piece of legislation. It is supported by federal law enforcement agencies, credit bureaus, banking associations, and other private entities. I urge all of my colleagues to join us and support the passage of this bill.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the substitute version of S. 512, The Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act of 1998, which the Senate is considering today.

On May 20, the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information, on which I serve as Ranking Member, heard from victims of identity theft from both Subcommittee Chairman KYL's and my home states. The victims told cautionary tales of lives suddenly, and without warning, turned upside down by the crime of identity theft.

These are not isolated stories. The Secret Service last year made nearly 9,500 identity theft-related arrests, totaling three-quarters of a billion dollars in losses to individual victims and

financial institutions. Such losses have nearly doubled in the last two years, and no end to the trend is in sight. In one out of every ten of these cases, identity theft is used to violate immigration laws, to illegally enter the country or to flee across international borders.

It used to be that identity theft required wading through dumpsters for discarded credit card receipts. Today, with a few keystrokes, a computer-savvy criminal can hack into databases and lift credit card numbers, social security numbers, and a myriad of personal information.

The Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act does two critical things in the war on identity theft: it gives prosecutors the tools they need, and it recognizes that identity theft victimizes individuals.

Prosecutors tell us that they lack effective tools to prosecute identity theft and to make victims whole. S. 512 has been drafted in consultation with prosecutors to give them the tools they need. S. 512 does so in a number of important ways:

It updates pre-computer age laws to criminalize electronic identity theft;

It stiffens penalties and adds sentencing enhancements that prosecutors tell us they need to effectively prosecute crimes; and

It allows law enforcement agents to seize equipment used to facilitate identity theft crimes.

Earlier this month, the Senate Judiciary Committee passed the Victim's Rights Amendment to the Constitution, of which I was also proud to be an original cosponsor. Similarly, S. 512 for the first time recognizes that individuals, and not just credit card companies, are victims of identity theft, and it provides them with proper restitution. It protects victims rights, fully recognizing individuals as victims of identity theft, establishing remedies and procedures for such victims, and requiring restitution for the individual victim.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my Senate colleagues to pass it.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 3480) was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment, as amended, be agreed to.

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

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, as amended; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and

that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 512), as amended, was considered read the third time and passed.

FEDERAL ACTIVITIES INVENTORY REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 502, S. 314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 314) to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. ANNUAL LISTS OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES NOT INHERENTLY GOVERNMENTAL IN NATURE.

(a) *LISTS REQUIRED.*—Not later than the end of the third quarter of each fiscal year, the head of each executive agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a list of activities performed by Federal Government sources for the executive agency that, in the judgment of the head of the executive agency, are not inherently governmental functions. The entry for an activity on the list shall include the following:

(1) The fiscal year for which the activity first appeared on a list prepared under this section.

(2) The number of full-time employees (or its equivalent) that are necessary for the performance of the activity by a Federal Government source.

(3) The name of a Federal Government employee responsible for the activity from whom additional information about the activity may be obtained.

(b) *OMB REVIEW AND CONSULTATION.*—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review the executive agency's list for a fiscal year and consult with the head of the executive agency regarding the content of the final list for that fiscal year.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF LISTS.—

(1) *PUBLICATION.*—Upon the completion of the review and consultation regarding a list of an executive agency—

(A) the head of the executive agency shall promptly transmit a copy of the list to Congress and make the list available to the public; and

(B) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall promptly publish in the Federal Register a notice that the list is available to the public.

(2) *CHANGES.*—If the list changes after the publication of the notice as a result of the resolution of a challenge under section 3, the head of the executive agency shall promptly—

(A) make each such change available to the public and transmit a copy of the change to Congress; and

(B) publish in the Federal Register a notice that the change is available to the public.

(d) **COMPETITION REQUIRED.**—Within a reasonable time after the date on which a notice of the public availability of a list is published under subsection (c), the head of the executive agency concerned shall review the activities on the list. Each time that the head of the executive agency considers contracting with a private sector source for the performance of such an activity, the head of the executive agency shall use a competitive process to select the source (except as may otherwise be provided in a law other than this Act, an Executive order, regulations, or any Executive branch circular setting forth requirements or guidance that is issued by competent executive authority). The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance for the administration of this subsection.

(e) **REALISTIC AND FAIR COST COMPARISONS.**—For the purpose of determining whether to contract with a source in the private sector for the performance of an executive agency activity on the list on the basis of a comparison of the costs of procuring services from such a source with the costs of performing that activity by the executive agency, the head of the executive agency shall ensure that all costs (including the costs of quality assurance, technical monitoring of the performance of such function, liability insurance, employee retirement and disability benefits, and all other overhead costs) are considered and that the costs considered are realistic and fair.

SEC. 3. CHALLENGES TO THE LIST.

(a) **CHALLENGE AUTHORIZED.**—An interested party may submit to an executive agency a challenge of an omission of a particular activity from, or an inclusion of a particular activity on, a list for which a notice of public availability has been published under section 2.

(b) **INTERESTED PARTY DEFINED.**—For the purposes of this section, the term "interested party", with respect to an activity referred to in subsection (a), means the following:

(1) A private sector source that—

(A) is an actual or prospective offeror for any contract, or other form of agreement, to perform the activity; and

(B) has a direct economic interest in performing the activity that would be adversely affected by a determination not to procure the performance of the activity from a private sector source.

(2) A representative of any business or professional association that includes within its membership private sector sources referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) An officer or employee of an organization within an executive agency that is an actual or prospective offeror to perform the activity.

(4) The head of any labor organization referred to in section 7103(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code, that includes within its membership officers or employees of an organization referred to in paragraph (3).

(c) **TIME FOR SUBMISSION.**—A challenge to a list shall be submitted to the executive agency concerned within 30 days after the publication of the notice of the public availability of the list under section 2.

(d) **INITIAL DECISION.**—Within 28 days after an executive agency receives a challenge, an official designated by the head of the executive agency shall—

(1) decide the challenge; and

(2) transmit to the party submitting the challenge a written notification of the decision together with a discussion of the rationale for the decision and an explanation of the party's right to appeal under subsection (e).

(e) **APPEAL.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPEAL.**—An interested party may appeal an adverse decision of the official to the head of the executive agency within 10 days after receiving a notification of the decision under subsection (d).

(2) **DECISION ON APPEAL.**—Within 10 days after the head of an executive agency receives an appeal of a decision under paragraph (1), the head of the executive agency shall decide the appeal and transmit to the party submitting the appeal a written notification of the decision together with a discussion of the rationale for the decision.

SEC. 4. APPLICABILITY.

(a) **EXECUTIVE AGENCIES COVERED.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act applies to the following executive agencies:

(1) **EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.**—An executive department named in section 101 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **MILITARY DEPARTMENT.**—A military department named in section 102 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) **INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT.**—An independent establishment, as defined in section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—This Act does not apply to or with respect to the following:

(1) **GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.**—The General Accounting Office.

(2) **GOVERNMENT CORPORATION.**—A Government corporation or a Government controlled corporation, as those terms are defined in section 103 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) **NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDS INSTRUMENTALITY.**—A part of a department or agency if all of the employees of that part of the department or agency are employees referred to in section 2105(c) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) **CERTAIN DEPOT-LEVEL MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR.**—Depot-level maintenance and repair of the Department of Defense (as defined in section 2460 of title 10, United States Code).

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SOURCE.**—The term "Federal Government source", with respect to performance of an activity, means any organization within an executive agency that uses Federal Government employees to perform the activity.

(2) **INHERENTLY GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTION.**—
(A) **DEFINITION.**—The term "inherently governmental function" means a function that is so intimately related to the public interest as to require performance by Federal Government employees.
(B) **FUNCTIONS INCLUDED.**—The term includes activities that require either the exercise of discretion in applying Federal Government authority or the making of value judgments in making decisions for the Federal Government, including judgments relating to monetary transactions and entitlements. An inherently governmental function involves, among other things, the interpretation and execution of the laws of the United States so as—

(i) to bind the United States to take or not to take some action by contract, policy, regulation, authorization, order, or otherwise;

(ii) to determine, protect, and advance United States economic, political, territorial, property, or other interests by military or diplomatic action, civil or criminal judicial proceedings, contract management, or otherwise;

(iii) to significantly affect the life, liberty, or property of private persons;

(iv) to commission, appoint, direct, or control officers or employees of the United States; or

(v) to exert ultimate control over the acquisition, use, or disposition of the property, real or personal, tangible or intangible, of the United States, including the collection, control, or dis-

bursement of appropriated and other Federal funds.

(C) **FUNCTIONS EXCLUDED.**—The term does not normally include—

(i) gathering information for or providing advice, opinions, recommendations, or ideas to Federal Government officials; or

(ii) any function that is primarily ministerial and internal in nature (such as building security, mail operations, operation of cafeterias, housekeeping, facilities operations and maintenance, warehouse operations, motor vehicle fleet management operations, or other routine electrical or mechanical services).

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on October 1, 1998.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, S. 314, originally sponsored by Senators THOMAS, among others, and Congressman DUNCAN in the House, was ordered reported by the Governmental Affairs Committee on July 15, 1998. The original S. 314 has had long and contentious past. The bill reported by our Committee represents months of drafting and redrafting to create language which truly represents a consensus.

I commend the original sponsors of this bill for their dedication to this issue and their willingness to accommodate the Governmental Affairs Committee's changes in order to develop legislation which could be supported by all sides. Interested industry groups have expressed their support of this legislation. And the Administration and the Federal employee unions, although opposed to the original S. 314, all have indicated they will not object to this legislation.

S. 314 would require Federal agencies prepare a list of activities that are not inherently governmental functions that are being performed by Federal employees, submit that list to OMB for review, and make the list publicly available. It also would establish an "appeals" process within each agency to challenge what is on the list or what is not included on the list. S. 314 also would create a statutory definition—identical to current regulation—for what is an "inherently governmental function" that must be performed by the government and not the private sector.

S. 314 adheres to the seven principles the Administration outlined in its testimony to this Committee. It reflects recommendations made by the General Accounting Office in testimony to this and other committees. And it provides a statutory basis for longstanding administrative policy.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I would like to add a few remarks concerning S. 314, the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998. I understand that under this measure, each federal government agency will be required to annually publish an inventory of governmental activities that are not inherently governmental in nature.

Under S. 314, agencies will retain discretion to determine whether an activity is inherently governmental or commercial, and private industry will be

given the option to challenge that decision. An agency may also decide that an activity is inherently governmental, but nonetheless pursue outsourcing. This latter practice can be continued and is encouraged by S. 314. For example, I would point my colleagues to the practices of the General Services Administration (GSA), the agency charged with managing all federal personal and real property—including the disposal of property no longer needed by the government, but desired by private consumers.

Three years ago, an Arthur Andersen study concluded that the auctioning function is inherently governmental to GSA's mission. Nevertheless, GSA has increasingly outsourced this function to the private sector.

Today's legislation in no way discourages the federal government's reliance on private industry—particularly, where, as in the case of GSA, a reputable commercial property disposal industry is established and no federal jobs or careers are displaced or otherwise placed at risk. Moreover, auctioning by commercial companies will yield a greater return on the government's investment due to the utilization of commercial incentives and practices. Under Office of Management and Budget Circular Number A-76, agencies are already required to maintain and update a baseline inventory of activities that could be performed by the private sector. S. 314 would largely codify current administrative policy.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be agreed to.

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, as amended; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the title amendment be agreed to; and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 314) was considered read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

"A bill to provide a process for identifying the functions of the Federal Government that are not inherently governmental functions, and for other purposes."

BORDER IMPROVEMENT AND IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 342, S. 1360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1360) to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM AND IMMIGRANT RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 110(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1221 note) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) SYSTEM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall develop an automated entry and exit control system that will—

"(A) collect a record of departure for every alien departing the United States and match the record of departure with the record of the alien's arrival in the United States; and

"(B) enable the Attorney General to identify, through on-line searching procedures, lawfully admitted nonimmigrants who remain in the United States beyond the period authorized by the Attorney General.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—The system under paragraph (1) shall not collect a record of arrival or departure—

"(A) at a land border or seaport of the United States for any alien; or

"(B) for any alien for whom the documentary requirements in section 212(a)(7)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act have been waived by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State under section 212(d)(4)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-546).

SEC. 3. REPORT ON AUTOMATED ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL SYSTEM.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit a report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the feasibility of developing and implementing an automated entry-exit control system that would collect a record of departure for every alien departing the United States and match the record of departure with the record of the alien's arrival in the United States, including departures and arrivals at the land borders and seaports of the United States.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Such report shall—

(1) assess the costs and feasibility of various means of operating such an automated entry-exit control system, including exploring—

(A) how, if the automated entry-exit control system were limited to certain aliens arriving at airports, departure records of those aliens could be collected when they depart through a land border or seaport; and

(B) the feasibility of the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State, negotiating reciprocal agreements with the governments of contiguous countries to collect such information on behalf of the United States and share it in an acceptable automated format;

(2) consider the various means of developing such a system, including the use of pilot projects if appropriate, and assess which means would be most appropriate in which geographical regions;

(3) evaluate how such a system could be implemented without increasing border traffic congestion and border crossing delays and, if any such system would increase border crossing delays, evaluate to what extent such congestion or delays would increase; and

(4) estimate the length of time that would be required for any such system to be developed and implemented.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL REPORTS ON ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL AND USE OF ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL DATA.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL AT AIRPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year until the fiscal year in which Attorney General certifies to Congress that the entry-exit control system required by section 110(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as amended by section 2 of this Act, has been developed, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) provides an accurate assessment of the status of the development of the entry-exit control system;

(2) includes a specific schedule for the development of the entry-exit control system that the Attorney General anticipates will be met; and

(3) includes a detailed estimate of the funding, if any, needed for the development of the entry-exit control system.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS ON VISA OVERSTAYS IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE ENTRY-EXIT CONTROL SYSTEM.—Not later than June 30 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report that sets forth—

(1) the number of arrival records of aliens and the number of departure records of aliens that were collected during the preceding fiscal year under the entry-exit control system under section 110(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as so amended, with a separate accounting of such numbers by country of nationality;

(2) the number of departure records of aliens that were successfully matched to records of such aliens' prior arrival in the United States, with a separate accounting of such numbers by country of nationality and by classification as immigrant or nonimmigrant; and

(3) the number of aliens who arrived as non-immigrants, or as visitors under the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for whom no matching departure record has been obtained through the system, or through other means, as of the end of such aliens' authorized period of stay, with an accounting by country of nationality and approximate date of arrival in the United States.

(c) INCORPORATION INTO OTHER DATABASES.—Information regarding aliens who have remained in the United States beyond their authorized period of stay that is identified through the system referred to in subsection (a) shall be integrated into appropriate databases of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of State, including those used at ports-of-entry and at consular offices.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON CERTAIN BORDER CROSSING-RELATED VISA FEES.

(a) LIMITATION.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State may not charge a fee in excess of the following amounts for the processing of any application for the issuance of a visa under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act if the appropriate consular officer has reason to believe that the visa will be used only for travel in the United States within 25 miles of the international border between the United States and Mexico and for a period of less than 72 hours:

(i) In the case of any alien 18 years of age or older, \$45.

(ii) In the case of any alien under 18 years of age, zero.

(2) *PERIOD OF VALIDITY OF VISAS FOR CERTAIN MINOR CHILDREN.*—If a consular officer has reason to believe that a visa issued under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to a child under 18 years of age will be used only for travel in the United States within 25 miles of the international border between the United States and Mexico for a period of less than 72 hours, then the visa shall be issued to expire on the date on which the child attains the age of 18.

(b) *DELAY IN BORDER CROSSING RESTRICTIONS.*—Section 104(b)(2) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 is amended by striking "3 years" and inserting "4 years".

(c) *PROCESSING IN MEXICAN BORDER CITIES.*—The Secretary of State shall continue until at least October 1, 2000, to process applications for visas under section 101(a)(15)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act at the following cities in Mexico located near the international border with the United States: Nogales, Nuevo Laredo, Ciudad Acuna, Piedras Negras, Agua Prieta, and Reynosa.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BORDER CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—

(1) *INS.*—In order to enhance enforcement and inspection resources on the land borders of the United States, enhance investigative resources for anticorruption efforts and efforts against drug smuggling and money-laundering organizations, process cargo, reduce commercial and passenger traffic waiting times, and open all primary lanes during peak hours at major land border ports of entry on the Southwest and Northern land borders of the United States, in addition to any other amounts appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated for salaries, expenses, and equipment for the Immigration and Naturalization Service for purposes of carrying out this section—

(A) \$113,604,000 for fiscal year 1999;

(B) \$121,064,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

(C) such sums as may be necessary in each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) *FISCAL YEAR 1999.*—

(1) *INS.*—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a)(2)(A) for fiscal year 1999 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, \$15,090,000 shall be available until expended for acquisition and other expenses associated with implementation and full deployment of narcotics enforcement and cargo processing technology along the land borders of the United States, including—

(A) \$11,000,000 for 5 mobile truck x-rays with transmission and backscatter imaging to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints;

(B) \$200,000 for 10 ultrasonic container inspection units to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints;

(C) \$240,000 for 10 Portable Treasury Enforcement Communications System (TECS) terminals to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints;

(D) \$1,000,000 for 20 remote watch surveillance camera systems to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints;

(E) \$180,000 for 36 AM radio "Welcome to the United States" stations located at permanent border patrol checkpoints;

(F) \$875,000 for 36 spotter camera systems located at permanent border patrol checkpoints; and

(G) \$1,600,000 for 40 narcotics vapor and particle detectors to be distributed to border patrol checkpoints.

(c) *FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND THEREAFTER.*—

(1) *INS.*—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this section for the Immigration and Naturalization Service for fiscal year 2000 and each fiscal year thereafter, \$1,509,000 shall be for the maintenance and support of the equipment and training of personnel to maintain and support the equipment described in subsection (b)(1), based on an estimate of 10 percent of the cost of such equipment.

(d) *NEW TECHNOLOGIES; USE OF FUNDS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Attorney General may use the amounts authorized to be appropriated for equipment under this section for equipment other than the equipment specified in this section if such other equipment—

(A)(i) is technologically superior to the equipment specified; and

(ii) will achieve at least the same results at a cost that is the same or less than the equipment specified; or

(B) can be obtained at a lower cost than the equipment authorized.

(2) *TRANSFER OF FUNDS.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Attorney General may reallocate an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the amount specified for equipment specified in this section.

(e) *PEAK HOURS AND INVESTIGATIVE RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT.*—

(1) *INS.*—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this section for fiscal years 1999 and 2000, \$98,514,000 in fiscal year 1999 and \$119,555,000 for fiscal year 2000 shall be for—

(A) a net increase of 535 inspectors for the Southwest land border and 375 inspectors for the Northern land border, in order to open all primary lanes on the Southwest and Northern borders during peak hours and enhance investigative resources;

(B) a net increase of 100 inspectors and canine enforcement officers for border patrol checkpoints;

(C) 100 canine enforcement vehicles to be used by the Border Patrol for inspection and enforcement, and to reduce waiting times, at the land borders of the United States;

(D) a net increase of 40 intelligence analysts and additional resources to be distributed among border patrol sectors that have jurisdiction over major metropolitan drug or narcotics distribution and transportation centers for intensification of efforts against drug smuggling and money-laundering organizations;

(E) a net increase of 68 positions and additional resources to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to enhance investigative resources for anticorruption efforts; and

(F) the costs incurred as a result of the increase in personnel hired pursuant to this section.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BORDER CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Given that the Customs Service is cross-designated to enforce immigration laws and given the important border control role played by the Customs Service, it is the sense of the Senate that authorization for appropriations should be granted to the Customs Service similar to those

granted to the Immigration and Naturalization Service under section 6.

AMENDMENT NO. 3481

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Senator ABRAHAM has a substitute amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] for Mr. ABRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 3481.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 3481) was agreed to.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to remark on final passage of an important piece of legislation, the Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1998. I am very pleased that we have been able to work together to produce a bill that the Senate can pass by unanimous consent.

The substitute amendment makes a number of improvements on the committee-reported version. I have worked particularly closely with Senators GRAMM and KYL to include provisions that would provide authorization for significant additional resources for the inspections and drug enforcement operations of the United States Customs Service at the land borders. These resources would help ease traffic and trade back-ups and would detect and deter drug trafficking. It is my hope that they be deployed on a fair basis among the northern and the southern border ports.

Senator KYL and I have also worked closely with the State Department and with the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make sure that modifications were made in the implementation of border crossing improvements so that local communities, particularly in Arizona, would not be unduly harmed by laws and regulations that could not be implemented without keeping travelers from visiting, shopping, and doing business in the United States.

I spoke at length on this legislation in the Judiciary Committee, and that Committee produced a full report on the difficulties that would be faced if Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 were not modified. I do not want to repeat myself here, but would like to comment briefly on some of the key issues.

The legislation first addresses the so-called Section 110 problem. Section 110 of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform

and Immigrant Responsibility Act requires the INS to develop, by September 30, 1998, an automated entry and exit control system to document the entry and departure of "every alien" arriving in and leaving the United States. The problem is that the term "every alien" could be interpreted to cover all aliens entering at land borders and seaports, which are points of entry where entry-exit control has not been in place. My legislation exempts land borders and seaports from coverage of the system, and instead requires the Attorney General to submit a detailed feasibility report to Congress on what full entry-exit control would involve, what it would cost, and what burdens it would impose on our States and our constituents. This is simply a sensible and responsible approach.

The other provisions in the bill include reporting requirements on data obtained from the entry-exit control system that would be in operation at airports, provisions to fix some serious problems that are being experienced on the Southern border with the issuance of the new biometric "laser visas"—which I know is of great concern to Senator KYL and others on the Southern border—and authorization for additional Customs and INS resources for border inspections and enforcement.

I will say a bit more about the Section 110 problem because that is the provision that is most important to me. Implementing Section 110 at the land borders is essentially impossible at the moment. No one—not INS, not the State Department, and not anyone in Congress—has come up with a feasible way of implementing such a system at the land borders.

At a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims just last week, testimony was heard from a private sector technology company that developing feasible technology to implement Section 110 would require "substantial" time, "ultimately long lead times", and "significant resources," none of which the company could specify with any precision given the absolutely monumental nature of the task. Commenting on the sheer size of the database that would be needed to contain the number of visitor entry and exit records that would in theory be collected and entered into the system by the INS, Ann Cohen, Vice President of the EDS Corporation, testified, "to put some perspective on the magnitude of this number, the information in this system at the end of one year would be equal to the amount of data stored in the U.S. Library of Congress."

In the Senate, we heard testimony at an earlier subcommittee hearing that if this system were implemented with just a 30-second inspection required for every border crosser, backups at the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit would

immediately exceed 24 hours. That would be unbearable, and the border would effectively be closed. The impact would be immediate and would be staggering. The U.S. automobile industry alone conducts \$300 million in trade with Canada everyday. I learned in Michigan that there are 800 employees of the Detroit Medical Center who commute from Canada every day and who would no longer be available to provide medical care to Michiganians. Tourism would be seriously harmed, families with members on each side of the land borders would be harmed, and our international relations with Canada and Mexico would likewise be seriously damaged.

To add to this, Congress did not have the chance to fully consider the question of entry-exit control at the land borders, as opposed to just at airports, because the final language of Section 110 appeared for the first time only in the Conference Report. Senator Simpson and Chairman SMITH acknowledged in letters to the Canadian Embassy following passage of the 1996 Act that they did not intend Section 110 to impose additional documentary burdens on Canadian border crossers.

The outpouring against this provision has been enormous. I would like to just mention a few. The approach this legislation takes is supported by the National Governors Association, the Republican Governors Association, Americans for Better Borders, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, The Washington Post, The Los Angeles Times, the American Trucking Association, Ford, Chrysler, and GM, the Travel Industry Association of America, and many, many businesses, State and local governments and other organizations.

It is not enough to delay implementation of this requirement. The Governors and others have spoken loud and clear against delaying the effective date of this requirement on the grounds that the States, businesses, and families who would be affected by this would have no idea what would be imposed on them when. This is not a case of pressuring the INS or anyone else to come up with a plan that will work. The fact is that the only ones who will be pressured are my constituents—and many of my colleagues' constituents—and that is unacceptable.

Once we get the report from the Attorney General, we can consider all the options and make a collective decision of where and how we would like entry-exit control to be implemented. But it would simply be preposterous and irresponsible for us to keep a requirement in the law when we cannot say how it could possibly be met in any way and at what cost.

Finally, as the Judiciary Committee noted in its report on the legislation, Section 110 has "nothing to do with stopping terrorists or drug traf-

fickers." I appreciate very much my colleagues' understanding of this issue, and their support of a rational approach that comprehends the important distinctions between hindering beneficial trade, travel, and tourism and taking affirmative steps to conquer illegal drug trafficking or other activities at the land borders. I am also pleased that this legislation includes additional law enforcement resources so that these important law enforcement issues can be addressed in the right way. This truly is a border improvement bill in all senses.

I owe a particular gratitude to all of my colleagues who cosponsored the legislation, particularly those who worked with me from the outset, including Senators KENNEDY, D'AMATO, LEAHY, GRAMS, DORGAN, COLLINS, MURRAY, and SNOWE. I very much appreciate their efforts and support.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President. I am pleased that after many months of debate, the Senate has finally passed S. 1360 today. This bill, "The Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1998," will ensure that free trade and tourism continue to flourish along our nation's borders. It will preserve the status quo for our friendly neighbors to the north and will provide us with the necessary time to study and develop an appropriate way to monitor our nation's borders and sea ports.

I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of S. 1360 and have spoken repeatedly about the need for this remedy. Without this type of legislation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service might be obligated to begin implementing an enormously expensive automated entry-exit monitoring system at all of our nation's borders this fall without having the opportunity to study the situation and develop a workable system. The passage of this legislation means the Attorney General will now have one year to study and report to Congress on the feasibility of various means of tracking the entry and exit of immigrants crossing our country's land borders.

Over the past year, I have worked hard to ensure that this legislation does not negatively impact the thousands of people and the millions of dollars of trade which cross our borders each day. This bill preserves the integrity of our open border with Canada and ensures that no additional burden is placed upon Canadians who plan to shop or travel in the United States. Mexican nationals will also have additional time under this bill to acquire new border crossing cards and will be able to obtain border crossing cards for their children under age 15 at a reduced cost. Vermonters and others who cross our nation's land borders on a daily basis to work or visit with family or friends in Canada and Mexico should be able to continue to do so without additional border delays.

The Border Improvement Act also takes a more thoughtful approach to modifying U.S. immigration policies than that contained in section 110 of the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act ("IIRIRA"). By requiring an automated system for monitoring the entry and exit of "all aliens", section 110 would subject Canadians, and others who are not currently required to show documentation, to unprecedented border checks at U.S. points of entry. This sort of tracking system would be enormously costly to implement along the borders, especially since there is no current infrastructure in place to track the departure of individuals leaving the United States at our land borders or sea ports. Section 110, as currently worded, would also lead to excessive and costly traffic delays for those living and working near the borders. That is why I am so pleased that we were able to pass this legislation today to remedy this situation.

Instead of requiring the INS to implement such a costly and burdensome border tracking system with little forethought, S. 1360 mandates that the Attorney General conduct a study over the next year of the feasibility of various automated monitoring systems. This study will include an assessment of the potential costs and impact of any new automated monitoring system on trade and travelers along the country's land borders and seaports. An entry-exit monitoring system at our nation's airports will still be implemented within the next two years.

The Border Improvement Act also authorizes additional funds to ensure that adequate staffing and the newest equipment is available for INS and Customs agents along both borders. S. 1360 authorizes nearly \$120 million in fiscal year 1999 for INS enforcement and inspection equipment and personnel, and an additional \$160 million for the U.S. Customs Service to acquire similar equipment and hire additional agents. The Customs Service is authorized to hire 535 inspectors and 60 special agents along the Southwest border and 375 inspectors along the Northern border. The INS is authorized to hire 535 and 375 inspectors for the Southwest and Northern border, respectively, under this bill. These additional resources will help these agencies in their investigations of drug and alien smuggling and should reduce traffic waiting times along the borders.

Overall, the Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1998 is a sensible means of correcting the problematic language in section 110 of the IIRIRA while ensuring better tracking of aliens who overstay their visas.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, tonight the United States Senate has prevented a disaster on the Northern border of the United States by passing S. 1360, the Border Improvement and

Immigration Act of 1997. I am proud to be a co-sponsor.

On September 28, 1996, the Senate passed the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, a 749-page bill with twenty-four separate titles. One small section of that bill, buried deep in the text, has been the subject of much consternation in northern New York. The provision, known as Section 110, requires the Immigration and Naturalization Service to develop a system to document the entry and departure of every alien entering and leaving the United States. Contrary to Congressional intent, the legislative language does not recognize the current practice of allowing most Canadian and American nationals to cross the border without registering any documents. Such an oversight is not uncommon in this type of omnibus bill that is hurried to passage in the final days of a legislative session.

If implemented, an automated entry-exit control system along the northern border would likely result in long delays at the border, hampering tourism and trade. This is not an inconsequential matter. The United States-Canadian trade relationship is the world's largest, totaling \$272 billion in 1995. Compare this to \$256 billion in trade with the entire European Union and \$188 billion in trade with Japan during that same period.

The unnecessary border crossing delays which would surely result from the implementation of Section 110 would negatively affect our dynamic trading relationship with our Northern neighbor and would wreak havoc with the flow of traffic at the border. Each year, more than eight million trucks cross the eastern United States-Canada border carrying a variety of goods to market. Additionally, the Eastern Border Transportation Coalition has estimated that 57 million cars crossed that region in 1995. Sixty percent of these were day trips—people crossing the border to go to school or work, attend cultural events, shop, visit friends, and the like. The remaining forty percent of auto border crossings were by vacationers making significant contributions to both nations' economies. Might I note that visitors from the U.S. comprise the largest single group of vacationers in Canada and Canadians are the largest single non-U.S. group of vacationers in Florida.

It was not the intent of Congress to interfere with the vibrant trading relationship that we enjoy with our Canadian friends. On December 18, 1996, Representative LAMAR S. SMITH and then-Senator Alan K. Simpson sent a letter to Canadian Ambassador Raymond Chretien to assure him of this fact, writing that "we did not intend to impose a new requirement for border crossing cards or I-94's on Canadians who are not presently required to possess such documents." Thankfully, to-

night this ambiguity has been resolved by this body.

By passing this bill and exempting land border crossings from the automated entry-exit control system created under Section 110, we have prevented what could have been a catastrophe at the Canadian border.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, S. 1360, the "Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1998" sponsored by Senator ABRAHAM requires an entry-exit system at air ports by the year 2000 and requires a feasibility study of an entry-exit system for land and sea ports within a year. However, it does not address all the problems for which Section 110 of the 1996 Act was intended. I hope that during conference, we can improve the bill by mandating a workable deadline for creating an entry-exit system at all land and sea ports.

Section 110 of the 1996 Immigration Act requires an automated entry-exit system by October 1, 1998. It also requires the Attorney General to identify visa overstays, making the system an integrated part of data collection by the INS.

The purpose of Section 110 in current law is to fix the problem which exists now. INS says that in FY96, over 24 million non-immigrants came into the U.S. INS also says that they are "unable to calculate overstay rates on nonimmigrants in general or for particular nationalities." INS also told my staff that they "do not have an estimate" of the average length of overstay for nonimmigrants or know the "destinations of nonimmigrants".

The purpose of Section 110 is to make sure INS has the ability, by building an integrated data system at all ports of entry—including air, sea and land ports of entry, in order to know who is coming into the country and who is leaving and more importantly, who is breaking the law by overstaying.

INS estimates that there are over 5 million illegal aliens in this country and 41% of the illegal alien population is due to visa overstays—that these aliens failed to depart. (source: 1996 Statistical Yearbook of INS).

In the 1997 report, the INS Inspector General concluded that currently, INS has no real ability to identify the characteristics of the visa overstays which could be used in developing an enforcement strategy that effectively targets visa overstays. It also found that capturing entry-exit information only at airports reveals information about 10% of the nonimmigrants in this country who come through airports. The other 90% come and leave through sea and land ports and therefore, are unknown if there is no entry-exit system at those ports.

INS' inability to identify visa overstays has greater significance when we add the fact that there are over 4.5-million border crossing cards which have been issued since 1940s.

Having an integrated entry-exit system at the land borders is critical in keeping track of all nonimmigrants, those with visas and border crossing cards, providing valuable information for law enforcements, not only to deport visa overstays but in prosecuting those drug runners who provide a critical link into the heartland of America.

Time has come to fully implement the 1996 Immigration Act. I hope that during conference, we can find a workable deadline for INS to create an entry-exit system at both sea and land ports. Doing a feasibility study is helpful in planning the implementation but without tough mandates to install entry-exit systems—while drug runners go back and forth freely at the Southwest border without law enforcement's knowledge, and while potential terrorists slip in easily through the Canadian border—is not the intent of Section 110 when Congress passed the 1996 Immigration Act last year.

Thank you Mr. President and I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD after the text of S. 1360.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment, as amended, be agreed to.

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

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2920, the House companion bill.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its consideration, all after the enacting clause be stricken, and the text of S. 1360, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof. I further ask that the bill be read a third time, and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to this measure appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 2920), as amended, was considered read the third time and passed.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I finally ask unanimous consent that S. 1360 be placed back on the calendar.

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

STEVE SCHIFF AUDITORIUM

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3731, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3731) to designate the auditorium located within the Sandia Technology Transfer Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as the "Steve Schiff Auditorium."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is a real honor today to support legislation, H.R. 3731, honoring Representative Steve Schiff. This legislation designates a special auditorium at the Sandia National Laboratories as the "Steve Schiff Auditorium." Steve spoke in this Auditorium on several occasions, as part of his long service to the people of New Mexico.

Steve Schiff exemplified all that was good about public service: integrity of the highest order, deep and fundamental decency, and an acute and open mind. He went about his business quietly, but with wonderful efficiency. He was great at telling stories, usually about himself. He was a model for all politicians to admire.

Steve came to New Mexico from Chicago, where he was born and raised. He served the people of New Mexico in different capacities since 1972, when he graduated from the Law School at the University of New Mexico. Before election to Congress in 1988, he served as District Attorney for eight years.

One of Steve's favorite local programs was his Tree Give-Away Program. For eight years, Steve held a Saturday tree give-away day at the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center. He gave away more than 115,000 trees. Through those trees, he shared his own hope, faith, and love. Those trees now flourish throughout the Albuquerque area in New Mexico as lasting symbols of this man. In a similar way, his legislative achievements continue to serve the American people as another reminder of this great American.

Along with those trees and his legislation, the Steve Schiff Auditorium will serve as a lasting memorial. I'm happy and honored to have been a part of his life.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time, and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any Statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 3731) was considered read the third time and passed.

COMMERCIAL SPACE ACT OF 1998

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of calendar No. 393, H.R. 1702.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1702) to encourage the development of a commercial space industry in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Commercial Space Act of 1997".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—PROMOTION OF COMMERCIAL SPACE OPPORTUNITIES

Sec. 101. Commercialization of space station.

Sec. 102. Commercial space launch amendments.

Sec. 103. Promotion of United States Global Positioning System standards.

Sec. 104. Acquisition of space science data.

Sec. 105. Administration of Commercial Space Centers.

TITLE II—REMOTE SENSING

Sec. 201. Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 amendments.

Sec. 202. Acquisition of earth science data.

TITLE III—FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Sec. 301. Requirement to procure commercial space transportation services.

Sec. 302. Acquisition of commercial space transportation services.

Sec. 303. Launch Services Purchase Act of 1990 amendments.

Sec. 304. Shuttle privatization.

Sec. 305. Use of excess intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Sec. 306. National launch capability.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) the term "commercial provider" means any person providing space transportation services or other space-related activities, primary control of which is held by persons other than Federal, State, local, and foreign governments;

(3) the term "payload" means anything that a person undertakes to transport to, from, or within outer space, or in suborbital trajectory, by means of a space transportation vehicle, but does not include the space transportation vehicle itself except for its components which are specifically designed or adapted for that payload;

(4) the term "space-related activities" includes research and development, manufacturing, processing, service, and other associated and support activities;

(5) the term "space transportation services" means the preparation of a space transportation vehicle and its payloads for transportation to, from, or within outer space, or in suborbital trajectory, and the conduct of transporting a payload to, from, or within outer space, or in suborbital trajectory;

(6) the term "space transportation vehicle" means any vehicle constructed for the purpose of operating in, or transporting a payload to, from, or within, outer space, or in suborbital trajectory, and includes any component of such vehicle not specifically designed or adapted for a payload;

(7) the term "State" means each of the several States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States; and

(8) the term "United States commercial provider" means a commercial provider, organized under the laws of the United States or of a State, which is—

(A) more than 50 percent owned by United States nationals; or

(B) a subsidiary of a foreign company and the Secretary of Transportation finds that—

(i) such subsidiary has in the past evidenced a substantial commitment to the United States market through—

(I) investments in the United States in long-term research, development, and manufacturing (including the manufacture of major components and subassemblies); and

(II) significant contributions to employment in the United States; and

(ii) the country or countries in which such foreign company is incorporated or organized, and, if appropriate, in which it principally conducts its business, affords reciprocal treatment to companies described in subparagraph (A) comparable to that afforded to such foreign company's subsidiary in the United States, as evidenced by—

(I) providing comparable opportunities for companies described in subparagraph (A) to participate in Government sponsored research and development similar to that authorized under this Act;

(II) providing no barriers, to companies described in subparagraph (A) with respect to local investment opportunities, that are not provided to foreign companies in the United States; and

(III) providing adequate and effective protection for the intellectual property rights of companies described in subparagraph (A).

TITLE I—PROMOTION OF COMMERCIAL SPACE OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 101. COMMERCIALIZATION OF SPACE STATION.

(a) **POLICY.**—The Congress declares that a priority goal of constructing the International Space Station is the economic development of Earth orbital space. The Congress further declares that free and competitive markets create the most efficient conditions for promoting economic development, and should therefore govern the economic development of Earth orbital space. The Congress further declares that the use of free market principles in operating, servicing, allocating the use of, and adding capabilities to the Space Station, and the resulting fullest possible engagement of commercial providers and participation of commercial users, will reduce Space Station operational costs for all partners and the Federal Government's share of the United States burden to fund operations.

(b) **REPORTS.**—(1) The Administrator shall deliver to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a study that identifies and examines—

(A) the opportunities for commercial providers to play a role in International Space Station activities, including operation, use, servicing, and augmentation;

(B) the potential cost savings to be derived from commercial providers playing a role in each of these activities;

(C) which of the opportunities described in subparagraph (A) the Administrator plans to make available to commercial providers in fiscal year 1999 and 2000;

(D) the specific policies and initiatives the Administrator is advancing to encourage and facilitate these commercial opportunities; and

(E) the revenues and cost reimbursements to the Federal Government from commercial users of the Space Station.

(2) The Administrator shall deliver to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, an independently-conducted market study that examines and evaluates potential industry interest in providing commercial goods and services for the operation, servicing, and augmentation of the International Space Station, and in the commercial use of the International Space Station. This study shall also include updates to the cost savings and revenue estimates made in the study described in paragraph (1) based on the external market assessment.

(3) The Administrator shall deliver to the Congress, no later than the submission of the President's annual budget request for fiscal year 2000, a report detailing how many proposals (whether solicited or not) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration received during calendar year 1998 regarding commercial operation, servicing, utilization, or augmentation of the International Space Station, broken down by each of these four categories, and specifying how many agreements the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has entered into in response to these proposals, also broken down by these four categories.

(4) Each of the studies and reports required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall include consideration of the potential role of State governments as brokers in promoting commercial participation in the International Space Station program.

SEC. 102. COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH AMENDMENTS.

(a) **AMENDMENTS.**—Chapter 701 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the table of sections—

(A) by amending the item relating to section 70104 to read as follows:

"70104. Restrictions on launches, operations, and reentries."

(B) by amending the item relating to section 70108 to read as follows:

"70108. Prohibition, suspension, and end of launches, operation of launch sites and reentry sites, and reentries."

(C) by amending the item relating to section 70109 to read as follows:

"70109. Preemption of scheduled launches or reentries."

and

(D) by adding at the end the following new items:

"70120. Regulations.

"70121. Report to Congress."

(2) in section 70101—

(A) by inserting "microgravity research," after "information services," in subsection (a)(3);

(B) by inserting "reentry," after "launching" both places it appears in subsection (a)(4);

(C) by inserting "reentry vehicles," after "launch vehicles" in subsection (a)(5);

(D) by inserting "and reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (a)(6);

(E) by inserting "reentries," after "launches" both places it appears in subsection (a)(7);

(F) by inserting "reentry sites," after "launch sites" in subsection (a)(8);

(G) by inserting "and reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (a)(8);

(H) by inserting "reentry sites," after "launch sites," in subsection (a)(9);

(I) by inserting "and reentry site" after "launch site" in subsection (a)(9);

(J) by inserting "reentry vehicles," after "launch vehicles" in subsection (b)(2);

(K) by striking "launch" in subsection (b)(2)(A);

(L) by inserting "and reentry" after "conduct of commercial launch" in subsection (b)(3);

(M) by striking "launch" after "and transfer commercial" in subsection (b)(3); and

(N) by inserting "and development of reentry sites," after "launch-site support facilities," in subsection (b)(4);

(3) in section 70102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking "and any payload" and inserting in lieu thereof "or reentry vehicle and any payload from Earth";

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma; and

(iii) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

"including activities involved in the preparation of a launch vehicle or payload for launch, when those activities take place at a launch site in the United States."

(B) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "means of a launch vehicle" in paragraph (8);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (10), (11), and (12) as paragraphs (14), (15), and (16), respectively;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraphs:

"(10) 'reenter' and 'reentry' mean to return or attempt to return a reentry vehicle and its payload, if any, from Earth orbit or from outer space to Earth.

"(11) 'reentry services' means—

"(A) activities involved in the preparation of a reentry vehicle and its payload, if any, for reentry; and

"(B) the conduct of a reentry.

"(12) 'reentry site' means the location on Earth to which a reentry vehicle is intended to return (as defined in a license the Secretary issues or transfers under this chapter).

"(13) 'reentry vehicle' means a vehicle designed to return from Earth orbit or outer space to Earth, or a reusable launch vehicle designed to return from Earth orbit or outer space to Earth, substantially intact."

(E) by inserting "or reentry services" after "launch services" each place it appears in paragraph (15), as so redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph;

(4) in section 70103(b)—

(A) by inserting "AND REENTRIES" after "LAUNCHES" in the subsection heading;

(B) by inserting "and reentries" after "commercial space launches" in paragraph (1); and

(C) by inserting "and reentry" after "space launch" in paragraph (2);

(5) in section 70104—

(A) by amending the section designation and heading to read as follows:

"§ 70104. Restrictions on launches, operations, and reentries";

(B) by inserting "or reentry site, or to reenter a reentry vehicle," after "operate a launch site" each place it appears in subsection (a);

(C) by inserting "or reentry" after "launch or operation" in subsection (a)(3) and (4);

(D) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "launch license" and inserting in lieu thereof "license";

(ii) by inserting "or reenter" after "may launch"; and

(iii) by inserting "or reentering" after "related to launching"; and

(E) in subsection (c)—

(i) by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: "PREVENTING LAUNCHES AND REENTRIES.—";

(ii) by inserting "or reentry" after "prevent the launch"; and

(iii) by inserting "or reentry" after "decides the launch";

(6) in section 70105—

(A) by inserting "(1)" before "A person may apply" in subsection (a);

(B) by striking "receiving an application" both places it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "accepting an application in accordance with criteria established pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(D)";

(C) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following: "The Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a written notice not later than 30 days after any occurrence when a license is not issued within the deadline established by this subsection.

"(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary may establish procedures for safety approvals of launch vehicles, reentry vehicles, safety systems, processes, services, or personnel that may be used in conducting licensed commercial space launch or reentry activities."

(D) by inserting "or a reentry site, or the reentry of a reentry vehicle," after "operation of a launch site" in subsection (b)(1);

(E) by striking "or operation" and inserting in lieu thereof ", operation, or reentry" in subsection (b)(2)(A);

(F) by striking "and" at the end of subsection (b)(2)(B);

(G) by striking the period at the end of subsection (b)(2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";

(H) by adding at the end of subsection (b)(2) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) regulations establishing criteria for accepting or rejecting an application for a license under this chapter within 60 days after receipt of such application."; and

(I) by inserting ", including the requirement to obtain a license," after "waive a requirement" in subsection (b)(3);

(7) in section 70106(a)—

(A) by inserting "or reentry site" after "observer at a launch site";

(B) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "assemble a launch vehicle"; and

(C) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "with a launch vehicle";

(8) in section 70108—

(A) by amending the section designation and heading to read as follows:

"§ 70108. Prohibition, suspension, and end of launches, operation of launch sites and reentry sites, and reentries";

and

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting "or reentry site, or reentry of a reentry vehicle," after "operation of a launch site"; and

(ii) by inserting "or reentry" after "launch or operation";

(9) in section 70109—

(A) by amending the section designation and heading to read as follows:

"§ 70109. Preemption of scheduled launches or reentries";

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting "or reentry" after "ensure that a launch";

(ii) by inserting ", reentry site," after "United States Government launch site";

(iii) by inserting "or reentry date commitment" after "launch date commitment";

(iv) by inserting "or reentry" after "obtained for a launch";

(v) by inserting ", reentry site," after "access to a launch site";

(vi) by inserting ", or services related to a reentry," after "amount for launch services"; and

(vii) by inserting "or reentry" after "the scheduled launch"; and

(C) in subsection (c), by inserting "or reentry" after "prompt launching";

(10) in section 70110—

(A) by inserting "or reentry" after "prevent the launch" in subsection (a)(2); and

(B) by inserting "or reentry site, or reentry of a reentry vehicle," after "operation of a launch site" in subsection (a)(3)(B);

(11) in section 70111—

(A) by inserting "or reentry" after "launch" in subsection (a)(1)(A);

(B) by inserting "and reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (a)(1)(B);

(C) by inserting "or reentry services" after "or launch services" in subsection (a)(2);

(D) by striking "source." in subsection (a)(2) and inserting "source, whether such source is located on or off a Federal range.";

(E) by inserting "or reentry" after "commercial launch" both places it appears in subsection (b)(1);

(F) by inserting "or reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (b)(2)(C);

(G) by inserting after subsection (b)(2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) The Secretary shall ensure the establishment of uniform guidelines for, and consistent implementation of, this section by all Federal agencies.";

(H) by striking "or its payload for launch" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "or reentry vehicle, or the payload of either, for launch or reentry"; and

(I) by inserting ", reentry vehicle," after "manufacturer of the launch vehicle" in subsection (d);

(12) in section 70112—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "launch or reentry" after "(1) When a";

(B) by inserting "or reentry" after "one launch" in subsection (a)(3);

(C) by inserting "or reentry services" after "launch services" in subsection (a)(4);

(D) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting "launch or reentry" after "(1) A";

(E) by inserting "or reentry services" after "launch services" each place it appears in subsection (b);

(F) by inserting "applicable" after "carried out under the" in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b);

(G) by striking ", Space, and Technology" in subsection (d)(1);

(H) by inserting "OR REENTRIES" after "LAUNCHES" in the heading for subsection (e);

(I) by inserting "or reentry site or a reentry" after "launch site" in subsection (e); and

(J) in subsection (f), by inserting "launch or reentry" after "carried out under a";

(13) in section 70113—by inserting "or reentry" after "one launch" each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d);

(14) in section 70115(b)(1)(D)(i)—

(A) by inserting "reentry site," after "launch site."; and

(B) by inserting "or reentry vehicle" after "launch vehicle" both places it appears;

(15) in section 70117—

(A) by inserting "or reentry site, or to reenter a reentry vehicle" after "operate a launch site" in subsection (a);

(B) by inserting "or reentry" after "approval of a space launch" in subsection (d);

(C) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(f) LAUNCH NOT AN EXPORT; REENTRY NOT AN IMPORT.—A launch vehicle, reentry vehicle,

or payload that is launched or reentered is not, because of the launch or reentry, an export or import, respectively, for purposes of a law controlling exports or imports, except that payloads launched pursuant to foreign trade zone procedures as provided for under the Foreign Trade Zones Act (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u) shall be considered exports with regard to customs entry."; and

(D) in subsection (g)—

(i) by striking "operation of a launch vehicle or launch site," in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "reentry, operation of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle, or operation of a launch site or reentry site."; and

(ii) by inserting "reentry," after "launch," in paragraph (2); and

(16) by adding at the end the following new sections:

"§ 70120. Regulations

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation, within 9 months after the date of the enactment of this section, shall issue regulations to carry out this chapter that include—

"(1) guidelines for industry and State governments to obtain sufficient insurance coverage for potential damages to third parties;

"(2) procedures for requesting and obtaining licenses to launch a commercial launch vehicle;

"(3) procedures for requesting and obtaining operator licenses for launch;

"(4) procedures for requesting and obtaining launch site operator licenses; and

"(5) procedures for the application of government indemnification.

"(b) REENTRY.—The Secretary of Transportation, within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, shall issue a notice of proposed rulemaking to carry out this chapter that includes—

"(1) procedures for requesting and obtaining licenses to reenter a reentry vehicle;

"(2) procedures for requesting and obtaining operator licenses for reentry; and

"(3) procedures for requesting and obtaining reentry site operator licenses.

"§ 70121. Report to Congress

"The Secretary of Transportation shall submit to Congress an annual report to accompany the President's budget request that—

"(1) describes all activities undertaken under this chapter, including a description of the process for the application for and approval of licenses under this chapter and recommendations for legislation that may further commercial launches and reentries; and

"(2) reviews the performance of the regulatory activities and the effectiveness of the Office of Commercial Space Transportation."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 70119 of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 70119. Authorization of appropriations

"There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for the activities of the Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation—

"(1) \$6,182,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998;

"(2) \$6,275,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999; and

"(3) \$6,600,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a)(6)(B) shall take effect upon the effective date of final regulations issued pursuant to section 70105(b)(2)(D) of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(6)(H).

SEC. 103. PROMOTION OF UNITED STATES GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM STANDARDS.

(a) FINDING.—The Congress finds that the Global Positioning System, including satellites,

signal equipment, ground stations, data links, and associated command and control facilities, has become an essential element in civil, scientific, and military space development because of the emergence of a United States commercial industry which provides Global Positioning System equipment and related services.

(b) **INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.**—In order to support and sustain the Global Positioning System in a manner that will most effectively contribute to the national security, public safety, scientific, and economic interests of the United States, the Congress encourages the President to—

(1) ensure the operation of the Global Positioning System on a continuous worldwide basis free of direct user fees;

(2) enter into international agreements that promote cooperation with foreign governments and international organizations to—

(A) establish the Global Positioning System and its augmentations as an acceptable international standard; and

(B) eliminate any foreign barriers to applications of the Global Positioning System worldwide; and

(3) provide clear direction and adequate resources to United States representatives so that on an international basis they can—

(A) achieve and sustain efficient management of the electromagnetic spectrum used by the Global Positioning System; and

(B) protect that spectrum from disruption and interference.

SEC. 104. ACQUISITION OF SPACE SCIENCE DATA.

(a) **ACQUISITION FROM COMMERCIAL PROVIDERS.**—In order to satisfy the scientific and educational requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and where practicable of other Federal agencies and scientific researchers, the Administrator shall to the maximum extent possible acquire, where cost effective, space science data from a commercial provider.

(b) **TREATMENT OF SPACE SCIENCE DATA AS COMMERCIAL ITEM UNDER ACQUISITION LAWS.**—Acquisitions of space science data by the Administrator shall be carried out in accordance with applicable acquisition laws and regulations (including chapters 137 and 140 of title 10, United States Code), except that space science data shall be considered to be a commercial item for purposes of such laws and regulations. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude the United States from acquiring sufficient rights in data to meet the needs of the scientific and educational community or the needs of other government activities.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term "space science data" includes scientific data concerning the elemental and mineralogical resources of the moon, asteroids, planets and their moons, and comets, microgravity acceleration, and solar storm monitoring.

(d) **SAFETY STANDARDS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring compliance with applicable safety standards.

(e) **LIMITATION.**—This section does not authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide financial assistance for the development of commercial systems for the collection of space science data.

SEC. 105. ADMINISTRATION OF COMMERCIAL SPACE CENTERS.

The Administrator shall administer the Commercial Space Center program in a coordinated manner from National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters in Washington, D.C.

TITLE II—REMOTE SENSING

SEC. 201. LAND REMOTE SENSING POLICY ACT OF 1992 AMENDMENTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) a robust domestic United States industry in high resolution Earth remote sensing is in the economic, employment, technological, scientific, and national security interests of the United States;

(2) to secure its national interests the United States must nurture a commercial remote sensing industry that leads the world;

(3) the Federal Government must provide policy and regulations that promote a stable business environment for that industry to succeed and fulfill the national interest;

(4) it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to create domestic and international conditions favorable to the health and growth of the United States commercial remote sensing industry;

(5) it is a fundamental goal of United States policy to support and enhance United States industrial competitiveness in the field of remote sensing, while at the same time protecting the national security concerns and international obligations of the United States; and

(6) it is fundamental that the states be able to deploy and utilize this technology in their land management responsibilities. To date, very few states have the ability to do so without engaging the academic institutions within their boundaries. In order to develop a market for the commercial sector, the states must have the capacity to fully utilize the technology.

(b) **AMENDMENTS.**—The Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 is amended—

(1) in section 2 (15 U.S.C. 5601)—

(A) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

“(5) Commercialization of land remote sensing is a near-term goal, and should remain a long-term goal, of United States policy.”;

(B) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraphs (7) through (16) as paragraphs (6) through (15), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (11), as so redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by striking “determining the design” and all that follows through “international consortium” and inserting in lieu thereof “ensuring the continuity of Landsat quality data”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(16) The United States should encourage remote sensing systems to promote access to land remote sensing data by scientific researchers and educators.

“(17) It is in the best interest of the United States to encourage remote sensing systems whether privately-funded or publicly-funded, to promote widespread affordable access to unenhanced land remote sensing data by scientific researchers and educators and to allow such users appropriate rights for redistribution for scientific and educational noncommercial purposes.”;

(2) in section 101 (15 U.S.C. 5611)—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by inserting “and” at the end of paragraph (6);

(ii) by striking paragraph (7); and

(iii) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (7); and

(B) in subsection (e)(1)—

(i) by inserting “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking “, and” at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(3) in section 201 (15 U.S.C. 5621)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” after “NATIONAL SECURITY.” in subsection (b);

(B) in subsection (b)(1), as so redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph—

(i) by striking “No license shall be granted by the Secretary unless the Secretary determines in

writing that the applicant will comply” and inserting in lieu thereof “The Secretary shall grant a license if the Secretary determines that the activities proposed in the application are consistent”;

(ii) by inserting “, and that the applicant has provided assurances adequate to indicate, in combination with other information available to the Secretary that is relevant to activities proposed in the application, that the applicant will comply with all terms of the license” after “concerns of the United States”; and

(iii) by inserting “and policies” after “international obligations”;

(C) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new paragraph:

“(2) The Secretary, within 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Commercial Space Act of 1997, shall publish in the Federal Register a complete and specific list of all information required to comprise a complete application for a license under this title. An application shall be considered complete when the applicant has provided all information required by the list most recently published in the Federal Register before the date the application was first submitted. Unless the Secretary has, within 30 days after receipt of an application, notified the applicant of information necessary to complete an application, the Secretary may not deny the application on the basis of the absence of any such information.”; and

(D) in subsection (c), by amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows: “If the Secretary has not granted the license within such 120-day period, the Secretary shall inform the applicant, within such period, of any pending issues and actions required to be carried out by the applicant or the Secretary in order to result in the granting of a license.”;

(4) in section 202 (15 U.S.C. 5622)—

(A) by striking “section 506” in subsection (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof “section 507”;

(B) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “as soon as such data are available and on reasonable terms and conditions” and inserting in lieu thereof “on reasonable terms and conditions, including the provision of such data in a timely manner subject to United States national security and foreign policy interests”;

(C) in subsection (b)(6), by striking “any agreement” and all that follows through “nations or entities” and inserting in lieu thereof “any significant or substantial agreement”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6) of subsection (b) the following:

“The Secretary may not seek to enjoin a company from entering into a foreign agreement the Secretary receives notification of under paragraph (6) unless the Secretary has, within 30 days after receipt of such notification, transmitted to the licensee a statement that such agreement is inconsistent with the national security, foreign policy, or international obligations of the United States, including an explanation of such inconsistency.”;

(5) in section 203(a)(2) (15 U.S.C. 5623(a)(2)), by striking “under this title and” and inserting in lieu thereof “under this title or”;

(6) in section 204 (15 U.S.C. 5624), by striking “may” and inserting in lieu thereof “shall”;

(7) in section 205(c) (15 U.S.C. 5625(c)), by striking “if such remote sensing space system is licensed by the Secretary before commencing operation” and inserting in lieu thereof “if such private remote sensing space system will be licensed by the Secretary before commencing its commercial operation”;

(8) by adding at the end of title II the following new section:

“SEC. 206. NOTIFICATION.

“(a) **LIMITATIONS ON LICENSEE.**—Not later than 30 days after a determination by the Secretary to require a licensee to limit collection or

distribution of data from a system licensed under this title, the Secretary shall provide written notification to Congress of such determination, including the reasons therefor, the limitations imposed on the licensee, and the period during which such limitations apply.

"(b) **TERMINATION, MODIFICATION, OR SUSPENSION.**—Not later than 30 days after an action by the Secretary to seek an order of injunction or other judicial determination pursuant to section 202(b) or section 203(a)(2), the Secretary shall provide written notification to Congress of such action and the reasons therefor."

(9) in section 301 (15 U.S.C. 5631)—

(A) by inserting ", that are not being commercially developed" after "and its environment" in subsection (a)(2)(B); and

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

"(d) **DUPLICATION OF COMMERCIAL SECTOR ACTIVITIES.**—The Federal Government shall not undertake activities under this section which duplicate activities available from the United States commercial sector, unless such activities would result in significant cost savings to the Federal Government, or are necessary for reasons of national security or international obligations or policies."

(10) in section 302 (15 U.S.C. 5632)—

(A) by striking "(a) GENERAL RULE.—";

(B) by striking ", including unenhanced data gathered under the technology demonstration program carried out pursuant to section 303,"; and

(C) by striking subsection (b);

(11) by repealing section 303 (15 U.S.C. 5633);

(12) in section 401(b)(3) (15 U.S.C. 5641(b)(3)), by striking ", including any such enhancements developed under the technology demonstration program under section 303,";

(13) in section 501(a) (15 U.S.C. 5651(a)), by striking "section 506" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 507";

(14) in section 502(c)(7) (15 U.S.C. 5652(c)(7)), by striking "section 506" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 507"; and

(15) in section 507 (15 U.S.C. 5657)—

(A) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) **RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.**—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Defense on all matters under title II affecting national security. The Secretary of Defense shall be responsible for determining those conditions, consistent with this Act, necessary to meet national security concerns of the United States, and for notifying the Secretary promptly of such conditions. The Secretary of Defense shall convey to the Secretary the determinations for a license issued under title II, consistent with this Act, that the Secretary of Defense determines necessary to meet the national security concerns of the United States."

(B) by striking subsection (b)(1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) **RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.**—(1) The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of State on all matters under title II affecting international obligations and policies of the United States. The Secretary of State shall be responsible for determining those conditions, consistent with this Act, necessary to meet international obligations and policies of the United States and for notifying the Secretary promptly of such conditions. The Secretary of State shall convey to the Secretary the determinations for a license issued under title II, consistent with this Act, that the Secretary of State determines necessary to meet the international obligations and policies of the United States.

"(2) Appropriate United States Government agencies are authorized and encouraged to provide to developing nations, as a component of international aid, resources for purchasing re-

mote sensing data, training, and analysis from commercial providers. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, United States Geological Survey, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration should develop and implement a program to aid the transfer of remote sensing technology and Mission to Planet Earth (OES) science at the state level"; and

(C) in subsection (d), by striking "Secretary may require" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary shall, where appropriate, require".

SEC. 202. ACQUISITION OF EARTH SCIENCE DATA.

(a) **ACQUISITION.**—For purposes of meeting Government goals for Mission to Planet Earth, and in order to satisfy the scientific and educational requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and where appropriate of other Federal agencies and scientific researchers, the Administrator shall to the maximum extent possible acquire, where cost-effective, space-based and airborne Earth remote sensing data, services, distribution, and applications from a commercial provider.

(b) **TREATMENT AS COMMERCIAL ITEM UNDER ACQUISITION LAWS.**—Acquisitions by the Administrator of the data, services, distribution, and applications referred to in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with applicable acquisition laws and regulations (including chapters 137 and 140 of title 10, United States Code), except that such data, services, distribution, and applications shall be considered to be a commercial item for purposes of such laws and regulations. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude the United States from acquiring sufficient rights in data to meet the needs of the scientific and educational community or the needs of other government activities.

(c) **SAFETY STANDARDS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring compliance with applicable safety standards.

(d) **ADMINISTRATION AND EXECUTION.**—This section shall be carried out as part of the Commercial Remote Sensing Program at the Stennis Space Center.

TITLE III—FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

SEC. 301. REQUIREMENT TO PROCURE COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Federal Government shall acquire space transportation services from United States commercial providers whenever such services are required in the course of its activities. To the maximum extent practicable, the Federal Government shall plan missions to accommodate the space transportation services capabilities of United States commercial providers.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The Federal Government shall not be required to acquire space transportation services under subsection (a) if, on a case-by-case basis, the Administrator or, in the case of a national security issue, the Secretary of the Air Force, determines that—

(1) a payload requires the unique capabilities of the Space Shuttle;

(2) cost effective space transportation services that meet specific mission requirements would not be reasonably available from United States commercial providers when required;

(3) the use of space transportation services from United States commercial providers poses an unacceptable risk of loss of a unique scientific opportunity;

(4) the use of space transportation services from United States commercial providers is inconsistent with national security objectives;

(5) the use of space transportation services from United States commercial providers is inconsistent with foreign policy purposes, or launch of the payload by a foreign entity serves foreign policy purposes;

(6) it is more cost effective to transport a payload in conjunction with a test or demonstration of a space transportation vehicle owned by the Federal Government; or

(7) a payload can make use of the available cargo space on a Space Shuttle mission as a secondary payload, and such payload is consistent with the requirements of research, development, demonstration, scientific, commercial, and educational programs authorized by the Administrator.

(c) **DELAYED EFFECT.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to space transportation services and space transportation vehicles acquired or owned by the Federal Government before the date of the enactment of this Act, or with respect to which a contract for such acquisition or ownership has been entered into before such date.

(d) **HISTORICAL PURPOSES.**—This section shall not be construed to prohibit the Federal Government from acquiring, owning, or maintaining space transportation vehicles solely for historical display purposes.

SEC. 302. ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.

(a) **TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AS COMMERCIAL ITEM UNDER ACQUISITION LAWS.**—Acquisitions of space transportation services by the Federal Government shall be carried out in accordance with applicable acquisition laws and regulations (including chapters 137 and 140 of title 10, United States Code), except that space transportation services shall be considered to be a commercial item for purposes of such laws and regulations.

(b) **SAFETY STANDARDS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring compliance with applicable safety standards.

SEC. 303. LAUNCH SERVICES PURCHASE ACT OF 1990 AMENDMENTS.

The Launch Services Purchase Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2465b et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 202;

(2) in section 203—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(3) by striking sections 204 and 205; and

(4) in section 206—

(A) by striking "(a) COMMERCIAL PAYLOADS ON THE SPACE SHUTTLE.—"; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 304. SHUTTLE PRIVATIZATION.

(a) **POLICY AND PREPARATION.**—The Administrator shall prepare for an orderly transition from the Federal operation, or Federal management of contracted operation, of space transportation systems to the Federal purchase of commercial space transportation services for all nonemergency launch requirements, including human, cargo, and mixed payloads. In those preparations, the Administrator shall take into account the need for short-term economies, as well as the goal of restoring the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's research focus and its mandate to promote the fullest possible commercial use of space. As part of those preparations, the Administrator shall plan for the potential privatization of the Space Shuttle program. Such plan shall keep safety and cost effectiveness as high priorities. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from studying, designing, developing, or funding upgrades or modifications essential to the safe and economical operation of the Space Shuttle fleet.

(b) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—The Administrator shall conduct a study of the feasibility of implementing the recommendation of the Independent Shuttle Management Review Team that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration transition toward the privatization of the Space

Shuttle. The study shall identify, discuss, and, where possible, present options for resolving, the major policy and legal issues that must be addressed before the Space Shuttle is privatized, including—

(1) whether the Federal Government or the Space Shuttle contractor should own the Space Shuttle orbiters and ground facilities;

(2) whether the Federal Government should indemnify the contractor for any third party liability arising from Space Shuttle operations, and, if so, under what terms and conditions;

(3) whether payloads other than National Aeronautics and Space Administration payloads should be allowed to be launched on the Space Shuttle, how missions will be prioritized, and who will decide which mission flies and when;

(4) whether commercial payloads should be allowed to be launched on the Space Shuttle and whether any classes of payloads should be made ineligible for launch consideration;

(5) whether National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other Federal Government payloads should have priority over non-Federal payloads in the Space Shuttle launch assignments, and what policies should be developed to prioritize among payloads generally;

(6) whether the public interest requires that certain Space Shuttle functions continue to be performed by the Federal Government; and

(7) how much cost savings, if any, will be generated by privatization of the Space Shuttle.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall complete the study required under subsection (b) and shall submit a report on the study to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 305. USE OF EXCESS INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal Government shall not—

(1) convert any missile described in subsection (c) to a space transportation vehicle configuration or otherwise use any such missile to place a payload in space; or

(2) transfer ownership of any such missile to another person, except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) **AUTHORIZED FEDERAL USES.**—

(1) A missile described in subsection (c) may be converted for use as a space transportation vehicle by the Federal Government if except as provided in paragraph (2), at least 30 days before such conversion the agency seeking to use the missile as a space transportation vehicle transmits to the Committee on National Security and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, shall ensure in writing that the use of such missile—

(A) would result in cost savings to the Federal Government when compared to the cost of acquiring space transportation services from United States commercial providers;

(B) meets all mission requirements of the agency, including performance, schedule, and risk requirements;

(C) is consistent with international obligations of the United States; and

(D) is approved by the Secretary of Defense or his designee.

(2) The requirement under paragraph (1) that the assurance described in that paragraph must be transmitted at least 30 days before conversion of the missile shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense determines that compliance with that requirement would be inconsistent with meeting immediate national security requirements.

(c) **MISSILES REFERRED TO.**—The missiles referred to in this section are missiles owned by the United States that—

(1) were formerly used by the Department of Defense for national defense purposes as intercontinental ballistic missiles; and

(2) have been declared excess to United States national defense needs and are in compliance with international obligations of the United States.

SEC. 306. NATIONAL LAUNCH CAPABILITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) a robust satellite and launch industry in the United States serves the interest of the United States by—

(A) contributing to the economy of the United States;

(B) strengthening employment, technological, and scientific interests of the United States; and

(C) serving the foreign policy and national security interests of the United States.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Defense.

(2) **TOTAL POTENTIAL NATIONAL MISSION MODEL.**—The term "total potential national mission model" means a model that—

(A) is determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, to assess the total potential space missions to be conducted by the United States during a specified period of time; and

(B) includes all United States launches (including launches conducted on or off a Federal range).

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the Administrator and appropriate representatives of the satellite and launch industry and the governments of States and political subdivisions thereof—

(A) prepare a report that meets the requirements of this subsection; and

(B) submit that report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS FOR REPORT.**—The report prepared under this section shall—

(A) identify the total potential national mission model for the period beginning on the date of the report and ending on December 31, 2007;

(B) identify the resources that are necessary to carry out the total potential national mission model described in subparagraph (A), including providing for—

(i) launch property and services of the Department of Defense; and

(ii) the ability to support a launch within 6 hours after the appropriate official of the Federal Government receives notification by telephone at Government facilities located at—

(I) Cape Canaveral in Florida; or

(II) Vandenberg Air Force Base in California;

(C) identify each deficiency in the resources referred to in subparagraph (B);

(D) with respect to the deficiencies identified under subparagraph (C), including estimates of the level of funding necessary to address those deficiencies for the period described in subparagraph (A);

(E) identify opportunities for investment by non-Federal entities (including States and political subdivisions thereof and private sector entities) to assist the Federal Government in providing launch capabilities for the commercial space industry in the United States;

(F) identify 1 or more methods by which, if sufficient resources referred to in subparagraph (D) are not available to the Department of Defense, the control of the launch property and launch services of the Department of Defense may be transferred from the Department of Defense to—

(i) 1 or more other Federal agencies;

(ii) 1 or more States (or subdivisions thereof);

(iii) 1 or more private sector entities; or

(iv) any combination of the entities described in clauses (i) through (iii); and

(G) identify the technical, structural, and legal impediments associated with making launch sites in the United States cost-competitive on an international level.

AMENDMENT NO. 3482

(Purpose: To modify the provisions relating to national launch capability)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, Senator FRIST has an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont, [Mr. JEFFORDS], for Mr. FRIST, proposes an amendment numbered 3482.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 46, between lines 1 and 2, strike the item relating to section 306 and insert the following:

Sec. 306. National launch capability study.

On page 87, beginning in line 21, strike "Government, if except as provided in paragraph (2), at least 30 days before such conversion" and inserting "Government if, except as provided in paragraph (2) and at least 30 days before such conversion,".

On page 88, beginning, in line 3, strike "shall ensure in writing" and insert "a certification".

On page 89, line 7, strike "CAPABILITY" and insert "CAPABILITY STUDY".

On page 91, strike lines 9 through 16 and insert the following:

(1) the ability to support commercial launch-on-demand on short notification at national launch sites or test ranges;

On page 91, line 18, insert "and" after the semicolon.

On page 91, line 23, strike "(A)," and insert "(A)".

On page 91, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(3) **QUINQUENNIAL UPDATES.**—The Secretary shall update the report required by paragraph (1) quinquennially beginning with 2012.

(d) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Based on the reports under subsection (c), the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Commerce, and representatives from interested private sector entities, States, and local governments, shall—

Reset the matter appearing on page 91, beginning with line 24 through line 22 on page 92, 2 ems closer to the left margin.

On page 91, line 24, strike "(E)" and insert "(1)".

On page 92, line 5, strike "(F)" and insert "(2)".

On page 92, beginning in line 6, strike "subparagraph (D)," and insert "subsection (c)(2)(D)".

On page 92, line 12, strike "(i)" and insert "(A)".

On page 92, line 13, strike "(ii)" and insert "(B)".

On page 92, line 15, strike "(iii)" and insert "(C)".

On page 92, line 17, strike "(iv)" and insert "(D)".

On page 92, line 18, strike "clauses (i) through (iii);" and insert "subparagraphs (A) through (C);".

On page 92, line 19, strike "(G)" and insert "(3)".

On page 92, beginning in line 21, strike "launch sites in the United States cost-competitive on an international level." and insert "national ranges in the United States viable and competitive."

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the Federal Government should be encouraging private industry's involvement and investment in space, not competing with it and in some cases, stifling it. I am afraid that if we do not act on and pass this amendment, we will continue to encourage American companies to move their operations overseas. Companies need consistent government policy that encourages the development of new technology through private investment. We should enable private companies to locate and conduct their business here at home.

This growing sector of the economy provides jobs to many highly-skilled and technically-trained workers. To put it into perspective, industry revenues have exceeded \$7.5 billion. Commercial space businesses have grown faster than the economy and have been relatively recession proof.

Senator GRAHAM and I have proposed a number of balanced changes to current law. Among them, our amendment requires a study by NASA to identify commercial opportunities and interest in servicing the International Space Station. Second, we authorize the Office of Commercial Space Transportation to license commercial providers to re-enter Earth's atmosphere and return payloads to Earth. Currently, only the Federal Government is permitted to do so.

Third, we encourage the President to enter into regional agreements with foreign governments to secure the U.S. Global Positioning System as the world's standard. Finally, we require the Federal Government to procure commercial space transportation services.

Space is a frontier for research and exploration. The Federal Government's investments in space technology have provided the private sector with impressive capabilities that can benefit both our citizens and the economy. It is now the private sector's challenge to make commercial space activities earn a profit. The role of the Federal Government should be to provide stable and supportive policies for these activities.

Mr. President, we are moving into the 21st century. However, the laws regulating this industry are decades old. It is critical that we update them. The Senate Commerce Committee reported this bill favorably on June 2, 1998, and the House passed a similar version on November 4, 1997. I hope it will receive broad, bipartisan support.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amend-

ment be agreed to, the committee substitute be agreed to, as amended, the bill be considered read a third time and passed, as amended, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 3482) was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 1702), as amended, was considered read the third time and passed.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to address the Senate on the passage of the "Commercial Space Act," introduced by Senator MACK and myself in November 1997.

I am pleased this bill has passed today because it is critical in allowing United States launch companies to compete effectively in the growing commercial space race.

Having already passed the House by a large margin, the Commercial Space Act needed to be considered by the Senate. I was pleased to work with my colleagues to ensure the future of our nation's high-tech economic frontier: commercial space.

I speak to you today as a Senator concerned about both our national security and our nation's economic position. The United States cannot afford to descend into another "launch gap." Our recent discussions over why U.S. satellites are being launched from China demands that the U.S. Senate act quickly to make the commercial launch environment in this country as progressive and productive as possible.

When the space race began with the launch of Sputnik in October 1957, American citizens listened in indignation and fear as the first man-made satellite—a Soviet satellite—beeped its way around the earth. In the two decades that followed, an aggressive U.S. space program, both civil and military, brought our country back to its rightful lead in technology by putting a man on the moon and securing many other achievements in space.

But there is no denying that today, the United States preeminence in commercial space is threatened. If you were to step back in time 30 years to the nation's premier launch facility, Cape Canaveral, you would have seen a forest of launch vehicles ready on the pads. Visit our launch facilities today and you will see under-utilized launch facilities while at the same time U.S. commercial companies struggle to develop new space vehicles under constraints of outdated laws and policies.

A recent aerospace survey predicts over 2,000 satellites will be launched into earth orbit over the next decade. The good news is that the U.S. government and American companies may

launch up to 65 percent of those payloads if the Commercial Space Act is implemented. The bad news is that many commercial satellite companies are already looking to foreign countries for launch services due to the restrictive environment in which they must operate in the United States and the lack of available launch vehicles.

In other words, Mr. President, while our space industry is rapidly preparing for the 21st Century, federal policy in dealing with this important source of economic activity is stuck on the launch pad.

The single most important provision of the Commercial Space Act is an amendment to the Commercial Space Launch Act of 1984 that gives the federal government the authority to license commercial space re-entry activities. In short: what goes up, must come down.

Can you imagine the Wright Brothers flight at Kitty Hawk ever being made if the government told them, "Sure you can fly it, just don't land." The way the law presently exists, commercial companies can launch but cannot land any vehicle returning from space. Only the U.S. government is allowed this privilege.

This provision must be changed to allow the development of future generations of spacecraft, such as the Reusable Launch Vehicle. This is the business of space: providing services, repeat services, to entrepreneurs. We must regulate in an efficient and expeditious manner to support this growing market.

That brings me to my next point: this bill, to borrow from Neil Armstrong, will take a giant leap in clarifying complex and sometimes divergent commercial space licensing requirements in federal agencies. By streamlining the regulations and licensing, we will allow commercial companies to raise capital, develop business plans, and create job opportunities that might otherwise go overseas.

Mr. President, U.S. commercial space industry faces a number of competitors from abroad. The most serious are the Russian Proton, the Chinese Long March, and the European Space Agency Ariane rockets launched from French Guiana in South America. But this is not a comprehensive list. There are numerous competitors who would be more than happy to see the U.S. commercial launch industry locked in a web of regulations and limitations.

I am proud to report that one thing our bill does not do is spend any new taxpayer dollars. As a policy bill, we are seeking to level the playing field without creating any new government programs. Our bill does require studies, but those studies will be accomplished using the existing resources of agencies involved and data that has already been collected.

For instance, our legislation would require the Department of Defense to conduct an inventory of its range assets and determine what, if any, deficiencies exist. Much of this information is already available through existing Defense Department reports. Armed with this information, we can convert our nation's launch ranges back to the busiest space facilities in the world.

But this legislation does more than just refrain from new spending. It actually saves money by allowing the conversion of excess ballistic missiles into space transportation vehicles. Due to the START treaty, these missiles can no longer be used for their original intended purpose. Furthermore, they are extremely expensive to store or destroy.

By using these missiles as launch vehicles, the government will be able to launch small scientific and educational payloads that cannot afford the larger and more expensive rocket systems. This is a legal and efficient way to dispose of an expensive asset. Our Russian counterparts have been firing their missiles as opposed to spending money to destroy them. We will implement one more practical step by firing them with a payload.

In closing, let me remind you of remarks that President John F. Kennedy made in the midst of the hotly contested space race. During one of his visits to Cape Canaveral, President Kennedy declared, "We choose to go the moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard."

As we consider this bill, we should all ponder that quote. It is not easy for the federal government to change the way it has done business for many years. It is hard; it is a challenge, for forward-thinking people both in and out of the government. But it is what we must do to protect our investment in the nation's economic future and our national pride. It is vital that we ensure our nation's position in the commercial space race of the 21st century.

I thank the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Commerce Committee Senator MCCAIN and Senator HOLLINGS, and the Chairman of the Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee Senator FRIST for supporting this legislation and guiding it through the Senate process.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: 605, 616, 617, 618, 652, 709, 711, 716, 719, 720, 721, 722, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744 through 778,

779, 780, and 781, and all the nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps and Navy.

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 appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Raymond L. Bramucci, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Thelma J. Askey, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the remainder of the term expiring December 16, 2000.

Jennifer Anne Hillman, of Indiana, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring December 16, 2006.

Stephen Koplan, of Virginia, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring June 16, 2005.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Deidre A. Lee, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

Rosina M. Blerbaum, of Virginia, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Coast Guard, and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 50a:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Timothy W. Josiah, xx.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

L. Britt Snider, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Scott E. Thomas, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2003. (Reappointment)

Darryl R. Wold, of California, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2001.

David M. Mason, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2003.

Karl J. Sandstrom, of Washington, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2001.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Jonathan H. Spalter, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Director of the United States Information Agency.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Hugh Q. Parmer, of Texas, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Carolyn H. Becraft, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Ruby Butler DeMesme, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Patrick T. Henry, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10 U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. George W. Keefe, xxx.

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10 U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Richard C. Cosgrave, xx.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Roger G. DeKok, xx.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John W. Handy, xx.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Nicholas B. Kehoe, III, xx.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Maxwell C. Bailey, xx.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Phillip J. Ford, xx.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Ronald C. Marcotte, xx.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force as Chief, National Guard Bureau, and for appointment to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 10502:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Russell C. Davis, xx.

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Richard S. Colt, xx.

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Keith B. Alexander, xx.

Dorian T. Anderson, xx...
 Eldon A. Bargewell, xx...
 David W. Barno, xx...
 William H. Brandenburg, xxx...
 John M. Brown, III, xx...
 Peter W. Chiarelli, xx...
 Claude V. Christianson, xxx...
 Edward L. Dyer, xx...
 William F. Engel, xx...
 Barbara G. Fast, xxx...
 Stephen J. Ferrell, xx...
 Thomas R. Goedkoop, xx...
 Dennis E. Hardy, xx...
 Steven R. Hawkins, xx...
 John W. Holly, xx...
 David H. Huntoon, Jr., xx...
 Peter T. Madsen, xx...
 Jesus A. Mangual, xx...
 Thomas G. Miller, xxx...
 Robert W. Mixon, Jr., xx...
 Virgil L. Packett, II, xx...
 Donald D. Parker, xx...
 Elbert N. Perkins, xx...
 Joseph F. Peterson, xx...
 David H. Petraeus, xx...
 Marilyn A. Quagliotti, xx...
 Maynard S. Rhoades, xx...
 Velma L. Richardson, xx...
 Michael D. Rochelle, xx...
 Joe G. Taylor, Jr., xx...
 Nathaniel R. Thompson, III, xx...
 Alan W. Thrasher, xx...
 James D. Thurman, xx...
 Thomas R. Turner, II, xx...
 John M. Urias, xx...
 Michael A. Vane, xx...
 Lloyd T. Waterman, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert F. Foley, xx...

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Dale R. Barber, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert T. Dail, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert A. Cocroft, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Leon J. LaPorte, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James M. Link, xx...

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Edmund C. Zysk, xx...

To be brigadier general

Col. William J. Davies, xxx...
 Col. James P. Combs, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. John N. Abrams, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. David H. Ohle, xx...

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Paul J. Glazar, xx...
 Brig. Gen. John R. Groves, Jr., xx...
 Brig. Gen. David T. Hartley, xx...
 Brig. Gen. Lloyd E. Krase, xx...
 Brig. Gen. Bennett C. Landreneau, xx...
 Brig. Gen. Benny M. Paulino, xx...
 Brig. Gen. Jean A. Romney, xx...
 Brig. Gen. Allen E. Tackett, xx...

To be brigadier general

Col. Richard W. Averitt, xx...
 Col. Daniel P. Coffey, xx...
 Col. Howard A. Dillon, Jr., xx...
 Col. Barry A. Griffin, xx...
 Col. Larry D. Haub, xx...
 Col. Robert J. Hayes, xx...
 Col. Lawrence F. Lafrenz, xx...
 Col. Victor C. Langford, III, xx...
 Col. Thomas P. Mancino, xx...
 Col. Dennis C. Merrill, xxx...
 Col. Walter A. Paulson, xx...
 Col. Robley S. Rigdon, xx...
 Col. Kenneth B. Robinson, xx...
 Col. Roy M. Umbarger, xx...
 Col. Jimmy R. Watson, xx...
 Col. Paul H. Wleck, xx...

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Emilio Diaz-Colon, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Edward G. Anderson, III, xxx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Thomas A. Schwartz, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624(c):

To be brigadier general, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Thomas J. Romig, xx...

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Bruce W. Pieratt, xx...

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Peter A. C. Long, xx...

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Chaplains and for appointment to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section xxx...:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Anderson B. Holderby, Jr., xx...

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Michael E. Finley, xx...
 Capt. Gwilym H. Jenkins, Jr., xx...
 Capt. James A. Johnson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James F. Amerault, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Michael L. Cowan, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Joseph S. Mobley, xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Edward Moore, Jr., xx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. John W. Craine, Jr., xxx...

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Herbert A. Browne, Jr., II, xx...

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Diane D. Blair, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, xxx...

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Kelley S. Coyner, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Ritajeon Hartung Butterworth, of Washington, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2004.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE, ARMY, COAST GUARD,
MARINE CORPS, NAVY

Air Force nominations beginning Albert K. Aymar, and ending Jerry L. Wilper, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 15, 1998.

Air Force nominations beginning Hedy C. Pinkerton, and ending Philip M. Shue, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 1998.

Air Force nominations beginning John J. Abbatiello, and ending Michael P. Zumwalt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 1998.

Army nominations beginning Johan K. Ahan, and ending Clorinda K. Zawacki, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 1998.

Army nomination of Angela D. Meggs, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 15, 1998.

Army nominations beginning Kevin C. Abbott, and ending Mark G. Ziemba, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 1998.

Army nominations beginning *Celestia M. Abner, and ending *Shanda M. Zugner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 1998.

Army nominations beginning Robert D. Branson, and ending William B. Walton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 1998.

Army nominations beginning Mark A. Acker, and ending X4578, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 1998.

Coast Guard nomination of Christopher A. Buckridge, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 17, 1998.

Marine Corps nomination of Michael J. Colburn, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 15, 1998.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Reginald H. Baker, and ending James J. Witkowski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 15, 1998.

Navy nominations beginning Mark T. Ackerman, and ending Mary J. Zurey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 22, 1998.

Navy nominations beginning David Abernathy, and ending Michael B. Witham, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 15, 1998.

Navy nominations beginning Sanders W. Anderson, and ending Paul R. Zambito, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 15, 1998.

Navy nominations beginning John S. Andrews, and ending William M. Steele, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 15, 1998.

Navy nominations beginning Paul S. Webb, and ending Wesley P. Ritchie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 1998.

Navy nominations beginning Kevin J. Bedford, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 1998.

Navy nominations beginning Douglas J. McAneny, and ending Richard A. Mohler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 1998.

NOMINATION OF RAYMOND BRAMUCCI AS
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Ray Bramucci for the position of Assistant Secretary of Employment and Training in the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I have known Ray for many years. He is a man of enormous integrity, deep commitment to public service, and is ready and anxious to take up his responsibilities at the Department of Labor. Ray has a passion for making things better, and believes strongly in lifelong education and job training for our youth, especially our disadvantaged youth. He will give this job his full measure. I urge the Senate to move rapidly to confirm him.

A leading figure in New Jersey politics and public affairs, Ray's expertise in labor-management relations, job training initiatives, employment services, and policy development provides a solid foundation for overseeing the administration of agency programs as Assistant Secretary. From 1990 to 1994, Mr. Bramucci served as Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Labor. In this position, he was a key cabinet member and principal advisor to the Governor on matters of both statewide and national impact, particularly in regard to economic development, education and training, and labor relations.

Mr. Bramucci also served as Chief Executive Officer of the New Jersey Department of Labor, an agency charged with workforce training and preparation, protecting workers from exploitation, and providing income security through benefit programs for injured, ill, and unemployed workers. While in office, he successfully created and implemented a number of ground breaking initiatives, including the Workforce Development Partnership, a program which has helped to train and upgrade worker skills since July 1992 and is training over 15,000 workers today. He helped to establish the nation's first state-funded program to provide extended unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their regular claims, as well as the New Jersey State Employment and Training Commission and the Employment Security Council, two national leaders in reforming and revitalizing the worker security system.

To the position of Assistant Secretary, he would also bring the skills he acquired in his 22 years of service as part of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. During this time, he rose from shop floor worker to

eventually become the senior executive and key negotiator for the Union, in which he played a central role in negotiating hundreds of individual and industry-wide contracts.

From 1979 to 1990, he was Director of New Jersey Operations for our former colleague, Bill Bradley. Ray was the eyes and ears for Senator Bradley in New Jersey, and a key adviser to him on political and policy matters. It was during this period that I got to know Ray well, and then when he served as Labor Commissioner. In recognition of his many accomplishments, he has been named to the Executive Board of CDS International, Inc., the Commission Board of the New Jersey Black Achievers Program of Business and Education, and President of the New Jersey Caucus Education Corporation.

Mr. President, the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training is charged with directing Department programs and ensuring that programs funded through the agency are free from unlawful discrimination, fraud, and abuse. Ray Bramucci has the experience and commitment to assume these responsibilities with sensitivity and skill. He will make an exceptional Assistant Secretary. I thank my colleagues for confirming Ray Bramucci so he can get on with the job.

NOMINATION OF PATRICK T. HENRY TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am delighted to support the nomination of Patrick T. Henry to be the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

P.T. Henry has served on the staff of the Armed Services Committee for the last five years. Before that, he had a distinguished career on active duty in the Marine Corps and in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, as well as serving as the Chief of Staff of the American Red Cross here in Washington.

Mr. President, I can't think of a better person to serve in this important position. P.T. Henry has played a key role in virtually every Defense manpower and personnel issue in the last two decades. Whether the issue is quality of life issues, military pay and benefits questions, recruiting and retention, or military health care, the United States Senate and the men and women of our armed forces have benefited tremendously from the advice and counsel of P.T. Henry.

I know that every member of the Armed Services Committee agrees with me that P.T.'s expertise in the area of Defense manpower and personnel issues is exceeded only by his commitment to the welfare of the men and women of the armed forces and their families. I am disappointed that P.T. will be leaving the Armed Services Committee staff, but I am delighted and proud

that he will be moving to such an important position in the Defense Department. The Senate's and the Armed Services Committee's loss is certainly the Army's gain.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank P.T. Henry for his service to the Senate and the nation. I know that he will do an outstanding job as the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, and that he will continue to be an effective advocate for the men and women of the Army.

NOMINATION OF BRIGADIER GENERAL ALLEN E. TACKETT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased that the President has nominated Brigadier General Allen E. Tackett for the rank of Major General. Brigadier General Tackett, a resident of Miami, West Virginia, graduated from East Bank High School and earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Charleston, Charleston, West Virginia. He began his military career over 35 years ago as a Private in the Special Forces. Advancing from a Private to a Major General is an accomplishment which exemplifies his dedication to the National Guard, our country, and our State of West Virginia.

Brigadier General Tackett is a military graduate of the Special Warfare Center, Jumpmaster Course; Infantry Officer Basic and Advanced Courses; Command and General Staff College; and the Special Warfare Center, Techniques of Special Operations.

Brigadier General Tackett's major decorations include the Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Medal, Humanitarian Medal, and the Armed Forces Reserve Medal. He was awarded, through rigorous training and proven efficiency, the coveted Special Forces Tab and Master Parachutist Badge.

Three years ago, Brigadier General Tackett assumed his current prestigious command as Adjutant General, West Virginia National Guard, with leadership responsibility for six thousand men and women serving in the West Virginia National Guard.

Mr. President, I am pleased to cast my vote for the confirmation of Brigadier General Allen E. Tackett as Major General, and I urge my colleagues to support this nomination.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 30, 1998:

THE JUDICIARY

FRANCIS M. ALLEGRA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LAWRENCE S. MARGOLIS, TERM EXPIRED.

LEGROME D. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA VICE EDMUND V. LUDWIG, RETIRED.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

MICHAEL M. REYNA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 21, 2004, VICE DOYLE COOK, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

CARDELL COOPER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE SAUL N. RAMIREZ, JR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CHARLES G. GROOT, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, VICE GORDON P. EATON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DAVID C. WILLIAMS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, VICE VALERIE LAU, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CLAIBORNE DEB. PELL, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

ROD GRAMS, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, OF DELAWARE, JR. TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

JOHN U. SEPULVEDA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, VICE JANICE R. LACHANCE.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

MONTIE R. DEER, OF KANSAS, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS, VICE TADD JOHNSON.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

JOSEPH E. STEVENS, JR., OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2003. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK(*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 628, AND 531:

To be colonel

JEFFREY C. MABRY, X.

To be lieutenant colonel

JEFFREY P. ALLERTON, X.

DALE R. BROWN, X.

MARK C. BRYANT, X.

STUART D. HARTFORD, X.

KENNETH R. NEUHAUS, X.

ROBERT R. SELLERS, X.

JOHN F. SIMONETTI, X.

MICHAEL J. SUTTON, X.

DAVID R. TAYLOR, X.

THOMAS K. WIGGS, X.

To be major

* RICHARD B. DELEON, X.

JOHN F. EASTON, X.

STEPHEN H. KENNEDY, X.

TERRY J. LEWIS, X.

JOEL J. SCHUBBE, X.

ANA Y. VALDEZSCALICE, X.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR A REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be captain

NEAL A. THAGARD, X.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID W. BROOKS, X.

RONALD M. PACKER, X.

SHELBY R. PEARCY, X.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

STEPHEN W. PRESTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, VICE STEPHEN S. HONIGMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HAROLD LUCAS, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE KEVIN EMANUEL MARCHMAN.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 552:

To be lieutenant

DAVID W. ADAMS, X.
KEDRIC M. BELLAMY, X.
EVELYN T. GIBBS, X.
THOMAS M. HENDERSCHIEDT, X.
ROSE E. JIMENEZ, X.
THOMAS L. KENNEDY, X.
JAMES D. MORALES, X.
JOSEPH ROTH, X.

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

CHRISTOPHER E. ARCHER, X.
DEBRA A. DRAHEIM, X.
JOHN S. DUENAS, X.
BRIAN M. GOEBEL, X.
DEVIN T. LASALLE, X.
ERIC T. LOWMAN, X.
STEPHANIE E. MITCHELLSMITH, X.
RICHARD R. RIKER, X.
JOHN C. RUDOLFS, X.
JOHN A. VELOTTA, X.

To be ensign

DOUGLAS W. ABERNATHY, X.
GREGORY A. BESHORE, X.
WILLIAM M. FELDLEE, X.
PATRICK L. LAHIFF, X.
SHAWN D. PETRE, X.
MICHAEL Y. SNELLING, X.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

MARILYN E. BRADDOCK, X.

To be lieutenant commander

STEVEN L. BANKS, X.
LAFAYETTE B. BELK, JR., X.
FRANK A. BIVINS, X.
ROBERT BUCKLEY, X.
THOMAS B. CALVIT, X.
GERARD S. CHRABOT, X.
DWAYNE C. CLARK, X.
LOUIS A. DAMIANO, X.
JAMES F. GALLAGHER, X.
JAMES W. HANSEN, X.
JOHN R. HOLMAN, X.
STEPHEN H. HOOPER, X.
KIMBROUGH M. HORNSBY, X.
CHARLES JOHNSON, II, X.
STEPHAN F. JUN, X.
DAVID A. LOWREY, X.
MARK A. MALAKOOTI, X.
ANTHONY J. MARCIANTE, X.
PETER G. MAYER, X.
DAVID B. MCLAREN, X.
KIMBERLY M. MCNEIL, X.
ANDREW A. NELSON, X.
DAVID NORMAN, X.
JOSEPH D. PAULDING, X.
BILLY J. PHILLIPS, X.
LARRY D. REID, JR., X.
GIACINTO F. RUBINO, X.
JEFFREY A. RUTERBUSCH, X.
JUDY R. SCHAUER, X.
EDWARD D. SIMMER, X.
DONNA J. STAFFORD, X.
PHILIP M. STOLL, X.
MARK D. TURNER, X.
BENJAMIN W. YOUNG, JR., X.

To be lieutenant

TIMOTHY A. ACKERMAN, X.
BARRY D. ADAMS, X.
RICHARD E. AGUILA, X.
MICHAEL T. AKIN, X.
YVONNE ANDERSON, X.
ELIZABETH A. G. ASHBY, X.
DIXIE L. AUNE, X.
JENNIFER L. BAILY, X.
DARRELL A. BAKER, X.
JULIE H. BALL, X.
SCOTT J. BEATTIE, X.
JAMES S. BIGGS, X.
WILLIAM R. BLAND, X.
ANNE K. BOURNE, X.
MATTHEW R. BOWMAN, X.
SCOTT D. BOXBERGER, X.
GERALD BOYLE, X.
RICK M. BROGDON, X.
GREGORY H. HUBB, X.
DELL D. BULL, X.
WILLIAM E. BURNS, JR., X.
TIERNEY M. CARLOS, X.
ROBERT T. CARRETTA, X.
DAVID J. CARRILLO, X.
JOE V. CASEY, JR., X.
GINA M. CAVALLI, X.
KARINA J. GIESIELSKI, X.
BARRY S. COHEN, X.
THERON C. COLBERT, X.
CANDACE A. CORNETT, X.
MICHAEL T. COURIS, X.
JAMES G. COX, X.
CHERYL A. CREAMER, X.
CHARLES J. CRUSE, X.

ERIC E. CUNHA, X
 PRESOTT E. DALRYMPLE, X
 GREGORY P. DAVIS, X
 MARISA A. DECILLIS, X
 DONALD R. DELOREY, X
 DAWN DENNIS, X
 HENRIQUE M. DEOLIVEIRA, X
 BEVERLY A. DEXTER, X
 KRISPEN S. J. DORFMAN, X
 DEBORAH D. DREWS, X
 ANTHONY L. DUCHI, III, X
 JENNIFER K. EAVES, X
 MARK T. EDGE, X
 LANCE C. ESSWEIN, X
 RICHARD L. FIELDS, JR., X
 NANCY J. FINK, X
 ANNE B. FISCHER, X
 GLENN S. FISCHER, X
 KEVIN FITZPATRICK, X
 ROGER D. FLODIN, II, X
 MARIA C. FLYNN, X
 PHILIP A. FOLLO, X
 WALTER H. FRENCH, III, X
 EFRAM R. FULLER, X
 JUAN M. GARCIA, III, X
 PATRICA A. GARCIA, X
 PEER E. GERBER, X
 ELIZABETH K. GILLARD, X
 BENNETT R. GLOVER, X
 CARLOS D. GODINEZ, X
 BABETTE R. GORDON, X
 CHARLES M. GORDON, X
 JOHN R. GOULDMAN, JR., X
 DARLENE K. GRASDOCK, X
 JOHN N. GREENE, X
 KURT E. GRUNAWALT, X
 LISA C. GUFFEY, X
 RICHARD A. GUSTAFSON, X
 RICHARD G. HAGERTY, X
 CLYDE A. HAIG, X
 WILLIAM O. HAISSIG, X
 ERIC R. HALL, X
 JON J. HANSON, X
 WILLIAM T. HARDER, X
 MARY K. HARRIS, X
 RONALD G. HARTMAN, JR., X
 MATTHEW J. HAUPT, X
 ELIZABETH A. HAYDON, X
 MATTHEW W. HEBERT, X
 KEITH W. HENDERSON, X
 GRANT R. HIGHLAND, X
 LESTER E. HUILBERT, JR., X
 MATTHEW W. HILDEBRANDT, X
 JACK A. HINES, X
 MARK A. HOFMANN, X
 MICHAEL C. HOLIFIELD, X
 NANCY E. HOLMES, X
 JOHN M. HOOPEES, X
 JOHN L. HOWLAND, X
 SALLY A. HUGHES, X
 RICHARD L. INGRUM, JR., X
 RAYMOND E. JACKSON, X
 MICHAEL J. JAEGER, X
 GREGORY A. JOHNSON, X
 JEFFREY D. JOHNSON, X
 ETHAN B. JOSIAH, X
 LETITIA D. JUBERT, X
 CYNTHIA L. JUDY, X
 JOSEPH A. KAHN, X
 JULIAN T. KELLY, X
 STEVEN A. KEWISH, X
 BARRY L. KILWAY, X
 SUSANNE K. KITCHEN, X
 KRISTIN L. KLIMISCH, X
 PAMELA S. KUNZE, X
 TAMARA L. LANE, X
 BRIAN C. LANSING, X
 JOSEPH T. LAVAN, X
 JOHN LEE, X
 WILLIAM J. LEONARD, JR., X
 DANA L. LIZAK, X
 CHARLES E. LOISELLE, X
 JAMES J. LYNCH, X
 TAMARA K. MAEDER, X
 MICHAEL J. MAGUIRE, X
 ERIC F. MANNING, X
 STEPHEN J. MANNING, X
 MARK A. MARZONIE, X
 KAREN D. MCCORMICK, X
 ELIZABETH H. MCDONNELL, X
 JAMES R. MCFARLANE, X
 WAINA J. MCFARLANE, X
 CHELSEA T. MCKINLEY, X
 SCOT C. MCMAHON, X
 CAROLYN M. MEDINA, X
 BRENDAN T. MELODY, X
 KRISTEN L. MOE, X
 STEPHEN R. MOLITOR, X
 EDGARDO MONTERO, X
 ERIN M. MOORE, X
 ROBERT P. MOORE, IV, X
 JOHN R. MORRIS, X
 STEPHANIE J. MOSER, X
 RAMIRO MUNOZ, JR., X
 JASON C. NARGI, X
 SCOTT V. NEEDLE, X
 KEVIN H. ODLUM, X
 CHRISTOPHER J. O'DONNELL, X
 HILARY S. D. OKELLEY, X
 CHARLES E. OLSON, X
 KEVIN R. ONEIL, X
 ANTHONY J. OPILKA, X

SCOTT E. ORGAN, X
 JOE V. OVERSTREET, X
 LINDA M. PALMER, X
 DOUGLAS A. PEABODY, X
 ANN M. PERRY, X
 RICHARD T. PETERSON, X
 NICOLE K. POLINSKY, X
 JASON R. PRICKETT, X
 WILLIAM J. PROUT, X
 EILEEN M. H. RACZYNSKI, X
 JOHN G. RICE, X
 TRACY V. RIKEL, X
 KIMBERLY S. ROBERTS, X
 MARC D. RODRIGUEZ, X
 MONICA G. ROMAN, X
 CHERYLANN A. ROSWELL, X
 MICHELLE C. SAARI, X
 STEPHANIE L. SANDERS, X
 LYNN T. SCHIERA, X
 MICHAEL J. SCHWEIN, X
 PATRICK B. SCOTT, X
 CATHERINE A. SELLERS, X
 WILLIAM H. SHEEHAN, X
 MARIA T. SHELDRAKE, X
 GREGORY J. SMITH, X
 LOREN J. SMITH, X
 SCOTT M. SMITH, X
 VICTOR S. SMITH, X
 ELIZABETH A. SNTYLER, X
 THEODORE J. STJOHN, X
 MARK D. SULLIVAN, X
 SCOTT A. SWOPE, X
 ITZEL A. TALBOT, X
 ELIZABETH A. H. TEWELL, X
 DOUGLAS A. THIEN, X
 SUSAN A. UNION, X
 KEN H. UYESUGI, X
 SHARON S. VETTER, X
 SORAYA M. C. VILLACIS, X
 CARLA L. VIVAR, X
 ROGER F. WAKEMAN, X
 JEFFREY A. WALTERS, X
 THOMAS A. WALTZ, JR., X
 MARCUS L. WARREN, X
 MICHAEL S. WATHEN, X
 DAVID C. WEIGLE, X
 JASON A. WELCH, X
 NELSON R. WELLS, X
 KURT J. WENDELKIN, X
 ROBERT B. WHITE, X
 KENNETH J. WHITWELL, X
 CATHERINE E. WIDMER, X
 JEFFREY S. WILCOX, X
 MITCHELL P. WRIGHT, JR., X
 HENRY X. YOUNG, X
 CAROL A. ZYLSTRA, X

Zylstra to be lieutenant (junior grade)

KIMBERLY C. ABERCROMBIE, X
 DOUGLAS J. ADKISSON, X
 IVAN L. AGUIRRE, X
 ROBERT E. ALEXANDER, X
 DAVID W. ANDERSON, X
 ROBERT E. BEBERMEYER, X
 BRYAN L. BECK, X
 DENNIS E. BLACKSMITH, X
 CHRISTOPHER L. BLANCHARD, X
 DALE S. BORDNER, X
 JEFF W. BOWMAN, X
 RODERICK L. BOYCE, X
 RALPH V. BRADEEN, X
 TRACY A. BRINES, X
 CLAUDIA M. R. BROWN, X
 MARK S. BUDELIER, X
 TERRENCE E. CASEY, X
 JEFF P. H. CAZEAU, X
 JOHN T. CHAPMAN, X
 RODNEY A. CHAPMAN, X
 PETER D. CHAREST, X
 ERIC C. CLINE, X
 ANTHONY J. COKE, X
 BRENDA M. COLLINS, X
 GREGORY J. COTTON, X
 GEORGE P. CULLEN, X
 NICKI L. DAILEY, X
 SHAHIN P. DANESHKHAH, X
 SHARON L. DECANT, X
 CARLOS F. DEJESUS, X
 KENNETH P. DEUEL, X
 LISA A. DIMARIA, X
 THOMAS S. DIVITO, X
 JIMI M. DOTY, X
 DARREN P. DRESSER, X
 THOMAS E. DUNMORE, X
 GRANT A. DUNN, X
 ERIK D. ECK, X
 LANCE J. EDLING, X
 KENDALL J. ELLINGTON, X
 WILLIAM R. ELLIS, JR., X
 JEFFREY N. FARAH, X
 WILLIAM M. FAULKNER, X
 ROBERT E. FENRICK, X
 ALFREDO T. FERNANDEZ, JR., X
 IVAN A. FINNEY, X
 MARK J. FOLSAND, X
 JOHN H. FOX, X
 JOHN P. FRIEDMAN, X
 RAYMOND GARAY, X
 MATTHEW M. GENTRY, X
 BLAKE C. GIBSON, X
 MARK W. GIBSON, X
 JOHN B. GILLETT, III, X

CHRISTOPHER C. GILLETTE, X
 JOSEPH A. GOODREY, X
 STEVEN R. GUNTER, X
 SHISHIR K. GUPTA, X
 AMY M. HAGEMAN, X
 BRIAN G. HARRIS, X
 RYAN J. HEILMAN, X
 TIMOTHY J. HERALD, X
 ERIC M. HOHL, X
 WILLIAM D. HOLDER, X
 ANDREW S. INMAN, X
 KEVIN R. JODA, X
 SANDRA D. JOHNSON, X
 ROBERT A. KEATING, X
 JOHN G. KENAN, X
 CORINNA M. KUPPER, X
 MICHAEL S. LAGUTIAN, X
 EFRIM R. LAWSON, X
 SCOTT D. LOESCHKE, X
 ANTONIA LOPEZ, X
 CHRISTOPHER K. LUEDDERS, X
 MATTHEW M. LYLE, X
 KATHLEEN S. MAAS, X
 PETER J. MACULAN, X
 ERIC J. MATHIS, X
 STUART M. MATTFIELD, X
 MATTHEW J. MAXWELL, X
 BRIAN L. MAZE, X
 MARVIN B. MCBRIDE, III, X
 JEFFREY E. MCCOY, X
 MASON C. MCDOWELL, X
 CLAYTON D. MENZER, JR., X
 DONALD H. MERTEN, III, X
 GARRICK J. MILLER, X
 STEVEN W. MILLER, X
 DANIEL A. MINES, X
 IDELLA R. MOORS, X
 JOHN S. MOYER, III, X
 GORDON E. MUIR, JR., X
 DAVID D. NEAL, X
 PAUL R. OBER, X
 JASON W. ORENDELL, X
 DANIEL A. PETNO, X
 ERIC G. PITTMAN, X
 GREGORY E. POOLE, X
 ERIC J. POWELL, X
 RICHARD L. PRINGLE, X
 DEREK J. PURDY, X
 JAMES E. REASON, X
 LAURIE H. REPPAS, X
 TRAVIS B. RHOADES, X
 CATHERINE E. RILEY, X
 ROBERT S. RINEHART, X
 JESS V. RIVERA, X
 GREGORY D. ROSE, X
 RICKEY G. RUFFIN, X
 ROBERT S. RUSSELL, X
 JEANNE M. SARMIENTO, X
 BRYAN T. SCHLOTMAN, X
 STEVEN C. SCHOBNECKER, X
 JAMES E. SCOTT, X
 RAMON I. SERRANO, X
 JAMES L. SHELTON, X
 MARVIN L. SIKES, JR., X
 DANIEL J. SIKKINK, X
 JEFFREY S. SMITH, X
 SCOTT M. SONDGERATH, X
 KENNETH L. SPENCE, X
 WINSTON R. SPENCER, X
 GERALD W. SPRINGER, II, X
 LOUIS J. SPRINGER, X
 STEPHEN J. STANO, X
 DANIEL M. STODDARD, X
 JEROD D. SWANSON, X
 EDMUND E. SWEARINGEN, X
 MARK A. SWEARINGEN, X
 STEPHEN L. I. THOMPSON, X
 DONALD M. THORNER, X
 DAVID A. URSINI, X
 SEAN W. VALLIEU, X
 JASON S. VANDONK, X
 RANDY J. VANROSSUM, X
 GUSTAVO J. VERGARA, X
 SHANNON P. VOSS, X
 KEVIN H. WAGNER, X
 BENJAMIN J. WALKER, X
 CEDRIC L. WALKER, X
 JEFFREY S. WARREN, X
 ERIC T. WHITELEY, X
 ULYSSES V. WHITLOW, X
 WILLIAM C. WHITSITT, X
 DUNCAN L. WILLIAMS, X
 BRIAN A. WILSON, X
 ROBERT L. WING, X
 COREY D. WOFFORD, X
 DANIEL F. YOUCH, X
 WILLIAM B. ZABICKI, JR., X
 MATTHEW H. ZARDESKAS, X
 JEFFREY B. ZILLMER, X

To be ensign

JOHN C. BAILLY, X
 JEFFREY P. BROWN, X
 GILLIAN B. BURNS, X
 MICHAEL CHIN, X
 JOSEPH W. COLEMAN, X
 MICHAEL F. DAVIS, X
 ROGELIO M. DU, X
 ROBERT J. HAIRE, JR., X
 RICHARD C. HAM, X
 CORINNE D. HAMPSON, X
 BRAD G. HARRIS, X

ROBERT C. HICKS, x...
 ERIC D. HOLLIS, x...
 SHAWN W. HUEY, x...
 JOHN B. HUGHES, x...
 DAVID R. JACKSON, x...
 HENRY A. JOHNSON, x...
 MARK E. JOHNSON, x...
 DINCHEN A. KLEIN, x...
 LAURA A. KNABB, x...
 KIRK A. KREISEL, x...
 ARRON W. LAYTON, x...
 TIFFANY A. LEHANE, x...
 GREGORY D. LEWIS, x...
 JEFFREY M. LISAK, x...
 RONALD B. LOTT, JR., x...
 JAMES MATHES, x...
 TODD D. MOORE, x...
 JEFFREY A. NESHELM, x...
 RICK L. NICKERSON, x...
 GREGORY J. OSTIDDER, x...
 NANNETTE M. PACO, x...
 CHRISTOPHER F. POUILLIOT, x...
 JASON A. SEIFERT, x...
 MARIANNE SIMMONS, x...
 GREGORY S. THOROMAN, x...
 BRIAN L. TOTHERO, x...
 PHILIP G. URSO, x...
 ROBERT J. WEGGEL, x...
 BRUCE C. WEYER, x...
 STEVEN J. WICKEL, x...
 MARK A. WINTERS, x...
 MATTHEW A. WISE, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5562:

To be lieutenant

NORA A. BURGHARDT, x...
 BRYAN E. HELLER, x...
 MARK R. LAUDA, x...
 STEVEN D. WATSON, x...

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

DAVID M. ALGER, x...
 JEFFREY J. BLOCK, x...
 JAN C. CUNNING, x...
 KEITH W. MIERTSCHIN, x...
 ALLEN R. SULLIVAN, x...

To be ensign

KEITH K. BENSON, x...
 MICHAEL J. BRADY, x...
 AMANDA E. MORRIS, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED TEMPORARY LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5569:

To be lieutenant

CHARLES W. CORIELL, x...
 STANLEY D. WILLIAMS, x...

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

JOHN R. ANDERSON, x...

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive Nominations Confirmed by the Senate July 30, 1998:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

RAYMOND L. BRAMUCCI, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

THELMA J. ASKEY, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2000.

JENNIFER ANNE HILLMAN, OF INDIANA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2006.

STEPHEN KOPLAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 16, 2005.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DEIDRE A. LEE, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR FOR FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY.

ROSINA M. BIERBAUM, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

L. BRITT SNIDER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SCOTT E. THOMAS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 2003.

DARRYL R. WOLD, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 2001.

DAVID M. MASON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 2003.

KARL J. SANDSTROM, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 2001.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

JONATHAN H. SPALTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

HUGH Q. PARMER, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CAROLYN H. BECRAFT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

RUBY BUTLER DEMESME, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

PATRICK T. HENRY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

DIANE D. BLAIR, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2004.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

KELLEY S. COYNER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

RITAJEAN HARTUNG BUTTERWORTH, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2004.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 56A:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TIMOTHY W. JOSIAH, x...

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. GEORGE W. KEEFE, x...

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. RICHARD C. COSGRAVE, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROGER G. DEKOK, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN W. HANDY, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. NICHOLAS B. KEHOE, III, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MAXWELL C. BAILEY, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. PHILLIP J. FORD, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RONALD C. MARCOTTE, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AS CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU, AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 10502:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RUSSELL C. DAVIS, x...

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD S. COLT, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

KEITH B. ALEXANDER, x...
 DORIAN T. ANDERSON, x...
 ELDON A. BARGEWELL, x...
 DAVID W. BARNO, x...
 WILLIAM H. BRANDENBURG, x...
 JOHN M. BROWN, III, x...
 PETER W. CHIARELLI, x...
 CLAUDE V. CHRISTIANSON, x...
 EDWARD L. DYER, x...
 WILLIAM F. ENGEL, x...
 BARBARA G. FAST, x...
 STEPHEN J. FERRELL, x...
 THOMAS R. GOEDKOOP, x...
 DENNIS E. HARDY, x...
 STEVEN R. HAWKINS, x...
 JOHN W. HOLLY, x...
 DAVID H. HUNTOON, JR., x...
 PETER T. MADSEN, x...
 JESUS A. MANGUAL, x...
 THOMAS G. MILLER, x...
 ROBERT W. MIXON, JR., x...
 VIRGIL L. PACKETT, II, x...
 DONALD D. PARKER, x...
 ELBERT N. PERKINS, x...
 JOSEPH F. PETERSON, x...
 DAVID H. PETRAEUS, x...
 MARILYN A. QUAGLIOTTI, x...
 MAYNARD S. RHOADES, x...
 VELMA L. RICHARDSON, x...
 MICHAEL D. ROCHELLE, x...
 JOE G. TAYLOR, JR., x...
 NATHANIEL R. THOMPSON, III, x...
 ALAN W. THRASHER, x...
 JAMES D. THURMAN, x...
 THOMAS R. TURNER, II, x...
 JOHN M. URIAS, x...
 MICHAEL A. VANE, x...
 LLOYD T. WATERMAN, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT F. FOLEY, x...

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. DALE R. BARBER, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT T. DAIL, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT A. COCROFT, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LEON J. LAPORTE, x...

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES M. LINK, x...

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. EDMUND C. ZYSK, [X]

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM J. DAVIES, [X]
COL. JAMES P. COMBS, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. JOHN N. ABRAMS, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID H. OHLE, [X]

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. PAUL J. GLAZAR, [X]
BRIG. GEN. JOHN R. GROVES, JR., [X]
BRIG. GEN. DAVID T. HARTLEY, [X]
BRIG. GEN. LLOYD E. KRASE, [X]
BRIG. GEN. BENNETT C. LANDRENEAU, [X]
BRIG. GEN. BENNY M. PAULINO, [X]
BRIG. GEN. JEAN A. ROMNEY, [X]
BRIG. GEN. ALLEN E. TACKETT, [X]

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD W. AVERITT, [X]
COL. DANIEL P. COFFEY, [X]
COL. HOWARD A. DILLON, JR., [X]
COL. BARRY A. GRIFFIN, [X]
COL. LARRY D. HAUB, [X]
COL. ROBERT J. HAYES, [X]
COL. LAWRENCE F. LAFRENZ, [X]
COL. VICTOR C. LANGFORD, III, [X]
COL. THOMAS P. MANGINO, [X]
COL. DENNIS C. MERRILL, [X]
COL. WALTER A. PAULSON, [X]
COL. ROBLEY S. RIGDON, [X]
COL. KENNETH B. ROBINSON, [X]
COL. ROY M. UMBARGER, [X]
COL. JIMMY R. WATSON, [X]
COL. PAUL H. WIECK, [X]

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. EMILIO DIAZ-COLON, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. EDWARD G. ANDERSON, III, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. THOMAS A. SCHWARTZ, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624(C):

To be brigadier general, judge advocate general's corps

COL. THOMAS J. ROMIG, [X]

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. BRUCE W. PIERATT, [X]

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PETER A. C. LONG, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5142:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ANDERSON B. HOLDERBY, JR., [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHAEL E. FINLEY, [X]
CAPT. GWILYM H. JENKINS, JR., [X]
CAPT. JAMES A. JOHNSON, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES F. AMERHAULT, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL L. COWAN, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOSEPH S. MOBLEY, [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. EDWARD MOORE, JR., [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN W. CRAINE, JR., [X]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. HERBERT A. BROWNE, JR., II, [X]

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ALBERT K. ADAR, AND ENDING JERRY L. WILPER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 15, 1998.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING HEDY C. PINKERTON, AND ENDING PHILIP M. SHUE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 7, 1998.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOHN J. ABBATELLO, AND ENDING MICHEL P. ZUMWALT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 7, 1998.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOHAN K. AHN, AND ENDING CLORINDA K. ZAWACKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 1998.

ARMY NOMINATION ANGELA D. MEGGS, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 15, 1998.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING KEVIN C. ABBOTT, AND ENDING MARK G. ZIEMBA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 7, 1998.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CELETHIA M. ABNER, AND ENDING SHANDA M. ZUGNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 7, 1998.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ROBERT D. BRANSON, AND ENDING WILLIAM B. WALTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 1998.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MARK A. ACKER, AND ENDING [X], WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 1998.

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER A. BUCKRIDGE, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 17, 1998.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. COLBURN, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 15, 1998.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING REGINALD H. BAKER, AND ENDING JAMES J. WITKOWSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 15, 1998.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MARK T. ACKERMAN, AND ENDING MARY J. ZUREY, WHICH NOMINATIONS

WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 22, 1998.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DAVID ABERNATHY, AND ENDING MICHAEL B. WITHAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 15, 1998.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING SANDERS W. ANDERSON, AND ENDING PAUL R. ZAMBITO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 15, 1998.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOHN S. ANDREWS, AND ENDING WILLIAM M. STEELE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 15, 1998.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING PAUL S. WEBB, AND ENDING WESLEY P. RITCHIE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 7, 1998.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KEVIN J. BEDFORD, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JULY 7, 1998.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DOUGLAS J. MCANENY, AND ENDING RICHARD A. MOHLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 1998.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on July 30, 1998, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

AIR FORCE

DARYL L. JONES, OF FLORIDA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE SHEILA WIDNALL, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON OCTOBER 22, 1997.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

TADD JOHNSON, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE CHAIR OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS, VICE HAROLD A. MONTEAU, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JULY 31, 1997, AND SEPTEMBER 2, 1997.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

CARDELL COOPER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE ELLIOTT PEARSON LAWS, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1997.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 31, 1998

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Friday, July 31. I further ask that when the Senate reconvenes on Friday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and the Senate then begin a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak up to 5 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. JEFFORDS. For the information of all Senators, when the Senate reconvenes on Friday, there will be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each. The Senate may also consider any executive or legislative items that may be cleared for action. The majority leader has announced there will be

no rollcall votes during Friday's session and would like to thank all Members for their cooperation this week and wishes them a restful and productive August break.

If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that

the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands

in adjournment until 10 a.m., Friday, July 31, 1998.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:05 p.m., adjourned until Friday, July 31, 1998.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 30, 1998

The House met at 1 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.
July 30, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable JO ANN EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend W. Douglas Tanner, Jr., Faith & Politics Institute, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, we come before You this day with hearts still heavy from the tragic events of last Friday. Even as we begin to heal, we are conscious that the pain of this week has been seared into our souls.

And yet, in our sorrow and vulnerability, we have deeply experienced our common humanity. Fierce political adversaries have reached out to each other. Mutual respect and genuine appreciation have been accorded across the lines of party, ideology and station. We have known in our hearts that every elected official, every police person, every staff member, every tourist is, first, a fellow human being. For that we are grateful.

We pray that a constant awareness of each other's humanity in this often fractious Capitol Hill community might become the lasting legacy of officers J.J. Chestnut and John Gibson. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT 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 had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3152. An act to provide that certain volunteers at private nonprofit food banks are not employees for purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

The message also announced that the Senate passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the human rights and humanitarian situation facing the women and girls of Afghanistan.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1260) "An Act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to limit the conduct of securities class actions under State law, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. DODD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute messages from each side.

RESPONSIBLE GAMING EDUCATION WEEK, AUGUST 3 TO AUGUST 7

(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, as Members of Congress, we should always be encouraged when the private sector tackles one of the social problems facing our Nation. Such is the case with the Nation's gaming industry. However, a vast majority of Americans who choose to gamble do so responsibly.

In an effort to emphasize the casino gaming entertainment industry's commitment to responsible gaming, the American Gaming Association, along with International Gaming Tech-

nology, a company headquartered in my district, has designated August 3 through August 7 as Responsible Gaming Education Week. This campaign was designed to raise the awareness of disordered gaming and to educate casino employees and customers about the importance of responsible gaming.

During this week, all casino employees will be asked to actively promote responsible gaming practices within their companies. As part of this effort, over 200,000 educational brochures on disordered gambling and the importance of responsible gaming will be provided to casino employees across America.

THE QUESTIONABLE VALUE OF NEW GOVERNMENT STUDIES

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, a new government study says if you are rich, you will live longer. If you are educated, you will live longer. If you do not smoke, you will probably live longer. If you can avoid cancer, you will live longer.

No kidding, Sherlock. After \$1 million, our government is telling us what Grandma told us years ago: If you smoke, you will probably die; if you do not get an education, you are not going to get a job; and if you do not have a job, you are going to be poor and you are not going to eat.

Beam me up. What is next? Do we give these people more millions to tell us if you commit suicide, you will not live long? If there is any consolation to poor people in America who happen to smoke and do not have a job, I never heard of anybody committing suicide by jumping out of a basement window. There is some dignity in poverty. Poor people are God's people, too.

Madam Speaker, I think we should slow down the money for these scientific mind-benders.

GRENADA'S INVITATION TO CASTRO DENIES PAST MARXIST OPPRESSION AND AMERICAN SACRIFICES

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, in 1983, 19 American soldiers gave their lives to liberate the island of Grenada from the Marxist regime which,

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

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

under the manipulation of the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro, had taken over that small nation. Thanks to U.S. troops and the leadership of President Ronald Reagan, the people of Grenada regained the freedom they had lost to the puppet regime backed by Castro.

Now it seems that the government of Grenada has forgotten about the repression imposed upon their Nation by Castro and has invited the dictator to visit the island this weekend. Castro's goal in this visit is to obtain support for his regime's membership to the Caribbean economic community, CARICOM, that will help him attain new financial resources to maintain in power.

How tragic that the government of Grenada has turned its back on its own people, who suffered under the Castro-sponsored Marxist regime. It has ignored and forgotten the 19 dead U.S. soldiers and the 115 wounded American patriots. Shame on the government of Grenada.

ONLY PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ENSURES A GOOD EDUCATION FOR EVERY AMERICAN CHILD

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

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, recently President Clinton vetoed the Education Savings Account Bill. In a letter to the House, he justified his action by calling the bill's provisions "bad education policy and bad tax policy."

Madam Speaker, how ironic. Americans have made it clear that parental involvement is essential to ensure our children receive a good education. Yet our President just vetoed a bill that would have extended tax relief to families who take part in the education of our Nation's children.

The Education Savings Account Bill would have offered parents the opportunity to save money in accounts that earn tax-free interest to pay for tuition, books and tools to help their children learn. It seems to me, by the President's veto, that he thinks parents and families do not deserve the right to take part in the education of their children.

Madam Speaker, the President is wrong. Only when we allow parental involvement can we ensure a good education is within the reach of every child in America.

WICKER AMENDMENT TO SHAYS-MEEHAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROPOSAL ALLOWS STATES TO REQUIRE PROPER IDENTIFICATION FOR VOTERS

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

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, later today Members will be given the opportunity to support a commonsense reform amendment to the Shays-Meehan campaign finance proposal. In far too many States and districts across this country, ineligible persons are voting. People are going to the polls without identification, and it turns out they are not eligible to vote.

Despite the resources and technology available to our government, cases of voter fraud continue to be brought to our attention year after year. My amendment simply permits States to require a valid photo identification before receiving a ballot; nothing more, nothing less. This is not a mandate. It grants permission to the States in the true sense of Federalism.

Madam Speaker, it is our duty as elected officials to preserve the integrity of the electoral process. Requiring proper ID is one step we can take to ensure valid elections.

THE DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT

(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, I rise today to focus on the schoolchildren of our Nation. Parents in all 50 States are concerned that their children's classrooms are overcrowded, that their kids do not receive enough individual attention from their teachers, that classrooms are not yet connected to the Internet and many schools are not safe and well-supplied, and that basic academics are not being effectively learned.

For 30 years, the Federal Government has been trying to improve America's schools by creating big Federal programs. While the goal was admirable, this strategy has failed the schoolchildren of America. It is time for a new approach.

We know that effective teaching takes place when we begin helping children master basic academics, when parents are engaged and involved in their children's education, when a safe and orderly learning environment is created in a classroom, and when dollars actually reach the classroom.

The Dollars to the Classroom Act addresses the linchpin of these four key education premises, directing dollars to the classroom so that a teacher that knows the name of your child can educate more effectively.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to improve the education of America's kids by supporting the Dollars to the Classroom Act.

PROVIDING SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 507 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 507

Resolved,

SECTION 1. APPLICATION.

This resolution shall apply to the investigation by the Committee on Education and the Workforce into the administration of labor laws by Government agencies, including the Departments of Labor and Justice, concerning the International Brotherhood of the Teamsters, and other related matters.

SEC. 2. HANDLING OF INFORMATION.

Information obtained under the authority of this resolution shall be—

(1) considered as taken in the District of Columbia as well as at the location actually taken; and

(2) considered as taken in executive session by the subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

SEC. 3. DISPOSITION AND INTERROGATORIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the committee, may—

(1) order the taking of depositions or interrogatories anywhere within the United States, under oath and pursuant to notice or subpoena; and

(2) designate a member or staff of the committee to conduct any such proceeding.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, strike "staff, or contractor" and insert "or staff".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the half-hour of time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Madam Speaker, this resolution providing special investigative authority for the Committee on Education and the Workforce was introduced on July 21, 1998, by our good chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BILL GOODLING), and the members of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

The resolution applies its authority only to the investigation by the Committee on Education and the Workforce into the administration of labor laws by government agencies, including the Departments of Labor and Justice, concerning the International Brotherhood

of Teamsters and other related matters; let me repeat that, "and other related matters," not "other matters," but "other related matters."

This resolution allows the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, after consultation with the ranking minority member, to order the taking of depositions or interrogatories anywhere within the United States under oath and pursuant to notice of subpoena.

Madam Speaker, the resolution further allows the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, after consultation with the ranking minority member, to designate a single member or staff of the committee to conduct depositions.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the resolution considers information taken under this new authority as taken in executive session by the Committee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Madam Speaker, as the Members are aware, clause 2(h)(1) of House Rule XI requires two members to be present to take testimony or receive evidence in a committee. In order to allow a single member or staff designated by the chairman to receive evidence, it is necessary for the House to approve a resolution of this nature.

Madam Speaker, the Committee on Rules is generally hesitant to depart from the House rules, which properly assigns responsibility to Members of the House to take testimony and receive evidence. That is the normal rule of the House. However, extenuating circumstances dictate the need for this resolution today.

Madam Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce has indicated that some 40 witnesses must be deposed, and there are a scant few legislative days remaining in this session. As we know, a week from tomorrow we go off on a 4-week break for a work period back home in our districts, and then we return around September 9, and will be in session for about 10 or 12 more legislative days before we adjourn sine die for the year.

Madam Speaker, the chairman of that committee and several active members of the subcommittee conducting the investigation have testified before the Committee on Rules that they are encountering resistance to their legitimate inquiry from some potential targets of the investigation.

□ 1315

Madam Speaker, attorneys for the Teamsters, and other potential witnesses as well in this investigation, have written to the subcommittee and indicated their refusal to comply with requests for voluntary interviews. In order then to understand the context of the documents already received by the

subcommittee, it is necessary to depose these individuals.

So, Madam Speaker, this resolution is consistent with precedents from former Democrat and Republican control of the House, and a number of important safeguards have been included. The Committee on Education and the Workforce has adopted a new committee rule, which we insisted on before we gave them this new deposition authority, which sets forth appropriate procedures for how the staff depositions will be conducted, including provisions for notice, minority protections, and the rights of witnesses.

Madam Speaker, I would also note for the record that the information obtained under the authority of this resolution is considered as taken in executive session by the committee. That is very important. In order to release such information, again under normal rules of the House, clause 2(K)(7) of House Rule XI says that a committee vote is required.

Madam Speaker, the Committee on Rules believes that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has demonstrated a compelling need for the authority provided by this resolution, and it is my belief that they will exercise it judiciously. We have a great deal of faith and a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) of the full committee, and I know that he and his committee, and the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA) of the subcommittee, will certainly act in a judicious manner, and we trust them to do that. So, I urge support for the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time. As my colleague has said and explained, this resolution will give authority to the staff of the Committee on Education and the Workforce to take depositions in connection with the committee's investigation into the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Madam Speaker, I must oppose this resolution, because it grants unnecessary authority for an investigation of questionable necessity. The standing rules of the House give deposition authority to committees as long as two Members are present. And since the rule was enacted in 1955, until the beginning of the 104th Congress, it has been the practice not to grant additional authority, except in cases of grave importance to the Nation. If we pass this resolution, it will be the third exception since 1996.

There is a question whether this authority is needed at all for the com-

mittee to obtain documents and testimony for the investigation. The Teamsters have already supplied the committee more than 50,000 documents. They have expressed in writing that they are willing to participate fully in public hearings of the committee, even without the force of subpoena. However, they do have grave and justified concerns with secret, behind-closed-doors witness interviews.

There is a question whether this whole investigation is needed. The Teamsters are already the subject of a full investigation by the U.S. Justice Department. That is their job. They already have the staff and the resources and the authority in place. I am disturbed that the committee has already spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on this investigation instead of on other, much higher priority concerns within the jurisdiction of the committee, such as the education of our children.

There is a question about whether this is an appropriate delegation of responsibility to staff. We, the Members of the House, are the elected officials entrusted with the authority to conduct investigations. This is not an authority we should delegate so quickly.

Finally, there is a question whether this authority creates opportunity for abuse of the powers of Congress to meddle in the matters of private individuals and organizations. Let us remember that the standing House rule on investigations was enacted to curb the abuses of the McCarthy era.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce requested this authority, saying it would be easier to obtain testimony and documents. The purpose of the House rules should not be to make our jobs easier. The House rules should promote democracy, preserve individual freedom, and keep the long arm of the government from stifling liberty.

Madam Speaker, I have too many questions about this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the resolution and vote no on granting unnecessary powers for unnecessary investigations.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just recall to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), my good friend, that giving this temporary exception to the rules is not to make jobs easier or life easier for Members of Congress. Rather, it is to get the job done. It is to follow through with due diligence. That is why we are very careful to give out this kind of authority.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from York, Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the person we are placing our trust in and who I hope

is going to visit me up in Saratoga during the month of August.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for yielding me this time, and I want to echo what the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, just said. We really owe it to the rank and file of the Teamsters to complete this as expeditiously as we possibly can, and therefore need this deposition authority in order to do that.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce is examining the failed 1996 election of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and related matters, including financial mismanagement at the union and possible manipulation of its pension fund.

Although the subcommittee's investigation has established a good foundation, its progress is increasingly slowed by obstructionist tactics of the IBT, including the refusal to allow interviews of relevant witnesses. We have been forced to issue subpoenas for documents to 14 organizations, most of whom refused to voluntarily provide information to the subcommittee at direction of the IBT. Subpoenas have also been issued to seven witnesses to secure their testimony at the subcommittee's public hearing.

Furthermore, the IBT has steadfastly refused on numerous occasions over the last 4 months to allow subcommittee investigators to interview current IBT employees and employees of its actuarial and accounting firms. IBT has even objected to the subcommittee interviewing former IBT employees.

To thoroughly and professionally examine outstanding issues, the investigation needs the authority to have designated staff conduct depositions. There are more than three dozen witnesses whose testimony would substantially further the investigation and who may have to be deposed. Much of this would be lengthy, detailed questioning which is not possible in a committee hearing. Some of it would also be very technical. Some of the depositions may have to be conducted after Congress adjourns for the year. All of it is needed if the investigation is to continue and make progress.

I want to ensure my colleagues that the authority granted through this resolution has safeguards to ensure that it is used appropriately. First, the authority is granted to the chairman of the full committee and can be used only in connection with the Teamsters investigation.

Second, information obtained under deposition authority is considered as having been taken in executive session by the subcommittee. That makes the information confidential and subject to the protocol under which the investigation is being conducted, a protocol which was agreed to by the minority.

Madam Speaker, the Committee on Education and the Workforce has judi-

ciously adopted rules to assure proper use of deposition authority. We will provide for bipartisan participation in depositions. The ranking minority member will receive 3 business days' written notice before any deposition is taken, no matter where he may be, and all Members will receive 3 business days' written notice that a deposition has been scheduled. Finally, our proposed committee rules provide for various rights for witnesses, including the right to counsel.

This resolution is well planned and will be implemented with care. Deposition authority is a tool that will enable the Teamsters investigation to unravel the improprieties associated with the 1996 IBT election so they do not recur. It will also shed light on mismanagement and financial improprieties so that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters can become more responsive to its members.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support rank-and-file Teamsters Union members and join me in voting for H. Res. 507.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the ranking minority member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the proposed change in rules and regulations and procedures. In my estimation, a decision to grant deposition authority to the Committee on Education and the Workforce would be unwise, unwarranted, and a radical break with House tradition and practices, and a very real threat to the civil liberties and privacy rights of American citizens.

The new deposition authority is virtually unlimited in scope and duration. It permits the majority to engage in an unprecedented fishing expedition, even during the summer recess of this House.

The chairman is seeking to acquire an extraordinary array of powers. With the stroke of a pen, he could summon to this Congress any American citizen for secret, under oath, behind-closed-doors interrogation. I am sure that the confidential testimony that our chairman just described will then either be officially, or through leaks, made public.

Any citizen who is not frightened by this scenario should be, particularly given the very clear record of investigatory abuse by the Republican majority in this House. To place the Republicans' proposal in a fair historical context, I would remind the Members of this House that such a sweeping power has been assumed by this body or by the Senate very rarely and only under the most compelling of circumstances. Only when faced with

grave accusations of government wrongdoing or with threats to our national security has this body deemed it necessary to assume a power which traditionally resides in the judicial branch of government.

Madam Speaker, there is no compelling reasons for this authority. I ask why is it necessary to depose 40 witnesses in secret session? Not one Teamster has refused a subpoena before this committee. Not one Teamster has refused to come before the committee and testify under oath and in public. There is nothing concerning fraudulent pension matters that has surfaced before this committee. And if there were, this committee does not have the expertise or the resources or the commitment to do anything about it.

Madam Speaker, I tell my colleagues that in this instance it is difficult to view the majority's proposal as anything other than a cynical power grab, a partisan fishing expedition, a concerted attack on organized labor, and an invitation to abuse innocent American citizens.

This investigation, which has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and dragged on for nearly a year, has been a shameful waste of time and money and an embarrassment to this institution. It is simply disingenuous for Republicans on the Committee on Education and the Workforce to claim that their failure to produce any new or relevant information regarding the 1996 Teamsters election is due to a lack of authority.

The problem is that the story they wish to tell, one of widespread, systematic corruption throughout the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, is one of fiction. No amount of snooping, interrogating, or wishful thinking will make it otherwise. This is simply too awesome a power, especially when considering that the chairman of the committee already has unilateral authority to issue subpoenas.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate Chairman GOODLING's words of assurance that committee Democrats will be involved in the deposition process and that other safeguards will be constructed around the proceedings. But with all due respect to my good friend, the past record of Republicans ignoring the rights of the minority on this committee does not speak well for such assurances.

We were given the same guarantees regarding consultation and notice when the chairman appropriated the power to unilaterally issue subpoenas.

□ 1330

Those promises have been consistently, routinely and casually broken. Perhaps most disturbing is the majority's proposal to allow staff who are not attorneys to conduct sworn depositions. The very thought is mind-boggling, American citizens being drugged

into this little star chamber to be interrogated under oath in secret by staff who are not bound by or trained in the Code of Legal Ethics. This is an open invitation for abuse and for the violation of legitimate legal and constitutional rights.

Legal proceedings should be conducted by those trained in the law, not by laymen. Testimony before Congress should be in a public arena for American citizens to judge guilt or innocence for themselves. I urge my colleagues to oppose this unwise and dangerous amendment to the rules of the House.

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

I would just like to point out to the previous speaker, who is the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, that the Committee on Rules has the responsibility of assigning the responsibilities and jurisdiction of committees.

We all know that the Committee on the Judiciary is primarily involved in looking into the legal code and the criminal law of the land. The Committee on Education and the Workforce has primary responsibility to look into labor issues and has oversight of the laws particularly as they pertain to pensions.

I know, I have worked for many years on the Social Security issue and the abuses that take place in the fiduciary accounts in Social Security. But here we have rank and file members of the Teamsters Union, and they want to know where their money went to and what happened.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PARKER).

Mr. PARKER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 507, which would provide for deposition authority for the Teamsters investigation.

I am the newest member of the committee, and one reason I joined this committee was because of my interest in the investigation. I was appalled that the 1996 election of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters had to be invalidated. I have a keen interest in ensuring a fair rerun election.

To protect the rank and file members of the Union, we have to have a thorough accounting of what went wrong with the 1996 election. It is also in their interest and that of other American taxpayers that financial mismanagement at the Union be cleaned up.

I was shocked to learn, when I joined the committee, that the investigation does not have deposition authority. It was evident to me from the beginning of my involvement that that is a critical investigative tool without which the investigation will have little chance of success.

Over the past few weeks alone, we have had instance after instance of the

Teamsters Union refusing to make critical witnesses available for interviews. The lawyers for the Union do not want us to talk to current or former employees of the Union or to employees of the Union's actuarial and accounting firms.

As just one example, on July 9, we received a letter from an attorney for the Teamsters' accounting firm informing us that the Union refuses to allow such interviews. It is evident to me that the officials of the Union are deliberately impeding the investigation and are trying to run out the clock on this Congress.

It is completely unrealistic to expect that Members of Congress will make themselves available to hold hearings to interview the more than three dozen witnesses from whom we need information. Unless the investigation receives deposition authority through the committee chairman, we are basically telling the Union officials that they have won, that they need not account for their actions either to their own membership or to the American public.

Madam Speaker, this authority will not be taken lightly. It will be used carefully. I understand what may be the reluctance of some Members of the House to provide extraordinary authority, but these are extraordinary circumstances which call for appropriate measures.

Madam Speaker, I urge approval of H. Res. 507.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 507.

I serve, Madam Speaker, as the ranking member on the subcommittee that has responsibility for oversight and investigation in the Committee on Education and the Workforce. This investigation on the Teamsters Union election, which was set aside because of the illegal swapping of funds, began last October, and it has sort of limped along.

The majority members have a full staff of, I do not know quite how many individuals there are now on board, but I am told that there are at least five or six attorneys that have been engaged to work on this particular investigation. I have tried to be diligent in paying attention to the agenda, to the hearings that have been called and to all of the communications that have emanated from the majority chair of this subcommittee.

So I rise with great amazement today to hear that there is any justification whatsoever in asking this House for these extraordinary powers that invade the privacy of many individuals. We are going to put, because of some whim on the majority side, many individuals whose names are not even known to even myself as the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, who

these persons are who have been reluctant to come before their staff for questioning or for discussions. Certainly I do not know of any Teamster member who has been asked for an interview who has not come before the subcommittee under subpoena to testify.

In every instance the Teamster members who declined these personal, closed-door discussions invited the subpoenas because what they wanted and what is their right in these United States is to come before bodies that are accusing them of misconduct to have their testimony taken in public.

What is so offensive about this rule today is an authority which is going to be granted to a very small number of individuals. These depositions could be held without one single Member of Congress present, because that is how the resolution reads. No Member needs to be there because of the word "or," member or staff.

Sure, I could be notified 3 days in advance that a deposition is going to take place during our district recess period when I am in Hawaii. I fully intend to do everything I can to be there, but I cannot guarantee that protection to these individual witnesses who are going to be deposed in this way, not by attorneys who know the rule of law, who know the rule of evidence, who respect the rights of privacy and privilege in this country, but by staff, who I do not say are going to have any ill temper or ill will but who might mistakenly invade into the high privileges which every Member of this Congress has sworn under oath to preserve. That is what is our constitutional right here.

I respect the millions of members in the Teamsters Union, and I want to do what is right for them. But I have not heard one single allegation of a reluctant witness who is not willing to come before the public, take an oath and testify to any question that this committee wants to put to them.

I believe that that is a right which is precious and should be protected by this House, and that is why the rule says we cannot depose unless the whole House agrees to it.

So I ask the Members today to search the record. There is no evidence of reluctant witnesses who have refused to come before the committee to testify. I think that that is the most important grounds upon which any such rule like this has to be premised.

I know most Members of the majority party are very much committed to the preservation of individual rights and democracy and freedom and civil liberties. What we are doing today is to trash all of that because of a political agenda.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

If my colleagues want to see an example of deposition authority and power being abused, look no further than what this Congress has done in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. People are subpoenaed for depositions. They are forced to come against their will, hire lawyers at \$300 an hour.

I just want Members to know this is not theoretical. I have seen people have to go hire lawyers, take time off from work, prepare for these depositions, go through the anxiety of it all to be questioned by staff people.

Just a couple days ago, we had a deposition in Los Angeles of one of these four people that we gave immunity to. It started at 1:00. It went until 8:30. This witness had almost nothing to say.

We have had staff people ask witnesses about their personal lives, whether they have ever been tested for drug abuse. We had one witness in a deposition who was asked whether they could tell about a colleague, whether that colleague had done something illegal.

This power can be abused. If there are hearings, at least the public will know what is asked. But if they are depositions, it is a staff person who can abuse that power, run roughshod over the rights of Americans by allowing them to, in closed door session, be asked any kind of question.

Be wary whenever we give deposition authority. In some cases, it is appropriate, but we know it can be abused because we have seen it abused in this Congress already.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Speaker, I know that all Members on the majority are always very cognizant of their responsibilities to protect individual rights. They are firm against big government coming in and intruding in this way, so I am personally shocked at this reckless venture into the invasion of these individuals. Forty people whose names I do not even know, and I am the ranking member, I do not know of any abuse with regard to the pension funds that has come to the attention of our subcommittee.

This is really a fishing expedition, reckless disregard of individuals who are going to have to hire attorneys at tremendous cost to themselves. We are not prepared to pay for it. I want to see the individual rights of this Union protected; and, if we really believe in their democracy and their individual rights to run their Union, by golly, we ought to allow them to have an election for their leadership.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I will just say to the gentlewoman that, yes, the rights of the Union should be protected; but, even more so, so should the individual rights of the individual rank and file members of that Union.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NOR-

WOOD), who has never won a green jacket in the Masters but has won my deep respect for the job he has done as a Congressman.

Mr. NORWOOD. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, let us take a look at the record. Let us take a look at the judge who has had supervision of the consent decree for the last 9 years, since 1989. How does he feel about the Teamsters and Teamster leadership in 1998? Here is what he said to the Teamster lawyers in court on Tuesday:

"I believe it is time for the good members of this Union to rise up in revolt. This Union has been run by a small group for their own benefit. I want to hear what the membership thinks. It is time for the good members to rise up and revolt against the self-serving, little men in charge."

To the attorney, "You don't really speak for the Union. You speak for a small minority," Edelman told Weich. "I can understand the wrath of Congress. They don't trust the Teamsters because of the Union's history of squandering taxpayer money. I'm going to get to the root of this evil. And if you don't have Sever here by noon, I will send the marshals for him."

□ 1345

The same type of stonewalling that this union leadership is imposing in New York in the Federal court is the same pattern of stonewalling that they are doing to this congressional committee, and the shame of it is we have funded this union and we have spent approximately \$20 million and this is their thank you to the American taxpayer.

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 507. I would say to my friend from California when it comes to being abused perhaps that we ought to be concerned a minute or two about the taxpayers of this country that have been abused to the tune of \$20 million. Maybe we ought to be concerned about the members of the Teamsters Union that have been abused to the point where their treasury reduced from \$155 million down to less than \$1 million. There are all kind of things and people we ought to be concerned about in their abuse and our point of view in the oversight committee and our job in the oversight committee is to find out what went wrong in these illegal elections.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce needs deposition authority because the Carey administration at the Teamsters is stonewalling our investigation. It is just sort of that simple. Now, that is an unfortunate situation, but Congress has a duty, a con-

stitutional duty to investigate a union that tramples its members' rights and flouts the very laws we have passed in this body.

Our investigation has been going on for almost a year now. We are starting to get the picture of how this union has been run. Frankly, Madam Speaker, it is not very pretty. The most recent development, of course, is that the president of the Teamsters, Ron Carey, has been barred from the union for life as has his former government affairs director William Hamilton. That is not fiction. In an election that cost the American taxpayers almost \$20 million, Carey took his members' dues to pay for his reelection campaign. Clearly he was more interested in keeping his job than protecting the rank-and-file Teamster.

The record of evidence compiled by the subcommittee thus far indicates that the Carey administration also may have manipulated the union's pension funds. That is serious stuff. Notice I said "may have." We need to know for sure whether we are right or wrong. And may have made political contributions with their members' dues, which is very illegal. Obviously we need to interview all of the Teamsters employees and contractors involved in these matters to find out the extent of these problems and do our duty.

Do the people running the Teamsters Union now, who were elected in a sham election, want us to get to the bottom of this? No. No, unfortunately not. They will not allow us to interview their employees, their accountants or their actuaries about the financial shenanigans that did go on. What are they trying to hide?

I will say this about the unelected people in charge of the Teamsters today. They do have a lot of gall. Not only do they refuse to let this Congress do its job by performing an oversight investigation, but they turn around and say, "You've got to pay for the next election." They will not let Congress find out how the election went wrong, but they will come to us and demand that we kick in another \$10 million so they can have another election.

I for one frankly have had enough of this, of the Carey administration's stonewalling. We need to pass this resolution today so that Congress can find out what they are trying to hide from. Union officials that misuse the hard-earned dues money of their members should not be allowed to thumb their nose at this Congress.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, first I would like to insert in the RECORD the transcript later in that proceedings where Mr. Sever did appear in court and the judge indicated that he could not order the IBT to pay for the election.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN
DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PLAINTIFF
V.
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS,
ET AL.,
DEFENDANTS

July 29, 1998, 12 p.m.

(Hearing resumed)

(In open court)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

The first item I will discuss is my request for a referendum. When I made that request, I had in mind that it was completely for the benefit of IBT. I call your attention to an item in their memorandum, which is very convincing and persuasive. The GEB's decision is consistent with the Court's statement on the record on June 29, 1998 that voluntary payment by IBT officers of the costs of supervision would be a "breach of a fiduciary relationship and something that is forbidden actually to do by law."

The thought occurred to me that the union could send a message to the IBT hierarchy that they would agree and it would not be considered by them a breach of a fiduciary relationship if they were voluntarily to agree to contribute some money to a rerun election. However, the memorandum is very persuasive that the cost and the effort involved in such an undertaking would be futile. So my good intention has come practically to naught.

I did say that voluntary contributions by the IBT in light of the decision by the Court of Appeals, dissent noted, would be a violation of their trust. Again, I repeat ad nauseam that it occurred to me that if they had a word from the membership that they would not be held to such an account they could then go ahead and make voluntary payments. So my request for a referendum is no longer in order. I am sorry it did not work out the way I thought it might.

I still am of the opinion, although I am not sure that I have the authority to order it, that instead of a referendum a poll of a very small but vital universe of 500 would give some indication to the hierarchy whether contributions could be made without being in default of their duty. I leave that to the entire discretion of the union itself.

Now let me address some verities. I think we all know that of all the many cases that are filed in this court and, indeed, in all the courts in all the land, if all those cases were to go to trial, the system would come to a creaking halt. Certainly it is not new news for you as practicing lawyers to know that compromises and agreements occur even after verdicts for a plaintiff and a defendant. And it also is not great news for you to understand that when one files an appeal, every effort is made by an instrument of that court to resolve the issue before the need of the decision.

I think common sense ought to be considered here. Is it your view that an unsupervised election does not have to put in place any assurance, any guarantee, any rules to demonstrate that a nonsupervised election will still be a democratic election, a free election, and that every effort will be made in a nonsupervised election, of which there have been many in the history of this union, that such an election should not raise any concern or fears that corruption would become the order of the day?

That is my concern. As I said, an unsupervised election sounds more fearsome than it

can actually be. And what I want here today, and I took the liberty of asking Mr. Sever, a member of the executive team, to come and see if I can employ reason and amicability and some stability to a problem that should be settled, does this unsupervised election, and I am intending to go ahead with that, mean that I have to be concerned with chaos?

Mr. WEICH: Your Honor, I'm quite confident that an unsupervised election would not be chaotic. Almost every union in the country conducts an unsupervised election under federal labor law. And, of course, this union is additionally bound by the consent decree and its own constitution. I am very confident that safeguards would be in place to insure that corruption does not occur and that the election is carried out in an open and democratic manner.

THE COURT: Would a supervised election give more assurance of orderly procedure? Would it relieve us of certain, perhaps unrealistic, apprehensions that the election would go forward in a more orderly process?

Mr. WEICH: It's a very difficult question to answer under current circumstances. I can only say, your Honor, that the IBT supports the supervision process. We have said in every public statement and reiterate again today that we would like to see supervision. We insist, though, that the United States be made to meet its obligations under the consent decree to pay for that supervision if it is to occur.

THE COURT: Do you understand my reason for a referendum?

Mr. WEICH: I do understand.

THE COURT: I was trying to relieve you of the danger of irresponsibility in the event you voluntarily agreed to make contribution.

Mr. WEICH: I do understand that, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I thought the only way I could deal with that problem on your behalf and somewhat on the Court's behalf was to have the voice of the union say no, you will not be guilty of any betrayal of a fiduciary relationship if you make a voluntary contribution. That was my reason.

Mr. WEICH: I understand that.

THE COURT: And now that you have convinced me that there is no point to it, I withdraw that request.

Let's go on.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: Your Honor—

THE COURT: You say order the Congress to do something, in this case, to provide funds. Think about this clearly and analyze it. Here is this district court judge telling the mighty sovereign Congress, Do something. And if they say no, what is my next step? Dealing with an old truism, that no court should enter an order which ends up in futility, am I to say I am going to hold the entire Congress in contempt? To think about it shows it is absurd.

The same thing holds true, as I said, if I say to the government, Pay. It is your obligation. And if they say, We cannot, what do I do? Hold the United States of America in contempt? I do not think I could possibly survive that.

Now the focus here is, Oh, the Attorney General is not inhibited by anything that the committees have said about inhibiting the use of the funds. That is your interpretation. But if I were the Attorney General, I would want more to rely upon than an interpretation. It is not a matter of what we think the inhibition proscribes or what the Court may think or even what the government may think. But before I, as an Attor-

ney General, would be free to do ahead and make my interpretation that the government is free to use certain funds, I would want more assurance than that, than face possible contempt by the House Appropriations Committee.

I implore you, why can't we be reasonable about this? Why can't we continue to have a supervised election by some contribution?

Mr. WEICH: Your Honor, we continue—

THE COURT: Am I off the wall when I say probably in your own experience that you have entered into compromises even when a verdict has been in your favor?

Mr. WEICH: Yes, your Honor, that's certainly true. I can only observe that we still await word from the United States whether it is prepared to put any money into this process. It strikes me that on this record, given the union's history of being willing to compromise in the past, it's the decision that the Court of Appeals handed down that at this time would be appropriate for the government to state whether it has any money before the question is put to the union.

THE COURT: You mean money that is absolutely free and clear and under no restrictions?

Mr. WEICH: Yes. Well, your Honor, you know our position, that there is money that the Court could order the government to pay. Our position there is not an extraordinary one. It's often the case that a government agency tells a federal court that it believes it doesn't have authority to do something or doesn't believe it's required to do something, the Court orders that agency to do it. And, as always, the United States complies.

But my point, in response—

THE COURT: Let's assume you are right, and I do not see how your logic can stand up. I say to the government, Pay, and they say, We cannot, we do not have the funds, whether under restrictions or not. What do I do, hold the United States in contempt? Well, what do I do? I have issued an order. I have said to the government, Pay, and they have said, We cannot. What do I do? Where does that lead us?

Mr. WEICH: The first place it would lead us—

THE COURT: Did you ever hear of sovereign immunity?

Mr. WEICH: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Do you know what that means?

Mr. WEICH: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Who would I hold in contempt? U.S. of America, you are held in contempt. Oh? Either you comply or I will send you to jail. Who will I send to jail, the U.S. of America? Isn't that what a lawyer is supposed to unravel in his thinking when he makes an argument? Is that order that I make now silly? Who would I hold in contempt?

Mr. WEICH: Your Honor, I—

THE COURT: Who would I drag into court? Uncle Sam, who is the symbol of America? Who would I hold in contempt? The Appropriations Committee? The subcommittee? The entire House of Representatives? The entire Senate? Whom would I hold in contempt? Do I fill the jailhouse with all these dignified representatives of their constituents?

You know, thought is a very important process. It is easy enough to embark on ideas that are grandiose and win favor with a constituency, but you have got to parse it and analyze it. No court is supposed to enter an order which is futile.

I have been dealing with this specter. Maybe the symbol of America is Uncle Sam

and I will have Uncle Sam, I will even have his beard trimmed for television purposes, and I will put Uncle Sam in jail. The more you think of it, the less appealing it becomes. So unappealing that it is not even worth all the discussion and thought and sleepless nights I have given to this.

I have no hesitation where contempt is proper, and again I must remind you that contempt must be by trial to another judge. Do you know that?

Mr. WEICH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am sure my colleagues would applaud my effort to ask them to try a case of contempt against the United States of America. I think that should convince you that it is an idea whose time has now come.

Now, can't we deal with this the way lawyers do all the time? Try to reach some understanding and agreement. I have had many cases resolved after a verdict by 12 men and women, good and tried, who found in a civil case by a preponderance, in a criminal case beyond a reasonable doubt, some negotiation. Why can't we do that here? Is there a motive why there is so much obstinacy here and obduracy about coming to any understanding or realization?

Mr. WEICH: Your Honor, I ask again that you put the question to the United States if there is money.

THE COURT: What do I do if they say no? You beg the question. You are a lawyer. I have asked you a question. Give me some help. Who do I hold in contempt?

Mr. WEICH: I'm confident that if you put the question to Ms. Konigsberg whether the United States would obey a lawful order of this Court her answer would be yes, therefore contempt would be unnecessary. If contempt were necessary—

THE COURT: Is there a danger that I ought to consider sanctions against any lawyer who tries to bring an action or a cause that is absolutely absurd in its very, very root? Again, I have asked you ten times: Whom do I ask another judge to hold in contempt?

Mr. WEICH: If contempt were necessary—

THE COURT: Contempt is always necessary if an order is not obeyed.

Mr. WEICH: Yes. If contempt were necessary, your Honor, there are officers of the United States who stand in for the United States—

THE COURT: All the officers of the United States?

Mr. WEICH: No, Ms. Konigsberg—

THE COURT: Aren't you a little bit ashamed of your begging the question?

Mr. WEICH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That would be quite a newspaper item, having all the 50 states and their senators and representatives hauled to court and put to jail. That would be novel. Instead of history of the law, it would be the hysterics of the law.

Again, can I bring you to the peace table?

Mr. WEICH: Your Honor, we've been at the peace table. We ask whether the United States is intending to come to the peace table.

THE COURT: I want to hear from the United States. Shall I hold you in contempt?

Ms. KONIGSBERG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: As long as we are in the amusement circle, let me tell you my own personal experience, without much name. At one time in my career I was special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, a rather important job. There was a case before a very distinguished justice and he wanted the government to produce certain documents. I told the judge I did not have these documents, I did not have control

of them, I had never seen them, that they were exclusively in the possession of the Attorney General, who resided in Washington.

The judge gave me a brief period of time to produce those documents or to be held in contempt and possibly jailed.

I spoke to the Attorney General. I have never seen the documents. I did not know their relevance. I did not even know that they would lead to relevant evidence, and he said, You may not have them. And you must go before the court and say that I will not release them.

And then he said, with a broad Texas drawl, David, jail is not too bad at all. They feed you three meals a day.

Fortunately, the judge had some generosity and heart and did not hold me in contempt, which would certainly have hurt my career. He certainly did not jail me, but the documents were never produced and there was really nothing that he could do. That was my own personal experience.

I am, as the record will show, a very reluctant judge when it comes to dealing either with sanctions or with contempt because that has the very treacherous danger of doing substantial irreparable harm to a lawyer who might be more zealous than smart.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Let me first address the issue about whether or not it could be perceived as a breach of fiduciary duty for the union's leadership to agree to pay the costs, some of the costs, of the rerun election. It, in the government's view, would not be a breach of fiduciary duty and though the government supports the Court's idea of having a referendum, it would not take a referendum in order to reach that conclusion.

THE COURT: Wouldn't a poll do just as well? I have had some experience in that area. A poll could be done. A universe of 500 is sufficient. It could be done in two or three days.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: That is possible.

THE COURT: By telephone.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: That is possible, your Honor. But whether—irrespective of any referendum and irrespective of any poll, it cannot be considered a breach of the union's fiduciary duty to pay these costs, and let me explain why. Though I know the Court mentioned that at the prior hearing, I don't consider that a finding by this Court; that was not a matter that was briefed. The union indisputably is going to have to bear the cost anyway of an unsupervised election.

THE COURT: Has anybody an estimate of what that cost would be?

Ms. KONIGSBERG: I would like to know from the IBT what they project that cost to be. I mean, I would suspect it is at least the same amount of money, if not more so, than the amount of money that the union would pay if they share the costs of the election. I think it would be helpful if the Court, if we could inquire of the IBT what that would cost. But I would suspect it is, at a minimum, \$4 million for them to have to pay in any event if they have to conduct their own election.

Second of all, it is in the interests of the union membership to have a fair election and to have a supervised election. The union has said itself that they are in favor of a supervised election, and everybody here agrees that the best way to insure a fair, free, democratic election, that all the members and all the public can have confidence in, is to have election officer supervision. So regardless of the relative costs of an unsupervised election versus what they would contribute, the union leadership can decide that

this is something that's in the members' interests to have an independent, court-appointed election officer supervise this so that the union membership can be assured of having a fair, free, democratic election.

Really what this can be, I suppose, likened to is, is the union saying that it would refuse, in effect, if the government is able to secure the agreement of Congress to pay \$4 million, or plus, toward the cost of this rerun election supervised by an election officer, is the union saying that it would refuse to accept the government's money in order to be able to have a supervised election? Because we all agree that they're going to have to pay these costs anyway in an unsupervised election, and we all agree that the election officer supervision is necessary.

I mean, I would submit to the Court there is at least a question whether it could be perceived as a breach of fiduciary duty not to agree to pay the costs in order to have a supervised election. So, I think it would be helpful to take the question of a breach of fiduciary duty off the table here. I don't think there is any question that the union leadership can agree to pay this. What the Second Circuit's decision was about was whether the union could be obligated to pay.

THE COURT: The Second Circuit decision completely ignores the very powerful dissent, and although that dissent did not carry the day, it sends a powerful message. Nobody even refers to that. That is bad argument. The dissent did not carry the day. It did not persuade the majority. But it is a very powerful message and should not be ignored.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: We agree, your Honor. But even accepting the majority's opinion, which, of course, we accept, all it says is that the union cannot be compelled—

THE COURT: That's right.

Ms. KONIGSBERG [continuing]: Based on the misconduct. It does not say that the union voluntarily cannot agree. It also does not say the government is required to continue supervision. But it does not say that they cannot voluntarily agree. And it is clearly in the union members' interests, as the IBT has conceded, to have a supervised rerun election, so that it would not be a breach of fiduciary duty.

THE COURT: I brought you here, Mr. Sever, to lend a helping hand based on your long experience to resolve this problem. Maybe your lawyer will feel a little freer if he has some notion from you that you are willing to help.

Mr. SEVER: Your Honor—

THE COURT: You are no longer with the Mets, are you?

Mr. SEVER: Your Honor—

Mr. WEICH: It's Tom Sever, your Honor, not Tom Seaver.

Mr. SEVER: Your Honor, in due respect, you know, I must indicate that we do have a decision by the Second Circuit of the court. In light of that decision, I did proceed on to the general executive board on July the 20th, and the general executive board rejected to pay for any costs in light of that decision, and, you know, I believe that we ought to—I believe in the judicial system, your Honor. And I believe that we ought to abide by the courts and follow the appropriate procedures of appeal, if necessary. But certainly that's where we stand at this point, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. But I am asking you: Can you not consider that there may be some room for compromise and negotiations?

Mr. SEVER: If there would be any room for compromise, your Honor, I would be more than happy to take that back to our general executive board.

THE COURT: Will you do that, please.

Mr. SEVER: I would take a poll with the board. I would do that if we could have a compromise.

THE COURT: And will you also say it is my—

Mr. SEVER: Would you repeat.

THE COURT: It is my passionate desire to see that this matter be resolved.

Mr. SEVER: It would—I would like to see it resolved, your Honor. However, you know, with respect to my fiduciary responsibility as the general secretary-treasurer, and with the due respect of the cost that may be associated, I believe that, you know, if there could be some kind of a compromise, such as maybe sending out the ballots, that I might be able to recommend that. And that cost would be somewhere around \$2 million. I might be able to recommend that to the general executive board.

THE COURT: All right. That is something.

Mr. SEVER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you want to say anything? Did you want to say anything?

Mr. WEICH: No your Honor.

THE COURT: I want this election to go forward. We have had some delays and I think it is time to fish or cut bait.

Now, in anticipation that we are going to have an unsupervised election, will you please give me some details of how you plan this election to go. I think my inherent power in terms of my need to manage my own caseload suggests that I can require you to give me some view of your plans.

I also think that hope does spring eternal. I think that perhaps the Senate, by its appropriate committees and their wisdom, might decide to allow the Attorney General some freedom in the use of funds. I just do not know how we can urge them to come forward with a yes-or-no answer, but perhaps they will.

Is there anything else?

Ms. KONIGSBERG: Yes, your Honor.

As the government set forth in its papers, the government believes that the Court has the authority to set a plan for this election, particularly given that the IBT—

THE COURT: You know their argument about the plan that you suggested, that this is just a disguise, using rhetoric, but to accomplish exactly the same thing that would occur in the hands of the supervised election.

Isn't that your argument?

Mr. WEICH: Yes, your Honor.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: I'm aware of their argument, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have a chance to answer. I think your date is Monday.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: That's right, and we will respond to that on Monday, your Honor.

THE COURT: But the IBT makes a very persuasive argument that this is merely a camouflage and that the Court does not have inherent power to do anything by way of accepting a substitute monitored election.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: We will address that. We disagree.

THE COURT: That is the problem with appointing a special master.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: Your Honor, the government disagrees very strongly with that characterization; that is to say, that there can be no court-appointed election officer in the absence of a supervised election doesn't mean that you throw the baby out with the bath water and that all of the learning under the consent decree about how to have a democratic election—

THE COURT: I will read your papers and I will study your papers, and I hope to get another version of how an unsupervised election will proceed.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

Mr. CHERKASKY: Your Honor, just very briefly, if I might. We also feel strongly that any—

THE COURT: Keep your voice up. Everybody wants to hear you.

Mr. CHERKASKY [continuing]. That any contribution that would be made by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters would not be a breach of their fiduciary duty.

THE COURT: Would not be what?

Mr. CHERKASKY: A breach of their fiduciary duty. I think all the parties agree—

THE COURT: I was trying to give you some assurance that under no circumstances would they be crucified on the cross for the sustaining of the fiduciary relationship.

Mr. CHERKASKY: I understand that, Judge. Certainly, it's—I think they've taken out of context your remarks at previous hearings. They have said previously that they would contribute some sums, so they didn't feel it was a breach of their fiduciary duty or they wouldn't have agreed to contribute anything.

Secondly, we would think that, we firmly believe that the Teamsters union, as was indicated yesterday, is a union that has every right to have a fair and free election as quickly as possible and that the membership, we believe, demand that. We also believe there are ways to do polling, ways that you could do polling going to each of the different locals and have a weighting voting process which could be done very quickly, very efficiently, and very inexpensively, so that in fact we could have a very quick read of what in fact the union felt as to the proposition of their making a contribution or not.

Finally, as unpleasant as it may be for us, we have to face the fact that this may be an unsupervised election and, your Honor, we will in fact be filing with your Honor a proposal of how to wind down the matters of the election office. We, in fact, are continuing to spend money, continuing to do work. We have a number of very significant protest matters before us which, in fact, we think urgently need to be completed, and we would in fact by next Monday have a proposal for you if in fact it's necessary, if the draconian happens, how to wind down the election office.

THE COURT: I have a note from my worthy staff:

"You need to give the IBT a timetable for giving more definite statements for unsupervised election."

Thank you. What would I do without you?

What timetable do you need?

Mr. WEICH: Respectfully, your Honor, it seems to us premature when the government has not, to date, withdrawn its election to supervise to order the IBT to do more than it has done, which is to set forth with a fair bit of specificity how it would conduct an unsupervised election in accordance with federal labor law, the IBT constitution and the consent decree. I really think that as a matter of logic and timing, the United States should conclude its efforts and say, finally, that it does not intend to supervise, if indeed that's the conclusion it reaches, despite our view that it should not be permitted to withdraw that.

THE COURT: If public relations and goodwill have any strong reason, and believe me they do, you cannot possibly estimate the goodwill and public relations game for the IBT to come forward generously to make some contribution.

I repeat this ad nauseam: In the ten years that I have been on this case, the union has

spent millions upon millions of dollars fighting every single revision of this decree. Millions. Some of it so silly that it has been a mockery and a teletale at cocktail parties. The quarreling over my order for the IBT to provide a \$50 secondhand cabinet file, in one matter where there were just a number of limited appearances, one law firm garnered \$6 million in fees. I think from my point of view a forthcoming spirit of generosity does not have to wait for Christmas.

Yes. Go on.

Ms. KONIGSBERG: Your Honor, because there is such a strong interest in having a prompt rerun election, we believe that there should be a schedule set for the IBT to submit a plan that these two things can occur at the same time and we think that would make sense to do. In addition, I wonder if the IBT has an estimate of what they think it would cost them to conduct an unsupervised election.

Mr. WEICH: Your Honor, we're prepared to submit additional details about how we would conduct additional details about how we would conduct an unsupervised election next Wednesday, August 5.

THE COURT: Can you give us an estimate of what the cost would be?

Mr. WEICH: We will do our best.

THE COURT: You will do that?

Mr. WEICH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything else?

Ms. KONIGSBERG: That's it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Nothing else?

Mr. WEICH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Please come up with something. I think after ten years on this case I deserve a break. And I think we have done one tremendous job of ridding this union of a lot of corruption and we are still on it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and particularly the portion of the resolution which allows nonattorneys to conduct depositions behind closed doors and without any member of the committee present. That authority is virtually unprecedented. The authority of having a non-attorney staff conduct the depositions was not given to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight where we heard abuses even with attorneys doing it. The House did grant that authority in the committee on the transfer of technology to China, a select committee on which I sit, but it was understood by the members of the select committee and the Members of the whole House that an issue of that magnitude required swift but thorough investigation, staffed with personnel skilled with the nuances of deposing witnesses with sensitive and potentially classified material. We also recognized that some of the material and witnesses sought for that investigation would require travel to China and experienced staff must be allowed to pursue those matters when Members' schedules might preclude their attendance. The staff members hired for that purpose, the 6-month duration of the committee, will obviously be hired with the appropriate skills for taking depositions. In contrast, this investigation into the 1996 Teamsters election will not address matters of national security but the members of the subcommittee must apply equal vigilance

to the rights of witnesses and the appropriate conduct of the investigation. Already the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations has come very close to interfering with an ongoing investigation by the U.S. Attorney's office into the Teamsters election, and we experienced a potentially damaging incident concerning the shocking modification of subpoenas without the approval of the committee. All of this occurred under the watchful eye of the consultants to the committee, whose professional credentials cannot be challenged.

In fact, the committee hired these consultants for the majority because the majority stated that it did not have qualified staff with the background, knowledge or experience to conduct the investigation. Now these consultants have given notice that they will be leaving the investigation, so I hesitate to think what will happen when staff who are not attorneys, not experienced in deposing witnesses and who are not required to abide by any codes of professional responsibility are allowed to continue where the consultants left off.

This subcommittee must be vigilant in its investigation into the Teamsters election. The rules of conduct must not allow the reckless endangerment of a process designed to prevent another failed election. In the end we must be responsible not only to the Teamsters but also to the taxpayers who paid for the 1996 election and who continue to pay for this investigation. We should not allow nonattorneys who have already been labeled by the majority as incapable of conducting the investigation to be granted the exceptional power to conduct depositions behind closed doors.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I think it is appropriate for the committee of the Congress to do an investigation. I think it is important to get to the bottom of the issues at stake. I also think in theory it is sometimes appropriate to have deposition authority. But when you look how this authority has been abused by the Republican majority in this very Congress, I think you have to step back and ask whether this is a wise thing to do.

If a committee is doing an investigation and they want to hear from a witness, bring a witness before the committee. If the witness will not come, subpoena the witness to come before the committee. Let members in an open session ask questions. But when you give deposition authority, it allows staff to bring in these people, behind closed doors, without the public even knowing what questions are being asked, and to abuse those people by

making them hire attorneys, making them take time off from work, making them answer questions over and over and over again while the clock is ticking away and the costs are going up.

I can tell Members that in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the staff has deposed 158 individuals. One-third of these people were compelled to give testimony under this threat of being held in contempt of Congress. Of these 158 depositions, 650 hours of testimony was taken. This is burdensome on people. It is a power that can and has been abused.

We have come now to a point where it is simply a partisan fishing expedition. Of 158 witnesses, 156 have only been asked about Democratic fundraising abuses while the committee has ignored substantial evidence of Republican campaign finance abuses. It becomes a partisan witch-hunt without any accountability to the American people.

Accountability is important. When you are in an open session, you have to be accountable because the public can see what you are doing. But when it is a deposition, behind closed doors, there is too much power and that power can be abused.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I hesitate to get involved in this at this time, but the gentleman is complaining that the committees were only investigating Democrat abuses on campaign finance. This gets under my skin a little bit, because no Republican has ever been accused of selling out our country. No Republican has ever been accused of accepting campaign money and then giving away the strategic interests of our country. Now that we have more than 18 intercontinental ballistic missiles aimed at America, we ought to get to the bottom of it.

Never before have we ever had an administration, whether Democrat or Republican and I go all the way back to Harry Truman's day when I was a Marine guard in this town never have we had a President, either Republican or Democrat, who deliberately withheld information and did not try to level with the American people. That is why we have had to have staff depositions in the past.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding time. Just to clarify some of the remarks from my colleague who sits on the subcommittee. "Close to impairing an investigation." Give me a break. We went through negotiations and discussions with the Southern District in New York. We never came close to impairing an investigation. We went through that process. We went through that process with them in a very diligent way and

never even came close to impairing that investigation.

Talking about these amateurs that are going to interrogate witnesses. The minority knows very well the kind of people that we need to have interviews and discussions with. What are we taking a look at? We are taking a look at very technical information. Where did \$150 million of net worth from the Teamsters go over a period of 5 years? Rank-and-file Teamsters would like to know. We would like to know. How did they launder \$1 million? How did they manipulate pension funds? We have got a specialist who was hired to do exactly that. It is a forensic auditor. We want a forensic auditor to go through it in detail. The forensic auditor and the staff needs to go through piles and piles of data, very technical data so that we can move forward.

We had a hearing where the IBT and Grant Thornton and the auditors brought in their people. They would not allow us to talk to them before the hearing. They came in and they had wonderful answers. "Oh, you were interested in that kind of information? Boy, you really ought to talk to so and so. I can't answer that question." The end result is they delay and they set back our progress at getting to this kind of information.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time. I just want to point out the statement made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) was completely irresponsible. No one has evidence to substantiate an accusation that the Administration sold out national security for campaign contributions. But we can substantiate the following: The Republicans have taken foreign money. We can substantiate the allegations that they have used illegal conduit payments, that money has been raised on government property.

□ 1400

And today is the anniversary of the Trent Lott-Newt Gingrich \$50 billion tax break for the tobacco companies snuck into a bill in the middle of the night after they received millions of dollars of campaign contributions from the tobacco industry.

Why are we not investigating those issues? Because the Republican Congress is on a partisan witch-hunt.

Do not do the same thing in this committee that we are seeing on the Burton committee: a one-sided, partisan witch-hunt where Republican abuses are ignored and Democrat abuses are blown out of all proportion, where the evidence does not lend credibility to the conclusions that are stated.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) to respond.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I just want to challenge the statement about whether the forensic auditor is paid. He is a paid consultant of that committee, and he made a statement about fraud, pension fraud, that the Department of Labor has challenged and criticized him, and the independent auditors of the Teamsters have challenged him. And there is no evidence of any pension fraud, and my colleague ought to stop saying it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a member of the subcommittee not only to oppose this resolution but also to express my severe disappointment in the way this process has been conducted and also to indicate that I think that, by giving this unprecedented power to the subcommittee, we may end up doing more harm than good under the circumstances.

I am a former prosecutor. I know a little bit about conducting investigations. Subpoena power can be extremely useful in getting at the truth and uncovering the facts in a particular matter, if it is necessary and if it is done right.

But as member of the subcommittee, I do not see the necessity in it. I do not see this great conspiracy of obstruction and reluctance of Teamster members to appear before the committee. In fact, our subcommittee chair referenced Mr. Sever and stonewalling that he apparently was committing when, in fact, he had appeared before our committee May of this year, was subjected to our numerous questions from across both aisles, and unless there is other information that they are not sharing with us, I do not see the stonewalling tactic taking place. Also, if it is done right, Madam Speaker.

Now, giving deposition power or authority to Members who do not have training on how to conduct a proper deposition is very dangerous. There is no easier thing to do if you are not trained than to muck up a deposition in a transcript, especially with witnesses who may be under some other criminal investigation, and that exactly was being proposed in this resolution: for nonattorneys to come in behind closed doors with witnesses and to subject them to an array of questioning when they do not know whether to ask a leading question or an open-ended question, when it is appropriate, they do not know how to give proper documents into evidence as part of the transcript, and this is just a recipe for disaster.

But perhaps my greatest concern about this resolution today, Madam Speaker, is the fact that we may be impeding upon an ongoing criminal investigation in the Southern District of

New York, the U.S. Attorney's Office. This is an issue that I have repeatedly raised in committee. As a former prosecutor, there was no greater fear for me when I was conducting an investigation than for outside forces to come in and start messing around with the conduct and the process of the criminal investigation and to start interfering with what we are trying to accomplish.

Madam Speaker, I just conclude by urging my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

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

Again, Madam Speaker, the gentleman spoke about the fact that staff deposition authority is unprecedented. I think he said it three times; I wrote down three times. And I know he was not a Member of this Body when the Democrats controlled it for 40 years, but I would advise him to go back and do a little study about how many times the Democrats gave staff deposition authority.

And he also mentioned stonewalling four times. He ought to read his hometown newspapers and that of the New York Times and the Washington Post and all the other papers across the country; they will headline who has been stonewalling all of these investigations.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Holland, Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this time to me.

I would like to just insert for the RECORD a July 23, 1998, letter from Anthony Sutin, who is the Acting Assistant Attorney General, who highlights in his letter that we have not jeopardized investigations. As a matter of fact, his quote:

We appreciate the subcommittee's cooperation in accommodating our law enforcement interests in the conduct of this oversight investigation.

We have consistently made sure in our efforts that we do not jeopardize what is going on in the courts, and we are complementing that effort, not jeopardizing that effort. We have been very, very conscious, and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin knows that because he has been in some of the discussions whenever there has been a conflict or when the Southern District has raised a concern. I think the one time they raised a concern we actually sat down with the minority and talked about that and jointly reached a decision that we would not proceed along that direction.

The letter in its entirety is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 23, 1998.

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to your letter, dated July 15, 1998, regarding the Subcommittee's oversight investigation about the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT) and, particularly, the Committee's subpoena to the Department for tapes relating to our on-going law enforcement action regarding IBT. As you know, the tapes were produced late on July 9, 1998, after service of the subpoena earlier on that date.

We appreciate the Subcommittee's cooperation in accommodating our law enforcement interests in the conduct of this oversight investigation. We also would like to resolve the apparent misunderstanding about the Department's actions in response to the subpoena. The Department undertook substantial efforts to assess our interests in this matter, which is consistent with our usual processes in response to congressional subpoenas. It is our long-standing practice to consider Department interests, such as law enforcement and individual privacy, among others, as well as a congressional committee's needs in responding to requests for information, including subpoenas. While the process in this instance included consultation with the United States Attorney in the Southern District of New York, the Department's response to the Subcommittee was neither dictated nor delayed by that Office. Indeed, the Department's same day response to the subpoena could not have occurred without the significant efforts of that Office.

It also should be noted that the United States Attorney obtained the tapes for law enforcement purposes and to facilitate the Committee's access by producing copies of them, and certainly not to thwart the Committee's access to them in any way. Because the IBT was to receive a complete copy of the tapes, production of the tapes to the United States Attorney and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could not possibly relieve the IBT of any obligation to respond to the Subcommittee's subpoena.

Congressional subpoenas are taken very seriously by the Department in every instance and we recognize a committee's authority to issue compulsory process when required in the exercise of its legitimate oversight functions. In some cases, subpoenas represent a collision of interests between the executive and legislative branches. Such a collision often can be mitigated through informal discussions designed to accommodate the needs of both branches, predicated upon an appropriate sense of comity between them. This also permits their representatives to scrutinize carefully the interests and needs of both branches so that satisfactory agreements can be reached. We regret that this particular subpoena did not permit us an opportunity to pursue such informal discussions; indeed, as far as we are aware, forthwith subpoenas are unprecedented in our relationship with Congress. Based upon our subsequent conversations with counsel, we look forward to working with the Subcommittee productively as this inquiry proceeds and hope that the misunderstandings of this experience can be avoided in the future.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like additional information about this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

L. ANTHONY SUTIN,
Acting Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, we have a situation here where they are requesting overwhelming, extraordinary powers, and whereas sometimes that might be appropriate, for example, when Oliver North in the basement of the White House was committing treason by disobeying the laws of Congress and selling weapons to an obvious enemy of America. Then that was time to use these kinds of powers, and I think those kinds of powers were assumed, and we had an appropriate investigation.

When the savings and loan swindle was under way, we should have used those kinds of powers, but we did not. We had Silverado Bank in Denver, Colorado, where the directors told the client, "You need \$13 million, we'll give you \$26 million, and you deposit half of that back into the bank so that when the auditors come it will look good." Not a single director on that bank's board went to jail, and half a trillion dollars the taxpayers were out of as a result of the swindle by the savings and loans banks. We did not use those kinds of powers.

Here we have a situation where, yes, some wrong deeds have been committed. As my colleagues know, the Teamsters' elections are important. Irregularities in elections are not to be sneezed at. They are important. But we do not need these kinds of powers to deal with election irregularities.

Teamsters have a long history, and there was a time when millions of dollars were being stolen. Dave Beck, Jimmy Hoffa—Jimmy Hoffa ended up being convicted and sent to jail, and later on he disappeared and it was assumed that he was murdered. Some terrible things have happened. Ron Carey came in as a result of reform that this government supported, and if he has done something wrong in respect to elections, he deserves to be punished. He does not deserve the mobilization of these kinds of overwhelming powers.

Madam Speaker, this is a partisan grab for power because they want to use it in a very partisan way. They want to continue what they have been doing all along, trying to destroy the unions in America, the labor movement in America. Working families have a lot to fear from this kind of abuse of power because it is going to be used in a very one-sided way, as it has up to now. They are not going to use this power to get to the bottom of the situation in an objective manner. We know from past history that that is not what is going to be happening.

So it should be denied. We should not let these kinds of overwhelming powers be utilized by a committee that has already demonstrated they only want to use it for very bipartisan purposes.

This is not Oliver North in the basement of the White House committing treason.

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

Madam Speaker, it is a good thing that this Member of Congress is on his good behavior here today because I heard my former good friend—I better not say that—my good friend from New York (Mr. OWENS) referring to Marine Colonel Oliver North as conducting treasonous activities. Let me tell the Members of this Body that there is no greater hero in this country than Marine Colonel Ollie North, who risked his life for my colleagues and I and every other American citizen. It was he and Ronald Reagan, our President, who stopped communism dead in its tracks in Central America. Otherwise, we might have the same kind of government there that we have in Vietnam today. We are going to be taking up a resolution on that in just a few minutes. Or we might have the same kind of a government in Central America that we have in China or North Korea or some of these other countries.

So, let me sing the praises of Colonel Oliver North and thank God that my grandchildren will have a free, democratic country to live in.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise today serving on both of the committees, and I thank my leadership for these assignments as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I serve on this oversight investigations committee and have had a firsthand view at how we have conducted ourselves as committee members and, more importantly, how the chairman of this subcommittee has conducted this committee.

This Congress has spent more than 20 or close to \$20 million on 50 investigations, 50 different investigations.

Ken Starr, DAN BURTON, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING); all of them have something in common, for they go after their political enemies. For, as we rise today, those on this side of the aisle, and I would hope that we would be joined by some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, asking simply for fairness, asking simply for us to follow the rules in which this Congress, and as a first-term Member I am not privy nor do I have practical experience in all the rules of this Body, but I do know my history.

Madam Speaker, the extraordinary power our colleagues seek to grant this

committee, we set precedent by giving it to the committee of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON). The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) spoke so eloquently about the abuses on that committee.

I would urge and caution my very dear friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) to pay close attention to how that committee conducted itself, to pay close attention to all the abuses and failures of that committee. We can get to the bottom of this Teamsters' investigation by simply following the rules.

I concur with my dear friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle and hopefully some on their side of the aisle who firmly believe that we can, indeed, do our job, and I might add that we have spent \$2 million, and I would ask that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) ask the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) to provide us with the correct and accurate accounting of what we have spent. Then perhaps we can move from that point, I say to my colleagues, and make some valid and accurate decisions about where we go.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I hate to disagree with the chairman of the subcommittee, but there have been two specific witnesses who have been called before us where the U.S. Attorney's Office was not consulted with, and they are very upset that they have been called and subject to our questioning who are part of the criminal investigation.

There are other examples like that, Madam Speaker. That is the concern that I have.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the U.S. Attorney's Office, Southern District of New York, which stated that taking testimony from certain witnesses who had been subpoenaed and scheduled to testify would impede an ongoing criminal investigation.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,
April 28, 1998.

Re: Teamsters investigation.

HON. PETE HOEKSTRA,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you as Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations (the "Subcommittee") to request that the Subcommittee not seek to question Brad Burton and Susan Mackie concerning involvement by individuals affiliated with the AFL in

fundraising for the 1996 Ronald Carey campaign for re-election as general President of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters ("IBT"), a subject which is under criminal investigation by my Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In my carefully considered judgment, such testimony taken at this time could seriously undermine and compromise this very active criminal investigation. While I fully recognize the importance of your Subcommittee's investigation, I respectfully urge you and your fellow members to balance the harm that the proposed testimony on this particular subject may cause to this important criminal investigation and prospective trials against any benefits that could come from the proposed examinations of this topic.

We understand that last week the Subcommittee sent letters requesting that these individuals appear to testify before the Subcommittee. We have no objection to testimony being taken from these witnesses, but only as to testimony regarding fundraising for the Carey campaign, which is the focus of the criminal investigation. At the request of Majority counsel, Deputy United States Attorney Shirah Neiman met with you and Congressman Norwood last week to explain, from our point of view, the negative impact we believe questioning these witnesses on this topic could have on the criminal investigation. Ms. Neiman also offered—consistent with grand jury secrecy obligations, and the integrity of the criminal investigation—to brief the Subcommittee or its counsel on matters of interest to the Subcommittee. Mr. Neiman also outlined the matters already in the public record regarding AFL involvement in the Carey campaign which might be of use to you in your hearings.

Today, the criminal investigation has resulted in felony prosecutions and guilty pleas of three individuals who are cooperating with the ongoing investigation and an indictment yesterday against the former Director of the IBT's Governmental Affairs Department. We have tried to be as cooperative as possible with all ongoing Congressional inquiries, Election Officer Investigations and Independent Review Board investigations, while at the same time ensuring the integrity of the ongoing criminal investigation and prosecutions. We are making this request because we believe that the criminal investigation and any potential criminal trials will suffer if witnesses are forced prematurely to go forward with deposition and/or public testimony. In addition, should the substance of interviews or testimony become public, the course of the criminal investigation could be irreparably damaged. We appreciate your weighing these factors in making your decision in this matter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

MARY JO WHITE,
U.S. Attorney.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

During the past two years, the American working families have experienced some success in defending the minimum wage increase, protecting Medicare/Medicaid, saved Federal job safety protections, threw anti-worker legislators out of office and held back the Fast Track proposal that would have made it easier for jobs to leave for overseas.

Many of my colleagues and their corporate allies opposed every one of those victories for working families because they put more value on profits than on people. Now, it seems as though some of my Republican colleagues and their anti-union allies say it's payback time.

Madam Speaker, a million dollars and one year later the Republican Members of the House have devised another devious plot to destroy the unions and the people who they represent—our Nation's working families.

The Republican Members passed out of committee a resolution to allow the Education and Workforce Committee to take depositions behind closed doors, without a Member of Congress present as a part of the Teamsters Union investigation. Actions such as this have only been implemented during threats to national security.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is duplicative in nature and is an abuse of congressional power that tramples the civil liberties of our Nation's working families.

This is a simple backdoor attack on unions and working families. This is an unfair and unjustified attack on democracy; but I was told at an Acorn rally in Milwaukee this past week that, a people united will never be defeated.

I urge that we unite on behalf of working families, I urge that we unite and defeat this resolution.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 507.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), our leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, this is just a continuation of the same old thing that we have seen for this whole Congress: Investigate, duplicate, waste taxpayers' dollars.

Madam Speaker, close to \$20 million, 17 investigations; they want to go through this again.

We spent a million dollars on this investigation already; now they want to expand the powers. What they want to do is in secret, under oath, with no Member present they want to interrogate witnesses.

It is out of control. They cannot face the reality of the issues of education and of health care and the things that the people care about in this country. This Congress is exclusively, exclusively designed to deal with investigations of the political enemies of the other side of the aisle.

That is what this is about, make no mistake about it.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this irresponsible resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, we have just a closing statement, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would simply say that this is bad legislation. It is cer-

tainly to me very much of a power grab. It is not necessary because the Justice Department is already investigating.

I would urge a no vote, and I will ask for a vote on this particular resolution.

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

□ 1415

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EMERSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 6½ minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, is it a rule of the House that documents that are to be entered in the RECORD should be in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has authority by unanimous consent to admit those documents for printing.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, if they have asked for unanimous consent, should I not have access to those documents when they are inserted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The documents are available with the Official Reporters of Debate.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, if the document has been inserted for the RECORD, should the Clerk or someone have the document?

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The documents should be delivered to the Official Reporters of Debate.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, there was no objection raised earlier to any unanimous consent made before.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is merely responding to a parliamentary inquiry.

The documents submitted by unanimous consent are delivered to the Official Reporters of Debates.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, have they been delivered?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire of the Official Reporters.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We have inquired, and the documents are not available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They should be submitted to the Official Reporters, or they will not appear in the RECORD.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I would just like a copy as soon as they ever get delivered to the House.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, do I understand that the balance of the time was yielded back by my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL)?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman from New York

(Mr. SOLOMON) has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, before recognizing our last speaker to sum up, let me just point out that this Congress always has its job to do in oversight. That is what we are attempting to do here.

Madam Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I thank the gentleman for leading the effort on this change to the rules. Let us just go through the process. In 1989, the IBT, because of massive influence by organized crime, was put under a consent decree with the Justice Department.

In 1996, they held an election. In the summer of 1997, there were severe questions about the validity of that election. I stood up and said, do not certify that election until all the objections have been investigated. The minority did not participate.

Shortly after that, the election was overturned. It was an election that cost the American taxpayer \$20 million, was administered by an election officer under a consent decree at the same time that an independent review board was looking at the Teamsters. There, maybe, would be some questions about how, with all this oversight, could we not even run a fair election. But, no, the other side does not believe that that is an important question to ask.

Shortly after that, in August of 1997, the election was overturned. At that point in time, I suggested that the winner of that election, the now disqualified president, maybe, should resign or remove himself from office. Some on the other side thought that that was a radical step, a witch-hunt.

On Monday of this week, the independent review board removed that official, Mr. Carey, from the Teamsters for life.

Early in 1998, one of the new improvements that was put in place was to make sure that the Teamsters were acting in the best interest of their members. Why? Because we had exposed that their net worth had decreased from \$157 million to \$700,000. Why? Because we had identified that, perhaps, there had been pension fraud. Why? Because there had been three people who had plead guilty to laundering a million dollars of Teamsters rank and file money through the process back to benefit Mr. Carey.

This independent financial auditor, what did we find out? We found out that he was not much more than a bookkeeper. Very qualified, but not empowered to do the kind of work that needed to be done. It only cost the

rank and file Teamsters around \$60,000 a month, I believe.

What else do we know? What would we like to know? Have you heard reports that documents are being shredded at the IBT headquarters on a recent weekend? That was this past weekend. We have been informed that two IBT employees wearing green uniforms delivered an industry size shredder to the office of the IBT communications director, Matt Witt, during the week of July 13, 1998, and that the noise of the shredder operating in that office could be heard on Saturday, July 18, when Mr. Witt was in the building.

There is no corruption going on at the Teamsters. These people are acting in the best interest of the rank and file. They are acting in the best interest of the taxpayers since we have paid for this. Sorry. Wrong.

What did Mr. Edelstein say, the judge who has been watching these people for 9 years? He believes it is time for the good members of this union to rise up and revolt. Rather than aggressively going after and exercising our responsibilities, the minority says, no, let us not go too fast. This is a witch-hunt.

This is protecting the rank and file interest of the Teamsters. The nice thing about this investigation is that rank and file Teamsters are rising up in revolt, and they are sending us documents. They are sending us complaints because many of them believe that the only people who have been acting in their best interests is this subcommittee, because we have been focused on rank and file, and we are not focused on the people in the marble palace over here who are not a rightfully elected leadership, but who are all part of a failed leadership, and they are all part of a discredited election. We are not indebted to the people who write the political action committee checks out of that building to people in this building.

It is time for us to move forward. It is time for us to take a look at why all of this that has been put in place on the Teamsters, all this government intervention is not working the way that it should be.

Staff deposition authority, there are all kinds of protections built into the rules of our committee. The witnesses will be protected. They will be accompanied by counsel. The counsel will have the opportunity to review all transcripts. The minority will be advised 3 days before any staff depositions are taken.

This power is needed because, even though Mr. Severs came in and said I will do everything that I can to help move this investigation forward as quickly as possible, what does that mean that he does? It does not mean that he voluntarily sends people to interview with our staff prior to a hearing.

He says, I will only let people come if it is in a formal hearing setting. No, I

am not going to help you go through these piles of documents to find out where \$157 million went. I am not going to help you find out how we laundered a million dollars. As a matter of fact, he is not helping us. He is not even helping his own rank and file.

When we ask Mr. Severs, what investigation do you have going on? He said, I am not doing anything. Three people have plead guilty. His former bosses has been expelled from the union. This leadership is doing absolutely nothing. It is time for Congress to continue and let this committee move forward with its work.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.Res. 507. This resolution grants unprecedented powers to the House Education and Workforce Committee to take depositions behind closed doors, without a Member of Congress present. Prior to this Republican-led Congress, the power for Committee staff to take depositions in closed-door sessions was granted on only two occasions—to the Judiciary Committee for impeachment proceedings and to the nonpartisan Ethics Committee.

Today, however, the Republican leaders of this House want to continue their witch hunt regarding the Teamsters presidential election. The Republican leaders want to use their partisan advantage to stomp on the civil liberties of union-associated individuals. By giving the power to Republican staff members of the Education and Workforce Committee to take depositions behind closed doors, this resolution prevents Democrats from having any role in this investigation. Shamefully, the public is shut out completely.

The Republican leaders in this House claim that this resolution is need because the Teamsters Union has been uncooperative. The Teamsters have complied with Committee requests and have already produced more than 50,000 documents for the Committee to review. Further, the Teamsters have not refused a request to testify before the Committee. Why must depositions be taken behind closed doors by Republican staff? What do the Republicans have to hide?

This resolution represents a back-handed attempt to circumvent an open process of investigation. This entire investigation has been duplicative and wasteful. After more than 18 months, more than a million taxpayer dollars have been spent on this investigation—with little to show for the effort. How much longer must we continue this partisan charade? Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment recommended by the Committee on Rules. The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed until later today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO VIETNAM

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House of Wednesday, July 29, 1998, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 120 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 120

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to Congress on June 3, 1998, with respect to Vietnam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on Wednesday, July 29, 1998, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. 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 House Joint Resolution 120.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield one-half of my time to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) in support of the resolution. I further ask that the gentleman from California be permitted to yield blocks of time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that half of the time yielded to me be yielded further to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and that he be permitted to yield blocks of time and that I would be permitted to yield blocks of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1430

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 120 and in support of the extension of Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver.

Since President Clinton lifted the trade embargo against Vietnam in 1994, the administration has taken steps to normalize U.S. trade relations with that country. This process is subject to the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, the provision of U.S. law which contains emigration criteria that must be met or waived by the President before a country subject to Jackson-Vanik can engage in normal trade relations, including normal tariff treatment, with the United States and gain access to U.S. trade financing programs.

Because Vietnam is not eligible for normal trade relations with the U.S., pending the completion and approval by Congress of a bilateral commercial agreement, the immediate effect of Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver is quite limited. Specifically, the waiver only allows Vietnam to be reviewed for possible coverage by U.S. trade financing programs such as OPIC, Eximbank, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Vietnam is not automatically covered by these programs as a result of its waiver, and must still face separate individual reviews against each program's relevant criteria.

The significance of Vietnam's waiver is that it permits us to stay engaged with the Vietnamese and to pursue further reforms. Vietnam is not an easy place to do business. However, our engagement enables us to influence the pace and direction of Vietnamese reform.

Madam Speaker, I would at this time insert in the RECORD a letter I received from 28 trade associations supporting Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver as an important step in the ability of the business community to compete in the Vietnamese market which is the 12th most populous market in the world.

I would also insert in the RECORD a letter from our distinguished former colleague, Mr. Charlie Vanik. It is a letter that he sent to our current colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) in support of this waiver.

JULY 22, 1998.

HON. PHILIP CRANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRANE: The American business community supports pursuing a policy of economic normalization with Vietnam. We endorse the decision to grant Vietnam a waiver of the "Jackson-Vanik" amendment. The waiver gives American companies selling to Vietnam access to cru-

cial U.S. export promotion programs and is an important first step to normalizing trade relations with Vietnam. We strongly oppose H.J. Res. 120, which would overturn the waiver. A vote on this legislation might come during the week of July 27.

Vietnam has met the requirements for a waiver. The Jackson-Vanik amendment is meant to encourage a policy of free emigration in countries with nonmarket economies. Since the Administration normalized diplomatic relations with Hanoi in 1995, Vietnam has cleared for interview over 80 percent of all remaining applicants of the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees agreement.

Pending legislation, H.J. Res. 120, would overturn the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam and deliver a serious setback to U.S.-Vietnam commercial relations. Without the waiver, American companies would be denied access to export promotion programs offered by the U.S. Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. These programs are vital to meeting the challenges of doing business in Vietnam's emerging market.

Overturning the Jackson-Vanik waiver also would derail bilateral negotiations seeking commitments from Vietnam on market access, services, intellectual property and investment. The eventual agreement will bring Vietnamese law closer to international trade norms, thereby helping U.S. companies to tap the long-term potential of the Vietnamese market. If we fail to remain on the path of economic normalization, we risk ceding the potential of that market to competitors in Europe, Japan, and elsewhere in Asia.

Finally, overturning the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam would have important political implications. Vietnam has cooperated with efforts to search for American POWs and MIAs. Cooperation could be jeopardized if the House passes a disapproval resolution.

The American business community believes that a policy of economic normalization with Vietnam is in our national interest. We applaud the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee for reporting unfavorably disapproval resolutions regarding the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam. We urge you to support economic normalization with Vietnam by voting against H.J. Res. 120.

Sincerely,

Aerospace Industries Association.
American Chamber of Commerce, Hanoi.
American Chamber of Commerce, Ho Chi Minh City.
American Chamber of Commerce, Hong Kong.
American Farm Bureau.
Asia-Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce.
Association for Manufacturing Technology.
Chemical Manufacturers Association.
Coalition for Employment through Exports, Inc.
Electronic Industries Alliance.
Emergency Committee for American Trade.
Fertilizer Institute.
Footwear Distributors and Retailers of America.
International Energy Development Council.
International Mass Retail Association.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Center for APEC.
National Foreign Trade Council.

National Oilseed Processors Association.
Pacific Basin Economic Council—U.S. Member Committee.
Securities Industry Association.
Telecommunications Industry Association.
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.
U.S. Council for International Business.
U.S. National Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation.
U.S.-Vietnam Business Committee of the U.S.-ASEAN Business Council.
U.S.-Vietnam Trade Council.
USA*Engage.

Juniper, FL, July 28, 1998.

Hon. JAMES P. MORAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: As one of the authors of the Jackson-Vanik provision of the 1974 Trade Act, I am writing to urge you to oppose the motion to disapprove trade credits for Vietnam (H.J. Res. 120).

The Jackson-Vanik provision was written with the intent of encouraging the Soviet Union to relax its restrictive emigration policy, particularly with Soviet Jewry. It specifically granted the President the power to waive restrictions on U.S. government credits or investment guarantees to communist countries if the waiver would help promote significant progress toward relaxing emigration controls. I am proud of the fact that the Jackson-Vanik provision was extremely helpful by encouraging the Soviet Union to relax its emigration policies and eventually helped open the door to improved economic relations with the Soviet Union.

In reviewing the current waiver that President Clinton granted Vietnam on June 3, I believe his actions are entirely consistent with the law. Vietnam has made significant progress on its commitments to resettle Vietnamese returnees and has consented to extend these more liberal emigration procedures to other refugee programs. I also believe the waiver will encourage the Government of Vietnam to continue to cooperate on locating U.S. servicemen missing in action, to become less isolated, and to follow the rule of law.

Sincerely,

CHARLES VANIK,
Former Member of Congress.

In the context of ongoing bilateral commercial agreement negotiations, Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver puts the burden squarely on the Vietnamese to come forward with the market principles needed to conclude an agreement worthy of congressional approval and the extension of normal trade relations to Vietnam.

Terminating Vietnam's waiver will provide the Vietnamese with an excuse not to undertake further reforms and would reerect the barrier to the normalization of our bilateral trade relations.

I urge my colleagues not to take away our ability to pressure the Vietnamese for change and for progress on issues of importance to the U.S. I urge a "no" vote on H.J. Res. 120.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), a leader in the efforts for freedom.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to lend my support to H.J. Res. 120, the resolution to disapprove the Jackson-Vanik waiver to Vietnam.

In March of this year, the government of Vietnam was granted a waiver from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. While this is a significant step towards the economic revitalization of Vietnam, the decision ignores basic human rights issues which still need to be resolved.

Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing one of the largest Vietnamese-American communities in the United States right in Orange County, almost 300,000 people. They are the parents, the siblings and the offspring of families who fought communism for 2 decades, and the majority of my constituents feel that economic relations with Vietnam should not be established until specific emigration, political and human rights issues are addressed.

The Orange County Register, one of the newspapers in our area, conducted informal reader polls and found huge multiracial majorities opposed the immediate lifting of the waiver. During this past year, many of my constituents have also contacted my office directly. In this debate I am their voice.

Jackson-Vanik is about emigration, then trade. Normalize emigration; move towards normalizing trade. Waiving the Jackson-Vanik requirement for Vietnam on March 10 was a mistake. This decision only makes it harder for many Vietnamese to reunite with their families.

The simple truth is that the Vietnamese Government does not meet the conditions of free emigration. Authorities have denied United States officials access to the vast majority of returnees who are eligible to emigrate. In other words, the way it was changed was that, first, one had to get an exit permit in order to be interviewed by the United States to see if one could come to the United States, and now they have changed that. Now they have the exit permit at the back end. And what they do is provide a list to the United States about whom we may interview. And, of course, that list is very limited.

The only significant human rights concession recently made was this exit permit at the back end instead of the front end.

Although this looks like an important concession, the United States is still forbidden to interview anyone whose name is not on the list supplied by the Vietnamese Government.

And although some of my colleagues, and I have seen these letters going around, will lead you to believe that Vietnam has cleared for interview over 80 percent of all of the remaining ROVR applicants, the fact of the matter is, many of those applicants are not even on the list.

What they leave out is the fact that the same officials who were denying

the exit permits to begin with are now in the position to keep people off of those lists. And according to a recent report to Congress, the State Department acknowledges that some 15,000 former United States Government employees and their families have not been issued those exit permits.

Besides the administrative roadblocks, pervasive corruption at all levels of the government in Vietnam creates additional obstacles for emigration. Let us say that one is on that list and one moves forward to an interview by the U.S. and the U.S. says, okay, come here, and then one has to get the exit permit; what happens? One of those government officials says, it is going to cost you \$2,000 to get this permit. Well, in a country where the annual per capita income is approximately \$300 U.S. dollars, most Vietnamese wishing to emigrate cannot afford to pay such an amount.

Contrary to the Vietnamese Government's pretense, it is saying that it has no political or religious prisoners, but many Vietnamese continue to languish in prisons because of their political or religious beliefs.

Last September I, along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), chaired a human rights caucus briefing on Vietnam. We heard from representatives of the international organizations and from the Vietnamese American community leaders about what is going on in current social, political and economic conditions in Vietnam. And believe me, while we may not pay much attention to what is going on in Vietnam because we have so many other issues, the Vietnamese community in Orange County and across the United States does pay, day in and day out, attention to the details of what is going on in Vietnam. We learned that we must be concerned about Vietnam's poor human rights record and religious persecution.

Madam Speaker, I began by saying that this is about emigration, and that is what I believe we need to discuss today, but let us not lose sight of the fact that human rights and business interests are also denied in Vietnam. We have learned from that briefing that we had that all religious groups face great challenges in obtaining things in Vietnam. For example, basic religious materials. And we also learned in that congressional briefing that although the Vietnamese constitution prohibits discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, religion or social class, we find that women and children and ethnic minorities are often the victims of repression.

Reports show that the Hoa Hao Buddhist Church, for example, continues to be suppressed. All of their religious activities and ceremonies are prohibited. Assembly of more than 3 persons is forbidden, and all of the assets and properties have been confiscated.

In my district, the Hoa Hao Buddhist Church brought my attention to the case of Buddhist priest Nam Liem. Mr. Liem is a 58-year-old Buddhist priest who practiced religion at a small family temple in Vietnam, and since 1975, he has been arrested and detained by the Communist authorities over 50 times. Today, he has not been released from prison.

In addition, there are many pro-democracy activists, scholars, poets, et cetera, whose only crime it was to "injure the national unity."

Of course, we have an "Adopt A Voice of Conscience Campaign" here in Congress to show the attention to the human rights abuses, religious persecution, and social state of Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, I would end by saying please, today, do not surrender our principal leverage with the Communist regime. Vote "yes" for free emigration, vote "yes" for family reunification, vote "yes" to end religious persecution. Vote "yes" to promote free speech and democracy. It is our honor at stake today as we honor the values which we are sworn to uphold.

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

I ask my colleagues to support this disapproval of a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik requirements of the 1974 Trade Act. What were the Jackson-Vanik requirements in that 1974 Trade Act? They clearly stated that we have concerns in this House dealing with human rights, things like freedom of religion and freedom of emigration, and this President of the United States, consistent with what he has done in many other cases around the world, has decided they do not count, they do not count at all. Those requirements that were laid down by former Congresses, much less our Founding Fathers, they do not count, because human rights does not count for this administration.

I would hope that my colleagues would today join us in affirming that human rights and those principles that our country stands for do count for something, and that we do not believe in just waiving them.

What are we waiving them for? The President is waiving the Jackson-Vanik requirements in order to extend American tax dollars, our tax dollars to subsidize or insure private corporations who want to do business in Vietnam, who want to make money by investing in a Communist dictatorship. This is a moral travesty, as well as bad business.

Six months ago when the President first issued this Jackson-Vanik waiver, we basically have been looking at what Vietnam has been doing since then. There has been no liberalization, no opening up of their political system. There has been no major release of political prisoners. Human rights and religious rights continue to be trampled

upon by those who hold power in Vietnam.

But what about the business end of it? Just this week I received a briefing by the GAO on the Vietnamese economy. People are jumping out of Vietnam because it is so corrupt. They showed me, the GAO showed me a 1998 report by the United Nations Development Program that shows that both the U.N., the IMF, the World Bank, and our own State Department is convinced that Vietnam has a lack of integrity and transparency in their economic dealings, and so businesses are pulling out.

Is this a time for us then to waive the human rights requirements so that businesses can go in with U.S. taxpayer guarantees and invest in Communist Vietnam? This is exactly the wrong time. They are going in the wrong direction economically, and they have not taken a step forward in terms of politically and morally.

No, what we are going to be doing is spending tax dollars with this waiver to guarantee American businessmen to go in and use cheap slave labor under a dictatorship to manufacture goods to export to the United States to put our own people out of work. That is immoral, and it does not work politically, and it does not work economically, because we are going to lose that investment money and the taxpayers will have to make up for it unless, of course, those big businessmen make a profit with the slave labor and then they will take all of that profit for themselves at our expense.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman's resolution not to give Most Favored Nation treatment to this Communist dictatorship.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) in support of denying this waiver.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120 and in support of continuing to normalize relations with Vietnam. This policy will promote American interests in receiving a greater accounting of our POWs, MIAs, promoting values of democracy and human rights, as well as helping American workers.

It is important to be clear about what extending Jackson-Vanik waivers will do and what it will not do. Today's vote is not about "for or against" normal trade relations for Vietnam; only when Vietnam concludes a bilateral agreement on trade approved by the Congress will it be eligible for normal trade relations.

□ 1445

Renewal of the waiver is the most recent step in the gradual normalization of the relationship with Vietnam in the postwar era.

I understand and appreciate the frustrations of the families seeking a greater accounting of POWs and MIAs by the Vietnamese government. We are all firmly committed to this goal. We will continue to make that clear to the Vietnamese government. However, the U.S. policy of incremental normalization has gone hand-in-hand with continued cooperation on this very, very important issue of accounting of POWs and MIAs.

Vietnam does in fact fall short of our standard of human rights and political and religious freedoms. However, their continued exposure to U.S. values on human and religious freedoms will promote progress in Vietnam on these objectives that we all share.

I disagree with those who argue that revocation of the waiver is an effective means to achieve further progress. Our former colleague and prisoner of war, Ambassador Pete Peterson, has noted that improvements in our relations have only been made since we have engaged the Vietnamese. In addition, many of my colleagues who have served in Vietnam support extending the waiver: Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Senator JOHN KERRY, Senator BOB KERREY, the gentleman from Illinois Mr. LANE EVANS, Representative JACK MURTHA, to name a few.

I urge a no vote on this resolution.

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

I would like to remind Members that they all received a letter from 17 of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, Vietnam vets, all in support of the waiver. I would urge them to make sure that they read it critically.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 Trade Act focuses on using various U.S. trade inducements to pressure non-market countries to allow freedom of emigration. It is not supposed to be a total referendum on that nation's internal policies, and it has nothing to do with MFN, and it has nothing to do with other human rights violations, other than the freedom to emigrate. That is what we are talking about today.

The practical effect of this waiver simply allows U.S. exporters to operate more efficiently in Vietnam. Our exporters face an uneven playing field when trying to sell to Vietnam. Foreign competitors have long had the support of their home governments, equivalents of the Eximbank, OPIC, TDA, and the USDA. Foreign countries have taken export opportunities away from Americans, simply because our

foreign competitors obtained a government-subsidized rate for an export loan, or dangled a foreign aid incentive before certain Vietnamese government officials. Japan alone has an \$850 million developmental assistance package to induce countries like Vietnam to buy Japanese exports.

Finally, we got the message, and the President's waiver is making a difference, particularly on infrastructure projects. U.S. workers are now making products to sell to Vietnam. Vietnam prefers buying American products. The waiver does not lower any U.S. import duties on Vietnamese products. It is totally one-sided in our favor in terms of our balance of trade.

If this resolution passes, only U.S. workers will be hurt. Larger American companies may still win export deals in Vietnam, but they will use foreign subsidiaries and foreign workers to complete the contracts. That is, U.S. companies will use their foreign subsidiaries to sell to Vietnam, thus displacing American jobs.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I support House Joint Resolution 120, which would disapprove the waiver of Jackson-Vanik. I cannot say strongly enough that 1998 is not the time to extend normal trade relations to Vietnam, to waive our requirement for free emigration from Vietnam.

I believe that Vietnam and the United States will be able to trade with each other in the future, but not until Hanoi ends its human rights abuses, allows for truly free emigration, and establishes a fair and sound economic environment for American businesses. This is going to take time to achieve. This also will require the U.S. to refrain from extending normal trade relations status to Vietnam until Hanoi makes these corrections.

I am very concerned about the human rights abuses in Vietnam that my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), have already spoken to. While paying lip service to religious freedom and individual liberty, the Communist government of Vietnam continues to persecute those who question the authority of the state, including those in the Buddhist church who stand not only for freedom, but also for freedom to worship.

On July 15 Vietnam imposed prison sentences of 10 months to 2 year on 10 members of a religious group for engaging in heretical propaganda because they believe in their religious beliefs.

The heart of Jackson-Vanik focuses on freedom of emigration. Vietnam continues to restrict the right of its citizens to emigrate. I cannot even begin to tell you how many cases my office deals with concerning families who are split because Vietnamese au-

thorities will not allow the emigration of a family member.

Despite these problems, I believe that, given time, Vietnam can make changes. These changes really began with the reform movement in 1986. Vietnam achieved high economic growth of 8 percent a year with low inflation. As a result, the U.S. lifted economic sanctions in 1994 and normalized relations in 1995.

That was the wrong thing to do, because it has all been downhill since then. The economic growth did not produce democratic and market reforms, as we have seen in other countries like China, South Africa, Zimbabwe. In addition to quashing the religious, political, and social freedom of its citizens, and restricting their right to emigrate, Hanoi has taken giant steps backward from fostering sound policies and stability to bolster its economy and to attract foreign investors.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) pointed out, there has been a dramatic retraction of business from Vietnam because of these policies 40 percent contracted foreign investment decreased in the last year alone. U.S. exports to Vietnam plummeted from \$616 million in 1996 to \$286 million last year. As my hometown newspaper, the San Jose Mercury News, wrote, "The ruling Communist party has stalled further reform."

I am someone who believes in trade. I also believe that in specific cases, trade can be a useful tool to change behavior. I voted for normal trade relations between the United States and China. I believe that that has helped China to improve, and hopefully they will continue to improve.

All of us in this Chamber believe in human rights. Sometimes we have reasonable differences of opinion about what are the best tools in a particular case to achieve human rights. In this case, nothing could be clearer to me than using the tool of trade to improve human rights in Vietnam.

We used that tool effectively with South Africa. I am glad we did. It is very obvious to me that Vietnam is eager, for historical reasons as well as desperate economic reasons, to have a valuable trade relationship with the United States. Our history with Vietnam shows that they will collaborate with us in the effort for human rights if we just stand firm.

Now is the time for patience. While Vietnam has taken some steps toward improvement, it has very far to go as we can see from the Hanoi government's treatment of its own people. Vietnam has failed, it has flunked, in its effort to earn normal trade relations. I think it would be a dramatic mistake for our country, for the Vietnamese people, and for world peace, if we allow the waiver of Jackson-Vanik to move forward.

I strongly, strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 120.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BEN GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 120, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), in disapproving the extension of the waiver, the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The issues here are progress on human rights, freedom of religion, and freedom of emigration.

Simply stated, the Vietnamese government has not demonstrated any significant progress on any of these issues. Many of us have voiced our objections to the rapid pace of normalizing relations with Vietnam. Yet, our President insists that waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment and opening programs of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Export-Import Bank to Vietnam is in our best national interest, and will encourage the Vietnamese government to cooperate on many issues, including economic reforms. However, OPIC guarantees and Export-Import Bank financing programs should be a reward for achievement, and not offered as any fanciful incentive based on a hope for the future.

Despite the opening of relations 3 years ago, prisoners of conscience are still in prison. Thousands of our former comrades in arms are still unaccounted for in Vietnam.

The recent highly respected State Department Human Rights Report on Vietnam states,

The government arbitrarily arrested and detained citizens, including detention for peaceful expression of political and religious objections to government policies. The Vietnamese government denied citizens the right to fair and expeditious trials, and still holds a number of political prisoners.

The consequence of the Jackson-Vanik waiver granted in March of this year by the President is that our taxpayers began paying for subsidies for U.S. trade and investment in Vietnam through the Export-Import Bank and Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

These programs were designed to overcome the risks for American companies operating in a corrupt, troubled business environment in Vietnam. Yet, the business climate in Vietnam is marked by limited market access, lack of transparency, unpredictability in business dealings, red tape, and corruption. Many firms are pulling out of Vietnam, and foreign direct investment was down 40 percent last year.

An example of the risk of doing business in Vietnam is that the Eximbank, which opened their programs to Vietnam in April of this year, has not approved any guarantees or loans or insurance since that date in Vietnam. Exim is offering a limited number of programs because of Vietnam's severe credit problems. OPIC has been open for a comparable period, and like Exim, has yet to approve any financing for any American investments in Vietnam.

So we ask, how has a waiver of important American laws served our interest, as promised by the President, who is determined to help U.S. business? Furthermore, will Jackson-Vanik improve the Vietnamese record on POW-MIA issues? In the several months since the waiver has been in place, it certainly has not.

So, in conclusion, a proposed extension of the waiver of Jackson-Vanik would reward a lack of progress on human rights, immigration, and economic reform, and the POW-MIA effort. Vote yes on this resolution of disapproval, and send a strong message that our Nation values principles over potential profits.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), a leader in the area of religious freedom in Vietnam.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the President's decision to extend the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam, and in strong opposition to the resolution of disapproval.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver process is designed to promote immigration from countries that do not have market economies. In the case of Vietnam, the waiver is clearly working as intended. Since the waiver was granted, Vietnam has made steady progress under both the ROVR and the Orderly Departure programs. If the waiver is rescinded through passage of this resolution of disapproval, that progress, which depends entirely on the cooperation of the Vietnamese government, will almost certainly be reversed.

I urge the defeat of this resolution, a step that will encourage greater cooperation by Vietnam in resolving our ongoing discussions on other issues of concern, including human rights and trade.

By the defeat of this resolution, we will also give a vote of confidence to the outstanding work of our ambassador in Vietnam and his very fine staff. I am pleased to urge defeat of this resolution.

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

Let me remind everyone, Mr. Speaker, that this waiver only allows that Vietnam be reviewed for possible coverage by U.S. trade financing programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the waiver extension and in opposition of the resolution of disapproval.

□ 1500

I think that Thomas Jefferson was right on target when he said, "Two thinking men can be given the exact same set of facts and draw different conclusions."

Mr. Speaker, I obviously have the highest regard for the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), my very dear friend and a great hero, a former POW himself, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and others who are supporting the resolution, and of course the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the chairman of my Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, when I think about the changes that all of us have observed over the past several years in Vietnam, they are incredible. I went in the early part of this decade and had the chance to see Negen Kotach, who was the Foreign Minister, present to me translated copies of Paul Samuelson's economic text. There are very bold moves being made towards a free market, and in fact we are making progress in the area of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving on the POW/MIA Task Force. In 1986, I went with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) on my first trip to Vietnam. It was a very, very troubling experience for all of us.

But I have concluded that over this period of time, based on every shred of evidence that we have, we have seen a dramatic improvement in the cooperation of the Vietnamese Government with the United States in trying to resolve this issue.

So, I oppose the resolution of disapproval and support the extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver.

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

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Rohrabacher motion. I do so with great reluctance, because I have tremendous respect for many of the people leading the fight against this waiver. But Jackson-Vanik is about immigration.

Anyone who has studied the statistics, because I know there are many anecdotal stories and there are many problems remaining, but anyone who has studied the statistics knows that in

the last year there has been a dramatic reversal and a massive improvement in the Vietnamese Government's cooperation with us on processing refugees, people who were shipped back from the camps in Thailand, in Hong Kong, in Indonesia, to Vietnam against their will. Mr. Speaker, 15,000 interviews have been granted already; 82 percent of the people we are interviewing have been cleared for coming to the United States or other countries that they intend to go to.

The criteria for interviews is far more liberal than the traditional refugee definition. We cannot turn down and thereby risk the retrenchment of this program, and I urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

I urge a "no" vote against H.J. Res. 120. Vietnam is cooperating on the key issue behind granting this waiver: Jackson-Vanik.

Mr. Smith and I fought long and hard with the administration to get them to implement a Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees (ROVR) program. This involved Vietnamese boat people who were forced back to Vietnam after ending the program of keeping them in camps abroad. After we got the administration to go along with it, we pressed them hard to get the Vietnamese to ensure their cooperation. And they have been successful.

So successful is the program that there are now 343 cases, involving 601 people, who have not left because, after receiving clearance from the Vietnamese Government and after having been interviewed by the INS, they have decided suddenly to get married and bring their spouses and other relatives over.

We have submitted over 19,000 names to the Vietnamese. They have cleared for interview 15,572. 991 have not been cleared, mainly because we gave the Vietnamese the wrong address. Of these, 36 have not been cleared because of criminal charges. We have put 713 on medical hold and excluded 23 for medical reasons.

This is a great achievement. Over 5,000 people have already left for the United States. More are coming and the administration is optimistic that it will have completed the program by the year's end.

This is what the Jackson-Vanik requirement is all about and Vietnam has met that requirement. Sure there has been some pushing and pulling but Vietnam has made major and significant steps to ensure the program works even though we allowed more liberal definitions of eligibility than we had applied for other immigrant applicants.

We want to encourage more openness by Vietnam generally. The success of this program and the joint accounting for POW/MIA demonstrates that we can work with Vietnam to our mutual interest.

Vote "no" on H.J. Res. 120.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations, who is respected throughout this body for his commitment to human rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), my good friend, for yielding me this time and for his excellent work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, let me just make it very clear what this vote is about. It is about U.S. taxpayer subsidies for one of the worst dictatorships in the world. Let us be clear on another thing. There is no freedom of immigration from Vietnam. If there were, there would be no need for this waiver. The administration could simply certify that Vietnam complies with the Jackson-Vanik Freedom of Information requirement. Instead, by waiving the requirement, the administration has conceded that there is no such freedom.

Yes, the government allows some people to leave when it is good and ready. But for the many thousands who have been persecuted because they were on our side during the Vietnam war, Vietnam is still a prison.

I hope my colleagues understand that this is not a vote about free trade. It is about subsidies; corporate welfare for Communists. Since the President gave the waiver in March, the U.S. taxpayer has been paying for Eximbank and OPIC subsidies of trade and investment in Vietnam. Many of these taxpayer dollars subsidize ventures owned in large part by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Over-regulation and widespread corruption make Vietnam a terrible place to do business.

Mr. Speaker, let me also remind Members, I was the prime sponsor of the amendment back in 1995. We had a hot debate, because we were sending people back who were real refugees. Yes, there has been some progress on ROVR. But we find that it slows to a trickle, to nothingness, when they decide to turn off the spigot. We should not be intimidated by that kind of opening and closing of the gates for the ROVR program.

Let me also say that in Vietnam, human rights violations are many. Catholic priests, Buddhists, are arrested and imprisoned. Vietnam enforces a two-child-per-couple policy by depriving parents of unauthorized children of employment and other government benefits. It denies workers the right to organize independent trade unions and has subjected many to forced labor.

The government not only denies freedom of the press, but also systematically jams Radio Free Asia which tries to bring them the kind of broadcasting they would provide for themselves if their government would allow them free expression.

Many organizations support the Rohrabacher resolution: the American Legion, the veterans groups. I urge my colleagues to please vote for it.

So we should disapprove the Jackson-Vanik waiver at least until the government allows all

the ROVR-eligible refugees to leave. And we should also stand up for the people who never left Viet Nam and are still trapped there, including long-term reeducation camp survivors and former U.S. government employees. Many of these people are members of the Montagnard ethnic minority who fought valiantly for the U.S. and have suffered greatly ever since. As of a few weeks ago, only 4 Montagnard applicants—out of over 800 we believe to be eligible for U.S. refugee programs—have been cleared for refugee interviews.

Finally, we must not forget the prisoners of conscience. Hanoi imprisons Catholic priests, Buddhist monks, pro-democracy activists, scholars, and poets. When we complain to the Vietnamese government, they just respond that "we have a different system." They need to be persuaded that a system like this is not one that Americans will subsidize.

In Vietnam human rights violations are many. Hanoi arrests and imprisons Catholic priests and Buddhist monks. Vietnam enforces a "two-child per couple" policy by depriving the parents of "unauthorized" children of employment and other government benefits. It denies workers the right to organize independent trade unions, and has subjected many to forced labor. The government not only denies freedom of the press, but also systematically jams Radio Free Asia, which tries to bring them the kind of broadcasting they would provide for themselves if their government would allow freedom of expression.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietnamese government and its victims will both be watching this vote. We must send the message that economic benefits from the United States absolutely depend on decent treatment of Vietnam's own people. We may not be able to insist on perfection, but we must insist on progress.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 8½ minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 6½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) has 11½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, at times the United States has been involved in Nation-building with our dollars. These are handouts. These are Communists.

Every Vietnam group that helped American troops while they were over there dying for peace, they have repressed every Vietnam group that was supportive of our troops.

I support the resolution. We just had a strike settled where General Motors workers won an agreement that they would not sell a couple of their plants by the year 2000. They are desperately fighting for jobs. The Congress of the United States and all our well-meaning, politically correct economic strategies is shipping jobs all over the world

and is patting Communists on the back. I want no part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. I think we are rewarding Communists that screwed our soldiers and screwed their own people who tried to help our men who were protecting their buns.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the resolution. I ask Congress to approve it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) who served as a prisoner of war in Vietnam and knows that they are not cooperating on the MIA/POW issue, just to back up what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) just stated.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not about Vietnam. It is about honoring and respecting the over 58,000 American soldiers who gave their lives battling communism so we could remain free. It is about our soldiers who still remain missing in action. It is about keeping the hope alive for the families who still wake up every morning asking the same question: What happened to my child, my husband, my brother, my father?

I have seen how this Communist government conducts business. I have personally experienced their threats, their lies, and their so-called promises. My distrust lies with the Vietnamese Government.

To those Members of Congress and to the administration who believe that opening up the Vietnam markets will bring closure to this chapter in history, they are wrong. I listened to their propaganda that America had betrayed us, left us to die. I knew they were wrong.

As a member of the U.S.-Russia Joint Commission on POW/MIAs, we have been negotiating for the last 5 years to get a full accounting of our missing. I can tell my colleagues that the Government of Vietnam continually refuses to cooperate.

My only request is let us stop the suffering of the parents, the children, the relatives, those who do not know the fate of their brave loved ones. Let us stand up to the Vietnam Government today and say: Give us information on our missing who died.

America demands to know what happened to our servicemen and women, the soldiers who died for this Nation to keep it free.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for extension of the waiver and in opposition to the resolution.

In the mid-1960s, I was an infantry officer and intelligence officer with the

First Infantry Division. I completed my service, but within a month the members of my tight-knit unit were in Vietnam and taking casualties the first night. I have emotional baggage, we all have emotional baggage in this country, but I would suggest it is time to get on and not reverse course on Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) who just spoke, but I bring to the attention of the Members what we know already. Another former POW, our former colleague Pete Peterson, tells us about the dramatic progress now being made, with the Vietnamese help, in remains recovery under some very difficult and dangerous and treacherous conditions. And in fact, of course, another POW, JOHN McCAIN, has also, along with others who served in Vietnam, supported a waiver in this instance.

But after all, this issue is about emigration. That is what Jackson-Vanik is about. So, we ought to address the issue before us.

Under the statute, a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment may be granted if it will substantially promote freedom of migration. Vietnam's record on emigration has improved dramatically in the last 10 to 12 years. Over 480,000 Vietnamese have emigrated to the United States under the Orderly Departure Program. And, despite some unwise things done in this House just a year or so ago, only about 6,900 ODP applicants remain to be processed.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to this Member that in the case of Vietnam, the Jackson-Vanik amendment is working. Last October, Vietnam eliminated the requirement for applicants to obtain exit permits prior to interviews for the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees, ROVR, greatly facilitating the implementation of ROVR.

Subsequently, as the waiver came up for renewal, Vietnam modified its procedures for handling the ODP cases of Montagnards and former reeducation camp detainees to conform with the ROVR procedures. The prospect of the initial waiver and later its renewal almost certainly factored in Vietnam's decision to liberalize procedures under the Orderly Departure Program and ROVR. The yearly renewal of the waiver will maintain incentives for progress toward free emigration.

Vietnam remains a difficult place for American firms to do business. That is sure. But we ought to extend the Jackson-Vanik waiver not to benefit the Government of Vietnam or its people, but for the benefit of the American people. The waiver should lead to increased U.S. exports and to have a greater impact on the way the Vietnamese regard human rights and democracy.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, this Member would suggest that now is not the time to reverse course on Vietnam. Since establishing relations three years ago, Vietnam has increasingly cooperated with the United States on a range of issues. The most important of these is, I am informed, dramatic progress and cooperation in obtaining the fullest possible accounting of Americans missing from the Vietnam War. Those Members who attended the briefing by the distinguished Ambassador to Vietnam, a former Prisoner of War and former Member of this body, the Honorable Pete Peterson, learned of the great efforts to which Vietnam is now extending to address our concerns regarding the POW/MIA issue, including their participation in physically very dangerous remains recovery efforts.

Moreover, the Government of Vietnam is proving to be cooperative on the issue of emigration—which, as Members of this body must know, is actually the issue that Jackson-Vanik addresses.

This Member would not want to permit the impression to exist among any of his colleagues that support of the Jackson-Vanik waiver is an endorsement of the Communist regime in Hanoi. We cannot approve of a regime that places restrictions on basic freedoms, including the right to organize political parties, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion.

But even in this problematic area, engagement is producing results. The American presence in Vietnam exposes Vietnamese to American ideals and principles. Vietnamese visitors to the United States including official delegations, students and businessmen, learn about the American way of life. We can expect that over time these contacts, along with access to international media and telecommunications, will have a beneficial effect on Vietnamese attitudes. Greater prosperity will lead to increased demand for responsiveness from the government, an important first step on the road to democracy.

Vietnam remains a difficult place for American firms to do business. This Member is particularly concerned about the level of corruption that has been tolerated by Hanoi. A bilateral trade agreement is under negotiation that will improve Vietnam's trade and investment environment to benefit and protect American business. Rejection of the waiver would undermine the trade negotiations and remove any incentive for Vietnam to meet United States requirements. Extending the waiver will encourage economic reforms and maintain American firms' access to the trade promotion and investment support programs of the Export-Import Bank, OPIC and USDA, enabling the firms to compete with foreign businesses that receive benefits from their own governments.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver does not give MFN to Vietnam. MFN can be considered only following the waiver and the approval by Congress of a completed bilateral trade agreement.

We should extend the Jackson-Vanik waiver, not to benefit Vietnam's Government or people, but for the benefit of the American people. The waiver should lead to increased United States exports to and investment in

Vietnam, which, in turn, will lead to more jobs for American workers. Continued engagement with Vietnam is the way to promote the democratic values we uphold. Approval of the waiver will encourage Vietnam's further integration into regional organizations and world markets. This integration is a positive force for regional stability.

I urge rejection of the resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY).

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120.

This resolution would deny my community and others like it the opportunity to continue its humanitarian efforts with the Vietnamese people to promote emigration. UPLIFT International, Heart to Heart, the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation have made generous contributions to those in need.

One of the recipients of the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation, Joyce Nguyen, is an intern in my district office. As a Student Ambassador from Rockhurst College, she traveled to Da Nang to assess the needs of the doctors and staff. She is a first generation American whose parents fled Vietnam after the war. Joyce learned of her cultural background and shared her American heritage with the doctors and the students that she taught English to. Her work in Vietnam allowed her to make permanent life friends and retrace the history of her ancestors.

I see many positive advantages at the local and national level for free emigration and social development. As the next millennium approaches, we should be concerned with forming a lasting friendship with Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 120.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam, and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120. It is true that our relationship with Vietnam has been marked with sorrowful memories. Unfortunately, when the word Vietnam is spoken, it conjures up haunting images of war and not of the beautiful and culturally rich country that it is today. In 1994, the Clinton Administration lifted the U.S. Trade Embargo which allowed U.S. firms to enter Vietnam's economy and compete in the international community. This action has led to Vietnam being part of the ASEAN organization, a qualification which shows promising potential for the country to be a significant trade partner with the U.S. Our goal is to forge a new relationship for both nations, so that we can both benefit from a friendship dedicated to healing and reconciliation.

Trade is important to America. More importantly, trade relations are important to the Fifth District of Missouri. Currently, Vietnam has a crumbling infrastructure, a shortage of medicine, and limited technology. Companies like Black and Veatch, Hoechst Marion Roussel

(HMR), Butler Manufacturing, Burlington Air Express, and countless other companies have business ventures with the Vietnamese which are vital to my district.

Black and Veatch, an engineering firm, headquartered in Kansas City, Missouri is performing a \$2.4 million project for the people of Vietnam. Black & Veatch is an 80 year old corporation which employs 2,500 engineers and architects in the Kansas City area and over 7,000 working professionals in over 90 offices worldwide. Black and Veatch was the first engineering company to set up an office in Vietnam and is currently upgrading water treatment plants in seven towns. HMR has a subsidiary in Vietnam which markets the drugs it makes here in the United States to the people of Vietnam. About 2,000 of my constituents work at HMR World Headquarters, an established pharmaceutical company which manufactures and markets medicine you can find in your local drugstores and across the world. Another company, Butler Manufacturing and its 5,100 employees rely upon the economic ties established in Ho Chi Minh City to deliver preengineered metal buildings and structural frames.

In Missouri, corporations are looking overseas for opportunities to sell American goods and services. Proctor and Gamble, United Airlines, Ford Motor Company, Goodyear, Pfizer International, Harley Davidson, Caterpillar, and Lucent Technologies are just a handful of companies employing thousands of Missourians who have operations and ongoing projects with Vietnam.

This resolution would deny my community the opportunity to continue its humanitarian efforts with the Vietnamese people. UPLIFT International, Heart to Heart, and the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation have made generous contributions to those in need. Corporate sponsors like Black and Veatch, Hoechst Marion Roussel, Federal Express, and Boeing have helped establish trust, and placed people before profit. What began in 1995 as a Heart to Heart airlift to supply 46 tons of medical supplies has led to additional efforts to supply the Vietnamese people with undertakings like UPLIFT's Project HOPE to ensure tuberculosis education and prevention. Under the direction and vision of Mike Meyer, UPLIFT has gained much corporate sponsorship as well as the trust of the Vietnamese government. When Typhoon Linda struck the Vietnamese coastline, Mr. Meyer was specifically asked by the Vietnamese government to help out and quickly found a way to provide the supplies needed.

The Westmoreland Scholar Foundation, named in honor of General and Mrs. William C. Westmoreland, is a non-political, non-profit educational foundation established for the purpose of educating those young people who can best contribute to reconciliation and harmony between the people of the United States of America and the people of Vietnam.

One of the recipients of the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation, Joyce Nguyen, is an intern in my District Office. As a Student Ambassador, from Rockhurst College in Kansas City, Missouri, she traveled to Da Nang, Vietnam with the intent to assess the needs of the doctors and staff. She and a fellow Rockhurst student, Son Do, traveled to Da Nang and are

both first generation Americans whose parents fled from Vietnam after the war. This was a unique experience for them to witness their parent's homeland and to communicate what the hospital lacked in essential equipment and medicines for its patients to UPLIFT International. With the support of Vietnam veterans like Ret. Col. Roger H. Donlon, the first soldier to receive a Congressional Medal of Honor in Vietnam, his wife Norma, and many community members, Joyce learned of her cultural background and shared her American heritage with the doctors and students as she taught them English. Her work in Vietnam allowed her to make permanent life friends and retrace this history of her ancestors.

The Westmoreland Scholar Foundation has Vietnamese American students enrolled in many colleges throughout the United States including Rockhurst College in my district. This program is meant to build bridges between both American and Vietnamese cultures. It ensures opportunities for students active in the Vietnamese-American communities for study and humanitarian services in Vietnam and for the exchange of Vietnamese students to study in the United States. This organization is dedicated to friendship with our Vietnamese allies, and the opportunity to gain the respect of our former Vietnamese adversaries in the tradition of patriotism, service, and leadership demonstrated by the lives of the Westmorelands.

I see many positive advantages at the local and national levels for free immigration and social development. As the next millennium approaches, we should be concerned with forming a lasting relationship with countries like Vietnam. I urge my colleagues to vote no on House Joint Resolution 120.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished Member who has been very active in the area of trade.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the proponents on the narrow terms of the waiver. But more importantly, I feel that they are also wrong on the big picture.

This very day, my daughter, a college-age young woman, is in Vietnam going anywhere she wishes, marveling at the friendliness of the people, over 60 percent of whom are under 25 years of age with no connection to the war, other than to live with its horrible consequences.

□ 1515

They are looking to America for a new relationship. This decision today is about whether we on this floor can exemplify the spirit of our late colleague, Walter Capps, about learning and reconciliation. It is about equipping our friend, Pete Peterson, in his mission as Ambassador to move the relationship between these two countries into the future in the spirit of healing and rehabilitation.

And most important, this debate is to assure that we, as Congress, can learn from this experience so that our children, their children and grandchildren will not be trapped by the web

that so ensnared three generations of Americans.

Please, reject the resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the father of Radio Free Europe.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate about trade or investment. American companies, I think we all know, are free to trade with and invest in Vietnam. We all wish them well in that. This resolution does nothing to change that.

What this resolution does is to say, now is not the time to send in government agencies, OPIC and the Eximbank, which is the practical effect of this waiver, and give us more leverage to fight for the many interests we have in Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Since we began normalizing relations with Vietnam, we have extended more and more to the Vietnamese government. As of today, we have given it recognition. We have opened an embassy in Hanoi. We have sent an ambassador to work out the many real interests we have in Vietnam. Today we are looking at letting a Jackson-Vanik waiver to go by and opening the door for OPIC and Eximbank funding, a subsidy to Vietnam. These gradual changes in our policy I thought were to be done with a sense of expectation of the Vietnamese government. My understanding was that this was supposed to be a two-way street.

Since we began normalizing relations with Vietnam, we have extended more and more to the Vietnamese government. As of today, we've given it recognition, opened an embassy in Hanoi, and sent an ambassador to work on the many real interests we have in Vietnam, including the POW/MIA issue. Today we're looking at letting a Jackson-Vanik waiver go by and opening the door for OPIC and Exim Bank funding in Vietnam.

These gradual changes in our policy. I thought, were to be done with a sense of expectation of the Vietnamese government. My understanding was that this process was supposed to be a two-way street.

I also thought we were going to bring a healthy dose of skepticism to the table. We were going to be skeptical, not because of any bitterness over our past in Vietnam, but because we understood the type of government we're dealing with: in simple terms, one of the world's most politically and economically repressive regimes.

This is the reality we must deal with in asking whether progress has been made on the issues we care about and also whether it's likely that progress will be made if we give up one more lever of influence we have over the Vietnamese government: American taxpayer subsidized trade benefits. And we should all realize that the Vietnamese government very much wants this waiver. This is real leverage. So, why give it up without human rights progress from Vietnam.

And why should U.S. taxpayers support these subsidized U.S. businesses in Vietnam,

one of the least open, most state-controlled economies in the world. This economy lacks property rights and suffers from corruption. Patent piracy is a problem. Not surprisingly, the first American corporation licensed to operate in Vietnam (Vatico, Inc.) closed shop and left the country earlier this summer. So let's send in OPIC and Ex-Im to aid U.S. businesses, and even Vietnamese government-controlled businesses in partnership with American firms?

This reminds me of another issue before this Congress: funding for the International Monetary Fund. There is debate over whether IMF funding, U.S. taxpayer-supported funding, can be effective in bringing about economic reform in aided countries. Many suggest that IMF support prolongs reform by propping up bad government policies. That's what happened in Indonesia. You know at least the subsidized IMF asks for change. With OPIC and Ex-Im Bank we will support businesses with only the hope that the Vietnamese government will change its policies. This is the type of wishful government-funded engagement we're considering. [By the way, the IMF has canceled loans to Vietnam.]

We've heard today that political and religious repression is pervasive in Vietnam. So it's not surprising that the Vietnamese government is jamming Radio Free Asia. Hanoi has done this almost from the beginning of RFA's Vietnamese broadcasting. Radio Free Asia is intended to provide Vietnamese with the range of information we believe will help them build democracy and free-market driven prosperity. The Vietnamese government wants none of this.

Let's remember the reaction many of us in this body had last month when Beijing denied Radio Free Asia reporters the right to travel with President Clinton to China. Many of us condemned that. Some of us thought President Clinton should have taken a stronger stand on this fundamental issue. Yet here we have Hanoi attacking the free press, RFA, in even more direct terms. What's our response: send in OPIC and the Ex-Im Bank!

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not a debate about trade or investment. American companies are free to trade with and invest in Vietnam. We wish them well. This Resolution does nothing to change that. What this Resolution does do is to say now is not the time to send in government-agencies, OPIC and the Ex-Im Bank, which is the practical affect of this waiver, and give up more leverage to fight for the many interests we have in Vietnam. I urge my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

It is the actions of the 1980s and 1990s that are moving this country to a lower common denominator concerning basic human rights and disregard for the fundamental values that should serve as the core of our foreign and economic policies. We cannot change nor should we seek to change the outcome of military events in Southeast Asia 3 decades ago. But the United States can, through existing law and

policy, assert foreign economic policies that provide for improvement and democratization of this part of the world, including Vietnam.

The fact is, we cannot keep spending the same dollar over and over again, talking about progress towards, while the fundamental tenets of Jackson-Vanik are not being met, much less basic human rights in this country. The fact is, we need to assert our influence now at this time to achieve that for those people in Southeast Asia that are still being ill-treated and not provided the opportunities that they merit much less any freedoms required by Jackson-Vanik.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to strongly support this resolution that opposes this type of trade liberalization.

I rise today in support of the resolution to disapprove the waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 for Vietnam. Serious issues remain in our relationship with Vietnam; the government of Vietnam is criticized by international human rights groups for a wide range of violations including arbitrary detention, disregard of workers rights and persecution of religious groups. The communist government in Vietnam will not allow democracy and freedom without pressure. What the United States does in regard to trade agreements does have an impact; we can be a force for positive change.

Actions of the U.S. are most important today, because of past actions of this Congress and Administration throughout the 1980s and 1990s; the United States is regrettably moving towards a lower common denominator—concerning basic human rights, disregard for fundamental values which should serve as the core of our foreign economic policies, and yielding to political expediency. We can't change nor should we seek to change the outcome of military events in South East Asia over two decades ago. But the U.S. can, through existing law, and policy assert foreign economic policies that achieve an improvement in the democratization of this region of the world, including Vietnam.

The year by year rubber stamping of normal trade relations, in light of the absolute contradiction of actions and deeds, is wrong. We should pass this resolution of disapproval.

The fact is that the Vietnamese government is not meeting the conditions of free emigration. It is irresponsible to allow this country beneficial trade relations, on a veneer argument that "progress towards" this goal is being made. With rights and privileges come responsibilities and hopefully, results. Supporters cannot keep spending the same currency piece in a circular manner—suggesting that maintaining the waiver and allowing the trade benefits to follow will facilitate the Vietnamese government's respect and embracing of human rights. At this point our United States forbearance should have produced positive results. Those who are persecuted and denied basic human rights look to us, as citizens of the world's oldest democracy, to responsibly pursue policies that would permit some hope of social, political, and economic benefit.

In its origins and provisions, Jackson-Vanik is centered on freedom of emigration. Advocates of this resolution will tell you that Vietnam has eliminated the requirement for an applicant under the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees program to obtain an exit visa prior to an interview with the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization service. They will point out this "progress towards" free emigration satisfies the requirements of the Jackson-Vanik trade law.

The truth is that Vietnam has not dropped its requirement for exit permits. Rather, this requirement was merely delayed until after the applicant is interviewed and approved by the United States interviewing teams. In addition to this administrative roadblock, in any instances applicants to U.S. resettlement programs are charged inordinate and significant fees that they cannot afford, in order to gain access to the programs. Vietnam doesn't meet even the basic test of the controlling law, Jackson-Vanik, much less a broader test regarding essential human rights.

In fact, Vietnam remains one of the most repressive countries in the world. Basic rights that we in the United States take for granted are denied to the citizens of Vietnam. All opposition to the communist party is crushed. Religious activities are closely regulated. Human rights organizations are not allowed to operate. Workers are not free to join or form unions of their choosing; such action requires governmental approval. Children remain at risk of being exploited as child labor workers, and women are commonly subject to serious social discrimination. At this point, Congressional action to waive the Jackson-Vanik provisions would symbolize "business as usual" for the Vietnamese leaders. Therefore, they may continue the oppression of their own people and still reap the benefits of trade relations with the United States.

Consideration of waiving the Jackson-Vanik provisions should at least be delayed until there are concrete, rather than superficial actions demonstrating that Vietnam is prepared and willing to act in good faith. This resolution will not stop U.S. trade with Vietnam, nor will it hinder free trade as Vietnam is simply not currently eligible for Normal Trade Status (NTS). Passage of this resolution would send a clear message that our laws mean what they say, that the U.S. will stand behind its laws and values, and that freedoms systematically denied to the average Vietnamese citizens are worth speaking out in defense of and standing up for. Basic human rights are not an internal matter. Because of these unresolved issues, we should in good conscience go forward with approving this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, the main discussion here seems to be, on both sides of the aisle, the question of human rights violations, the question of religious persecution, immigration policy, and the issue of the POW and the MIAs. So how best do we deal with that particular issue right now 2 or 3 decades after the war is over?

I think that the U.S. needs to exert its influence in those areas. So how

best do we exert our influence to change that, when it seems to me very obvious America's absence of engagement will create a void that will be filled by a country with little or no interest in our POWs or MIAs, human rights violations or their emigration policy.

It is the United States in this world that wants to be engaged in those kinds of problems. The Vietnamese government has shown significant improvement in all of these areas in the last couple years, especially since our former colleague, Pete Peterson, a former POW, is now the ambassador to Vietnam.

With the Vietnamese and the Americans working side by side on roads, bridges, coastal hotels, dredging the harbors, et cetera, et cetera, with the Vietnamese paying the bill, with that kind of engagement, the human contact with this country and that country will make the difference.

I urge a no vote on the resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), who knows we are not talking about the Vietnamese paying the bill. We are paying the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I just say to my friend who just spoke, this is not about staying engaged with the Vietnamese. We are fully engaged. We have normalized relations. We have full trade with Vietnam. Those policies are not in question.

What is in question, though, is about, and we are not refighting the Vietnam war. We are fully engaged in this. Although the Vietnamese are showing some improvement in the area of emigration with the Rover program and others, I think they are woefully short of meeting the threshold that would allow us to use American tax dollars to subsidize American businesses doing business in Vietnam.

I have from my own district Dr. Nguyen Dan Que and Doan Viet Hoat, who are still languishing in Vietnamese prisons, on trumped up charges, for 15 years. Their families are not allowed to visit. When I was there last January, I was not allowed to visit. They are not allowed to get correspondence. They are not allowed to emigrate and come back to Northern Virginia, where they would like to join their families.

We are in a sense, by ignoring existing prisoners there who are there on trumped up charges, rewarding behavior that is woefully short of the kinds of gains that we have seen in China and other places. I do not think this behavior should be rewarded, their human rights abuses being rewarded with tax subsidies from U.S. taxpayers. I think we need to send Vietnam a message that more freedom of emigration has to be accomplished, and I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 120, which would

disapprove the President's renewal of his waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment for the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. As many of you know, I have been a fervent supporter of U.S. engagement with countries who have had a history of committing human rights violations. My positions rests on my belief that it is only through the gradual building of trust between nations that arises when commerce and cultural ideas flow freely, that democracy and freedom will prevail in such societies. To my deep regret, the Vietnamese government has demonstrated that no amount of economic engagement will compel improvements in its human rights record, especially when it comes to its emigration policies. The President's waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment this year is clearly without any basis. Indeed, it is contrary to the overwhelming evidence that the Vietnamese government does not permit free emigration as the Jackson-Vanik amendment requires before normal trading status can be conferred on Vietnam.

Having visited Vietnam this past January, I can attest to the fact that Vietnam has done little to improve its human rights violations or loosened its restrictions on free emigration. Unlike China, which has made slow but measured progress in the area of human rights as witnessed by the many Chinese religious leaders and citizens that I spoke with during my visit to China last year, the same unfortunately cannot be said for Vietnam.

Two Vietnamese-American families in my district intimately understand the agony of having a family member thrown into a Vietnamese prison simply because they promoted human and political rights. Both Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, a 53-year-old endocrinologist, and Professor Doan Viet Hoat each received 20 year sentences for conducting "activities aimed at overthrowing the people's government." Professor Hoat's sentence was later reduced to 15 years of imprisonment and 5 years of house arrest and deprivation of his civil liberties. Worried about their health and safety, their families asked me to do all I could to learn about their medical conditions. We had understood that both men were suffering from serious kidney problems. However, my request was denied. I was not permitted to visit with any political prisoners and the medical information I did receive was unclear.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver exists for the express purpose of improving emigration between nations by using the promise of economic relations as leverage. With this in mind, I do not dispute the fact that it has an unquestionably important role in normalizing U.S.-Vietnam relations. However, so much work has yet to be done in the way of individual liberty in Vietnam. I cannot help but feel that the waiver is being improperly implemented this year.

Make no mistake, I consider productive relations with Vietnam's Government to be very important. But a relationship must stand on mutual understanding and clear expectations. It is time that we make a statement to the Government of Vietnam on the state of human rights in that country. I would hope that our support for the resolution would also carry the message that we will not stand for continued human rights abuses in Vietnam.

I would like to note that trade between nations implies a degree of mutual respect and

acceptance. We as a nation have demonstrated goodwill in this endeavor and still have yet to see these efforts reciprocated in accord with the waiver's provisions. Vietnam's government has had adequate time to demonstrate its commitment towards improving its emigration policies since the President ended the U.S. trade embargo on Vietnam in 1994. Given the continued restrictions on emigration and political freedoms in Vietnam, I feel that we must voice our disapproval.

I am encouraged by the fact that many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have found the proposed waiver renewal to be ill-considered. Once we see concrete progress by the Vietnamese government—that real improvements are being made so far as human liberties are concerned—then I will be one of the first to say that waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment and normalizing U.S.-Vietnamese trade relations would further the interests of civil liberty and freedoms. Until that time, however, we must send a clear message and vote in favor of this disapproval resolution. Doing otherwise will reflect poorly on this nation and on the principles for which it stands.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with what I think is one of America's greatest Vietnam war heroes, a former colleague and our present ambassador to Vietnam, in asking all my colleagues to vote in opposition to this bill.

The reason for it, I think, is clear. We have Vietnam now the 12th largest country in the world in terms of population. Almost 70 percent of those residents of Vietnam are under the age of 25, the vast majority of which were born after the Vietnam war.

I think, clearly, this country has demonstrated, by a policy of economic and social and cultural engagement, we have been able to have the greatest impact in improving the quality of lives of those countries in which we reach out to. We make the greatest difference advancing human rights, the greatest difference in advancing the issue of religious freedom, the greatest impact in advancing the concept of democracy when we choose to economically and culturally and socially engage with a country. That is what it is all about, when we continue with the waiver for Jackson-Vanik.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this motion.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, passage of House Joint Resolution 120 would not be a message, it would be a hammer. It would be a hammer because it sends the clear message to the people of Vietnam that we are not serious about trying to be constructive and open up our trade and open up our relations with this country.

If we believe that, by imposing these stricter standards of economic engagement with Vietnam, we are going to send a message and have some success; and if we are going to look at examples like South Africa, we have to remember that South Africa were multilateral sanctions where we had virtually an entire world behind those efforts to change South Africa.

We cannot say that about Vietnam. We know for a fact that the Europeans, Japan, other Asian countries, Latin America, they are all ready to go in and fill a void if the U.S. disengages. That will not just be at the expense of U.S. business, it will be at the expense of the U.S. government and the U.S. people.

We must engage. If no one has faith with the folks that are speaking here, please remember our former colleague, Pete Peterson, ambassador to Vietnam, a former POW who says it is right to do this. Please oppose House Joint Resolution 120.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's waiver of the Jackson-Vanik trade restrictions on Vietnam.

I am a veteran myself. I have served almost 30 years with the National Guard. I have been on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, serve on the House Committee on International Relations. I realize that times come when we have to move toward normal relations with Vietnam. It was a terrible war. It was a terrible conflict. It was a war of containment. I would not call it a war that we won.

Our former colleague, now the U.S. ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson has nothing but praise for the Vietnamese efforts to aid the U.S. in locating and identifying the remains of POWs and MIAs. The ambassador says that the two countries are cooperating at an unprecedented level for former combatants.

I say to the critics of the waiver, listen to the words of the VFW. They say, We believe that current U.S. trade policies may have resulted in both gradual improvement in U.S.-Vietnamese relations and general and proportional improvements.

Oppose the resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, at this point I think we need to add little, but perhaps some other observations.

I consider the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) not only my colleague but my dear friend, and I would say that on almost everything we have been together where human rights are concerned. I feel that we just have a difference of view today, and I hope that his, in this instance, does not

prevail. Not because of any argument about commitment to human rights but what the best course is today in order to advance human rights.

I make a plea to all of my colleagues who know Pete Peterson, not just as I do, as a colleague and dear friend, but know what he went through as a POW. Surely, surely, as the first ambassador to Vietnam since the war, we owe him the opportunity to carry through on all of the elements that he thinks he can bring to bear to see not only human rights but the relationship between Vietnam and the United States of America blossom.

If we can conduct trade with China, surely we can conduct trade, surely we can give Mr. Peterson the opportunity to conduct the business of the United States. Surely, if we have this opportunity to make a statement that individuals can make a difference, that the Vietnam war can be healed, that those of us who have been scarred in this country by everything that took place there can find a healing purpose in giving Pete Peterson the opportunity to carry through on the program that he has put forward. If that is accomplished, I can assure Mr. ROHRABACHER and my colleagues here, all of whom stand united on behalf of human rights, that a great advancement will have taken place. We will have made a step today in that direction that we can all be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add to the comments that have been made this afternoon opposing this resolution because I believe passing it will not accomplish goals we all seek, such as greater accounting for POW's/MIAs and economic reforms.

I firmly believe that we are more likely to succeed in our foreign policy and human rights objectives by continuing and building on the work already begun by our ambassador, Pete Peterson, a former Member of Congress and a POW.

The purpose of the Jackson-Vanik amendment is to promote free emigration. As of July 13, 4,388 Vietnamese had departed for the United States under the Resettlement Opportunity agreement. Since the Jackson-Vanik waiver was granted, Vietnam has greatly reduced the red tape for prospective emigrants.

Both supporters and opponents must concede that progress is being made in emigration, business development, investment opportunities, and accounting for U.S. military personnel which are of vital interest and concern to America and the families of missing service men and women.

This bill will not only end the progress that has been made, but reverse the positive developments that have occurred. It will be a setback for our efforts to account for missing U.S. military personnel and other objectives.

I urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), my distinguished colleague from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many references to our former colleague, now ambassador, Pete Peterson. I wish everyone could have heard his very powerful and compelling testimony before the Subcommittee on Trade about reconciliation and engagement in Vietnam. This is not about MFN. I have heard some references to MFN or normal trade relations. That only occurs after a negotiated bilateral trade agreement. This is about allowing private overseas investment loan guarantees.

□ 1530

We must talk about our relations with Vietnam and what kind of leverage we have if we do not engage Vietnam. We lose leverage in obtaining more information from the Vietnamese government on those POWs and MIAs that we are still not sure about.

The VFW in a statement released on July 28 said that disapproving the waiver would harm the prospects for the cooperation between our governments that is necessary for a successful resolution and accounting for our missing Americans. We also lose leverage in bringing Vietnam closer into the community of nations. We lose leverage in encouraging Vietnam to promote the freedom of immigration, the very point of the Jackson-Vanik amendment when it was passed back in 1974.

I urge the defeat of H.J. Res. 120.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from San Diego, CA (Mr. HUNTER) a Vietnam veteran and a man whose standards are very much respected in this body.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. A couple of facts here are incontrovertible. One is that we have over 1,500 Americans still missing in Vietnam, including all 448 American pilots who were shot down in Vietnam-controlled Laos. That can mean only one thing. Not one of those pilots came home out of that 448. It means the North Vietnamese leaders had a policy of execution of the pilots that went down in that area. That is a war crime. There should be war trials for the criminals, for the Vietnamese communist leaders who propagated that policy of execution, if we could find them, if we could apprehend them, if we could lay hands on them. If we had treated Himmler and Goering like we are treating the Vietnamese communist dictatorship, they would be attending World Trade Organization meetings instead of the Nuremberg war trials. I think if we could devaluing the sacrifices of our veterans like we are doing with this bill, someday we are going to have a war and they are not going to come.

Support Rohrabacher.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120. I believe that this resolution is counterproductive to the national interests of the United States and to the continued improvement in the bilateral relationship between our Nation and Vietnam.

I did not have the privilege of serving in this House with Ambassador Pete Peterson, but over the course of the last 2 weeks I have had an opportunity to sit with him on several occasions and talk to him about his experience as ambassador to Vietnam from this country. Ambassador Peterson, I think, more than anyone else understands the problems and the complex nature of the issue as we transition from a very negative relationship with Vietnam to hopefully a better and more understanding relationship.

Ambassador Peterson tells me that Vietnam is a country in transition. It is a country in transition culturally, philosophically, economically, socially and even educationally. I believe that it is important, it is vital that we remain engaged with Vietnam and that we assist Vietnam and provide the leadership to help with that assistance to that country so that they can transition from a dictatorship to ultimately a democracy. I had an opportunity this morning to again be with Ambassador Peterson in the Cannon Building where there is an exhibition and it is simply titled "Vietnam, The Land That We Never Knew."

Mr. Speaker, I was in Vietnam 30 years ago. I spent 13 months there in the United States Army. I told Ambassador Peterson that I really did not have any interest in going back, but he has convinced me that with the policy of engagement, it is our obligation and our duty to go back and see the Vietnam that we never knew.

I am opposed to this resolution and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), a combat veteran who served in southeast Asia.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. As the gentleman from Illinois said, I did serve in the Vietnam War. I was a Navy officer on swift boats patrolling rivers and canals down in the delta region. But let me make it very clear that in my view having served in Vietnam does not give me any special qualification to have an opinion on this issue. Maybe it gives me some background on which to draw in making a decision. And I would use it to draw on a historical perspective.

In 1991, it was President Bush that proposed a road map, and I was very much involved in the Congress at the time that was being considered, for improving our relations with Vietnam. To follow the road map, Vietnam had to take steps to help us account for our

missing servicemen. In return for the cooperation, the United States was to move incrementally towards normalized relations.

Progress was made, and in 1994 a second step was taken when President Clinton lifted the trade embargo against Vietnam. In 1995, formal diplomatic relations were established between the United States and Vietnam.

Today's vote is just one more step along this road. As Ambassador Pete Peterson has said, if we grant this waiver today, he will have some of the tools he needs to convince Vietnam's leaders to improve human rights conditions, to continue support for the resolution of our POW and MIA cases that are still unresolved, and to maintain their commitment to liberalizing their economic and political institutions.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has always recognized a clear distinction between being at peace and being at war. We cannot, we must not forget the pain and suffering of war. But by granting this waiver and advocating for even greater liberalization of Vietnamese society, we can say to Americans who served in Vietnam that their commitment is vindicated as economic and political freedom takes root in that country.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a Vietnam veteran, the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, this is really a vote on whether we are truly dedicated to resolve the full accounting of our missing from the Vietnam war. As the Veterans of Foreign Wars have said, passing this resolution of disapproval will only hurt our efforts at a time when we are receiving the access that we need from the Vietnamese to determine the fate of our POW/MIAs.

As many of the speakers have said, there is no more authoritative voice on this issue than our former colleague and now Ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson. He supports the Jackson-Vanik waiver. As a prisoner of war who underwent years of imprisonment in the notorious Hanoi Hilton, Ambassador Peterson should have every reason to be skeptical and harbor bitterness towards the Vietnamese. Yet he believes that the best course is to further develop relations between our two nations.

He knows this because it is in our Nation's best interest. We have achieved progress on the POW/MIA issue because of our evolving relationship with Vietnam, not despite it. He also knows that without access to the jungles and the rice paddies, without access to the ar-

chival information and documents, and to the witnesses of these tragic incidents, we cannot give the families of the missing in action the answers they deserve.

Our Nation is making progress on providing these answers. Much of this is due to the Joint Task Force on Full Accounting, our military presence in Vietnam which is tasked with looking for our missing. I have visited these young men and women and they are among the bravest and most gung ho group of soldiers I have ever met. Every day, from the searches of battle sites in treacherous jungles or the excavation of crash sites on the sides of mountains, they put themselves in harm's way to perform a mission they deeply believe in. It is truly touching to these men and women, some of whom were not even born when our missing served, so dedicated to a mission that they see as a sacred duty. They told me time and time again, allow us to remain here so we can complete this mission, so that we can do this job. If we pass this resolution today, we risk all the progress we have made.

I ask my colleagues to please vote against the resolution.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Today's debate is not about whether we respect our wonderful former colleague and now ambassador, Mr. Peterson. We do, although we note there are others who were prisoners of War in Vietnam who feel that we should support this resolution. This debate is about whether we use this tool available to us to get Vietnam to do the right thing, to allow for free emigration. If they were doing the right thing, we would not need to have this waiver before us at all. We must stand firm for human rights by using this tool to increase performance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues that today is about reunification of families. It is not about trade. I am for trade. This is about reunification of families. It is about doing the right thing. I know. Because when you have a Vietnamese American in your district who wants to get their wife over after 15 or 20 years, after having tried to find her, after finding her in a camp and he cannot, he calls my office because I have the Vietnamese staffer who will help them. I get to hear the stories.

Please vote for this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is about disapproving the waiving of the Jackson-Vanik restrictions which the President would like to do of the 1974 trade act. The fact that he is asking us to waive the restrictions of Jackson-

Vanik mean that the communist Vietnamese are not meeting the moral standards that we set. So all of this talk about all the progress that we have heard about going on in communist Vietnam is so much baloney. The President himself is acknowledging that they are not doing that because he has asked us to waive those standards.

What is the purpose behind waiving the standards, the standards we put in place in face of the persecution of Jews in Russia that we wanted to deal with back in the 1970s? Why he is doing this? Why are we replacing those standards? So that our businessmen can go over, with government guarantees and government subsidies, meaning our taxpayer dollars, and invest in this dictatorship and make a profit and then export their goods to the United States and put our own people out of work. That is what this is all about.

I ask the American people to determine if you tried to set up a business, if you are trying to pay your mortgage, do you get a loan guarantee or a subsidy from the taxpayers? No. This is what the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) said it is. This is corporate welfare for communists at its very worst because we are lowering our standards in order to do so.

By the way, all this talk about MIA and POWs, I hope Members listened to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and all this talk about Pete Peterson whom I respect and admire and served with in this House. The communist government of Vietnam has not given us the records of the prison that the gentleman from Texas was kept in or the prison that Pete Peterson himself was incarcerated in for 6 years. We requested that and they have denied even giving us those records because if we got the records, we would know that they have not come clean on the MIA/POW issue. That is why almost all of the veterans organizations are asking support of my resolution because they want to keep faith with those people who fought for freedom and keep faith with our principles of democracy.

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

I saw our distinguished ambassador, Mr. Peterson, sitting back here. I think he deserves the respect and honor of all of us not only for the outstanding job he has done there but for his service, his tour of duty, which included 6½ years at the Hanoi Hilton. And so we pay tribute to you, Pete. Keep up the good work.

Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that has not been elaborated on in this proposal deals with immigration. I want to just touch briefly on that and point out that over the past 10 to 15 years, more than 480,000 people have entered the U.S. under the Orderly Departure Program from Vietnam. Applicants

under the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees, what is called the ROVR program, those numbers are also impressive. The government of Vietnam has cleared for interview over 15,500 of the ROVR applicants and permitted over 4,300 persons qualified for ROVR already to depart to the United States.

□ 1545

INS expects to complete most interviews of ROVR applicants by the end of this year.

I think basically what we are talking about is maintaining an improved relationship rather than putting barriers to increased communication and improved relations with a country that is going through transition and going through a transition in a positive way, and we have encouraged that transition, and for that reason I would ask all of my colleagues to join with us in voting to oppose H.J. Res. 120 because I think it sets us back.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 120.

America needs to heal from the tragedy of the Vietnam War.

Preserving the Presidential waiver for Vietnam will help alleviate the pain.

Extending the waiver promises a path towards mending the horrors of war because it provides an avenue for serious open dialogue.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver has given momentum to reconciling America's questions regarding POWs.

It has increased humanitarian efforts, enhanced leverage in treaty negotiations and allowed increased economic opportunities for American businesses.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has witnessed first-hand the positive impact that the waiver has produced.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver has strengthened US-Vietnam cooperation by establishing the Joint Document Center in Hanoi.

The Trilateral Recovery Operations of the U.S., Laos and Vietnam.

And the Vietnamese government has publicized activities related to missing Americans.

These are concrete results and real outcomes.

And these accomplishments have come about because of the Jackson-Vanik waiver.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver has been our diplomatic leverage—without it, we threaten America's interests.

The past makes us all uneasy—however, as we enter into the new millennium, we must work on forging relationships for the future.

We must start now—this waiver provides the tool to achieve our goals.

A vote against this harmful resolution sends a clear message of a commitment to the healing of America and Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 120. The full story of how the President and his senior advisors made decisions on Vietnam has never been told.

I am very concerned that the American people do not know the complete story on what

influenced the decision to extend normal Diplomatic relations to the People's Republic of Vietnam.

Now we have to once again look at the President's actions and challenge why, in spite of evidence to the contrary, he is giving a waiver to Vietnam on an important human rights issue.

In October 1996 I began an inquiry of the current Administration and the potential impact foreign money might have had on our Foreign and Defense policy.

My goal was to acquire all information from the President and other senior members of his Administration about their connections with John Huang and the Lippo Group.

From 1996 to this day I believe the administration may have improperly assisted the Lippo Group in developing business in the People's Republic of Vietnam.

My fear was (and still is) that campaign contributions by Mochtar and James Riady and John Huang all improperly influenced our Foreign policy on Vietnam.

And to this day I feel the American people have not been given the truth on all the activities undertaken by the President, John Huang and the Lippo Group.

In 1992 the Riadys were the largest single campaign donors to then Presidential candidate Clinton.

Now all Americans are finally finding out that for the last five and a half years Foreign money may have corrupted our Foreign and Defense Policy, especially in Asia.

It was shocking to find, as early as November 1992, the late Ron Brown was meeting with Vietnamese government officials about lifting the U.S. embargo while Presidential candidate Clinton was taking a much harder line on full accounting for POW-MIAs.

Then, after being appointed Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown met with John Huang, who at that time was the senior Lippo official in America, to discuss Vietnam.

It took years for the truth to come out.

Years later the Wall Street Journal reported that soon after he was first elected President, Mr. Clinton received a personal letter from Mochtar Riady, Chairman of the Lippo Group.

In his letter to the President, Riady was strongly lobbying for the immediate U.S. diplomatic recognition of Vietnam.

Riady's letter was very clear—not only should America move to quickly recognize Vietnam, but Mochtar brazenly informed the President that Lippo had employees on the ground in Vietnam ready to do business.

While Riady's letter was kept secret there were important and serious debates by well meaning members on both sides of the aisle as to the merits of recognizing Vietnam.

Issues such as full accounting for Pow-Mias, religious freedom for Vietnamese citizens, free emigration and free speech were debated. But one has to ask if the fix was in all along to help the Riadys.

Now, today once again with a bipartisan spirit Congress is addressing what to do about assisting Vietnam.

It is my position that, because of previous bad faith in providing full disclosure to congressional oversight, we can't have a fair debate on the merits of the assisting Vietnam until we find out exactly what the Administration did to help the Lippo group.

The great tragedy of the ethical cloud hanging over our Foreign Policy is that we become uncertain as to the validity of the Administration's position on any foreign economic issue.

Did the Administration sell out American business interests by improperly helping a foreign firm, the Lippo Group, with inside information about the timing of our recognition of Vietnam? This type of information could be worth millions at the expense of American Firms.

So I look with great skepticism at the President issuing a waiver. I am perplexed as to who will eventually benefit. On the merits of the case I don't think the average Vietnamese will benefit, since the IMF has held up loans to Vietnam because the government has not made appropriate economic reforms.

The President's waiver is suspect as to why he continues to insist his action will substantially promote the freedom of emigration provisions.

In fact Congress has the names of hundreds of Vietnamese who have been denied emigration since 1975. This pattern of human rights abuse continues to this day.

Finally, as a practical matter, if Vietnamese leaders think American Foreign Policy can be influenced by Lippo money they will have no incentive to take our positions seriously on any issue especially enforcing the freedom of emigration provisions in the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

Now is the time to send a signal to the World that the Congress takes very seriously our oversight responsibilities and we pledge to bring sunlight on the Administration's actions.

Vote to support H.J. Res. 120 and show Vietnam and the world that Congress will not allow our Foreign Policy to be sold for campaign contributions.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join the Congressional Dialogue on Vietnam. This group facilitates an open exchange among Members of Congress, the Administration, and the public on issues that affect those who have personal interests tied to Vietnam.

In particular, I wish to call attention to the grassroots campaign, "Adopt a Religious Prisoner in Vietnam." This group notifies its members on the current state of religious persecution in Vietnam as well as the plight of people who have been imprisoned for their religious beliefs.

The current Vietnamese government detains individuals for a variety of ideological reasons, including those who openly discuss religious ideas. These prisoners of conscience are writers, philosophers, and artists who have never served in combat and yet some have been incarcerated since the Vietnam War.

This past January I had the unique opportunity to visit Vietnam. Despite the advancements our countries have made in diplomatic relations, we still differ on issues concerning religious prisoners. On my visit I was denied the opportunity to visit with prisoners of conscience, and what medical information I did receive was ambiguous.

In my opinion, this underscores the value of the "Adopt a Religious Prisoner in Vietnam" campaign and its ties to overseas religious institutions. I want to take a moment to tell you about my own adoptee. The Venerable Thich

Tue Sy has been a Buddhist monk from the age of seven years. He taught himself several languages including Classical Chinese, English, and Sanskrit. A noted scholar and founder of the Free Vietnam Force, he was arrested by Vietnamese government authorities on April 2nd, 1984. Four years later he was prosecuted on national security charges and sentenced to death, but protests from the international community helped to commute his sentence to 20 years in a government "re-education" camp. He has been jailed for the past 14 years in a camp where nutrition and health conditions are typically poor.

The "Adopt a Religious Prisoner in Vietnam" campaign affords Members of Congress the opportunity to address two very important audiences. One is the world community, and the message is that as concerned legislators we decry the blatant oppression of individuals worldwide, especially when it is based solely on differing ideology. We also send a message to the adoptee, telling that person there is an advocate who is appealing for his or her release, and encouraging that individual to continue pursue the goals of free speech and religious liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I again encourage my colleagues to join the Congressional Dialogue on Vietnam as well as the "Adopt a Religious Prisoner in Vietnam" program. The Congressional Dialogue was founded by the gentlewomen from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN and represents a committed bipartisan endeavor to support the progress of US-Vietnam relations. In defense of fundamental human rights and in the interests of our many Vietnamese-Americans who have ties to Vietnam, I hope that all of my colleagues will participate in these efforts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 120 and in support of waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment for Vietnam.

Last August, I visited Vietnam as part of a Congressional delegation, although there was a certain level of economic and political interaction between the United States and Vietnam, there was still the need to increase this interaction. The Jackson-Vanik waiver, enacted for the first time on March of this year, is a tool for this interaction, for this engagement.

Not only has the Jackson-Vanik increased the freedom of emigration in Vietnam, our American businesses investing and exporting to Vietnam are benefitting from federal economic programs, such as those administered by the Export-Import Bank. Removing the waiver could mean job losses for workers in the United States.

It will be a great setback not to grant the waiver. Let us not use this issue to act as a referendum on our total relationship with Vietnam. I understand that we still have many issues with Vietnam which we are not satisfied, such as human rights and POW/MIA concerns. In fact there are separate vehicles for these other concerns. By waiving the Jackson-Vanik, we continue to increase our engagement with Vietnam and we will have even greater opportunities to discuss other issues such as human rights, issues which I agree are just as important to the American people.

We are linked to Vietnam economically, politically and even culturally. We should not

move backwards by passing this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.J. Res. 120.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 120 which denies President Clinton's waiver for Vietnam from the Jackson-Vanik freedom of emigration requirement of the Trade Act of 1974. On June 3, 1998, President Clinton notified Congress of his intention to extend Vietnam a Jackson-Vanik waiver for an additional year from July 3, 1998 to July 3, 1999.

Vietnam's trade status is subject to the Jackson-Vanik amendment to Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974. This provision of law governs the extension of normal trade relations, as well as access to U.S. government credits or credit or investment guarantees, to non-market economy countries ineligible for normal trade relations tariff treatment. A country subject to the provisions may gain MFN treatment and coverage by U.S. trade financing programs by complying with the freedom of emigration provisions of the Trade Act. The Trade Act authorizes the President to waive the freedom of emigration requirements with respect to a particular country if he determines that such a waiver will substantially promote the freedom of emigration provisions.

Extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam gives Vietnam access to U.S. government credits or credit or investment guarantees such as those provided by Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and Export-Import Bank support for U.S. businesses in Vietnam. Vietnam has not yet concluded a bilateral commercial agreement with the United States and therefore, Vietnam is ineligible to receive normal trade relations tariff treatment.

Recently, the Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing on Vietnam. U.S. Ambassador Pete Peterson and Senator JOHN KERRY eloquently testified about the importance of having a policy of engagement with Vietnam. Both of these men heroically served our country during the Vietnam War and they strongly believe that we should work with the Vietnamese government and form a stable, fruitful relationship between the two countries.

Vietnam has made consistent progress on its commitments under the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees agreement. The United States government has made it its highest priority to obtain the fullest possible accounting of missing U.S. citizens from the Vietnam War. The Vietnamese government has been extremely cooperative. Human rights in Vietnam need to be improved and hopefully, engagement will do this.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. We should not forget about the past or the dedication of our servicemen who fought in Vietnam, but we should move forward. If those who were prisoners of war in Vietnam believe that it is time to engage Vietnam and normalize relations with Vietnam, we should listen to their advice. It is time to move forward with Vietnam and build a relationship that benefits both the United States and Vietnam.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120. This resolution would disapprove the President's determination that a waiver of the so-called Jackson-Vanik requirements would substantially

promote freedom of emigration objectives with respect to Vietnam. This waiver permits U.S. Government financial support for American businesses to invest and trade with Vietnam and is a precondition for concluding a commercial agreement to establish normal trading relations.

By passing this resolution, Congress would disapprove and reverse the most recent step taken by the United States to normalize relations with Vietnam. This policy of gradual engagement after trying to isolate Vietnam began in the early 1990s with the lifting of the trade embargo and the establishment of full diplomatic relations in 1995.

Since the normalization process began the Vietnamese government has cooperated in POW/MIA accounting, made progress on its emigration practices, and is now undertaking market-oriented reforms of its state-controlled economy.

It is also true that Vietnam violates human rights and denies religious and political freedoms to its citizens. But as is the case with China, we cannot isolate Vietnam unilaterally in a global economy. Continued exposure of the Vietnamese people to American values of human and religious rights and democratic principles through increased trade and investment and continued engagement with the Vietnam government provides the best means to achieve fullest possible POW/MIA accounting and to promote political and economic reforms.

Disapproving the waiver will signal a return to a previous policy of isolation which failed. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 29, 1998, the previous question is ordered.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 163, nays 260, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

YEAS—163

Aderholt	Bachus	Barr
Andrews	Baker	Bartlett

Barton	Hansen	Paul
Billrakis	Hasert	Pelosi
Blunt	Hayworth	Peterson (PA)
Bonilla	Hefley	Pitts
Bonior	Hill	Pombo
Bono	Hilleary	Porter
Brown (OH)	Hinchey	Quinn
Bryant	Hobson	Radanovich
Bunning	Hoekstra	Regula
Burton	Holden	Riley
Buyer	Horn	Rivers
Canady	Hostettler	Rogers
Chabot	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Chenoweth	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Christensen	Hyde	Royce
Coble	Inglis	Ryun
Coburn	Jackson (IL)	Sanchez
Collins	Jackson-Lee	Sanders
Cook	(TX)	Saxton
Cooksey	Jenkins	Scarborough
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer, Dan
Coyne	Jones	Schaffer, Bob
Crapo	Kelly	Sessions
Cubin	Kennedy (RI)	Shadegg
Cunningham	Kildee	Shuster
Davis (VA)	King (NY)	Smith (MI)
Deal	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Klug	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Kucinich	Snowbarger
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Solomon
Dickey	Lazio	Souder
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Duncan	Lipinski	Stearns
Ehrlich	LoBlondo	Strickland
Emerson	Lofgren	Stump
English	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Ensign	McCollum	Talent
Everett	McGovern	Tauzin
Forbes	McIntyre	Thornberry
Fossella	McNulty	Thune
Fox	Meeks (NY)	Tiahrt
Franks (NJ)	Menendez	Torres
Frelinghuysen	Metcalfe	Trafficant
Gallely	Miller (FL)	Turner
Gekas	Myrick	Upton
Gibbons	Nadler	Vento
Gilman	Neumann	Wamp
Goode	Ney	Waters
Goodling	Northup	Watts (OK)
Graham	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Green	Packard	Whitfield
Gutknecht	Pappas	Wolf
Hall (TX)	Pascrell	

NAYS—260

Abercrombie	Carson	Filner
Ackerman	Castle	Foley
Allen	Chambliss	Ford
Archer	Clay	Fowler
Army	Clayton	Frank (MA)
Baessler	Clement	Frost
Baldacci	Clyburn	Furse
Ballenger	Combust	Ganske
Barcia	Condit	Gedden
Barrett (NE)	Conyers	Gephardt
Barrett (WI)	Costello	Gilchrest
Bass	Cramer	Gillmor
Bateman	Crane	Goodlatte
Becerra	Cummings	Gordon
Bentsen	Danner	Goss
Bereuter	Davis (FL)	Granger
Berman	Davis (IL)	Greenwood
Berry	DeGette	Gutierrez
Bilbray	Delahunt	Hall (OH)
Bishop	DeLauro	Hamilton
Blagojevich	Deutsch	Harman
Bliley	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Boehert	Dixon	Hefner
Boehner	Doggett	Herger
Borski	Dooley	Hilliard
Boswell	Doyle	Hinojosa
Boucher	Dreier	Hoolley
Boyd	Dunn	Houghton
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Hulshof
Brown (CA)	Engel	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	John
Callahan	Etheridge	Johnson (CT)
Calvert	Evans	Johnson (WI)
Camp	Ewing	Johnson, E. B.
Campbell	Farr	Kanjorski
Cannon	Fattah	Kaptur
Capps	Fawell	Kasich
Cardin	Fazio	Kennedy (MA)

Kennelly	Mink	Scott
Kilpatrick	Moakley	Sensenbrenner
Kim	Mollohan	Serrano
Kind (WI)	Moran (KS)	Shaw
Kleczka	Moran (VA)	Shays
Klink	Morella	Sherman
Knollenberg	Murtha	Shimkus
Kolbe	Nethercutt	Sisisky
LaFalce	Nussle	Skaggs
Lampson	Oberstar	Skeen
Lantos	Obey	Skelton
Largent	Olver	Slaughter
Latham	Ortiz	Smith (OR)
LaTourette	Owens	Smith, Adam
Leach	Oxley	Snyder
Lee	Pallone	Spratt
Levin	Parker	Stabenow
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Paxon	Stenholm
Livingston	Payne	Stokes
Lowey	Pease	Sununu
Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Luther	Petri	Tauscher
Maloney (CT)	Pickering	Taylor (MS)
Maloney (NY)	Pickett	Taylor (NC)
Manton	Pomeroy	Thomas
Manzullo	Portman	Thompson
Markey	Poshard	Thurman
Martinez	Price (NC)	Tierney
Mascara	Pryce (OH)	Velazquez
Matsui	Ramstad	Visclosky
McCarthy (MO)	Rangel	Walsh
McCrery	Redmond	Watkins
McDermott	Reyes	Watt (NC)
McHale	Rodriguez	Waxman
McHugh	Roemer	Weldon (PA)
McInnis	Rogan	Weller
McIntosh	Rothman	Wexler
McKeon	Roukema	Weygand
McKinney	Roybal-Allard	White
Meehan	Rush	Wicker
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Wilson
Mica	Salmon	Wise
Millender-McDonald	Sandlin	Woolsey
Miller (CA)	Sanford	Wynn
Minge	Sawyer	Yates
	Schumer	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Burr	McDade	Smith, Linda
Gonzalez	Neal	Towns
Istook	Rahall	Young (FL)
Linder	Riggs	

□ 1609

Messrs. FOLEY, RANGEL, SPRATT, LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. LEE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. KELLY, and Messrs. SMITH of Michigan, NORWOOD, MCCOLLUM, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, TORRES, and COLLINS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The joint resolution was not passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the vote de novo on agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 507, as amended, on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—222

Aderholt	Gilcrest	Packard
Archer	Gillmor	Pappas
Army	Gilman	Parker
Bachus	Gingrich	Paxon
Baker	Goode	Pease
Balleger	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Barr	Goodling	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Pickering
Bartlett	Graham	Pitts
Barton	Granger	Pombo
Bass	Greenwood	Porter
Bateman	Gutknecht	Portman
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Bilbray	Hansen	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hastert	Radanovich
Billey	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Blunt	Hayworth	Redmond
Boehrlert	Hefley	Regula
Boehner	Herger	Riley
Bonilla	Hill	Rogan
Bono	Hilleary	Rogers
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Horn	Roukema
Burton	Hostettler	Royce
Buyer	Houghton	Ryun
Callahan	Hulshof	Salmon
Calvert	Hunter	Sanford
Camp	Hutchinson	Saxton
Campbell	Hyde	Scarborough
Canady	Inglis	Schaefer, Dan
Cannon	Jenkins	Schaffer, Bob
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Chambliss	Jones	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Kasich	Shaw
Christensen	Kelly	Shays
Coble	Kim	Shimkus
Coburn	King (NY)	Shuster
Collins	Kingston	Skeen
Combest	Klug	Smith (MI)
Cook	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Kolbe	Smith (OR)
Crane	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Largent	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Latham	Snowbarger
Cunningham	LaTourette	Solomon
Davis (VA)	Lazio	Souder
Deal	Leach	Spence
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Dickey	Livingston	Sununu
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Talent
Dreier	Lucas	Tauzin
Duncan	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	McCrery	Thomas
Ehrlich	McHugh	Thornberry
Emerson	McInnis	Thune
English	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Ensign	McKeon	Upton
Everett	Metcaif	Walsh
Ewing	Mica	Wamp
Fawell	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Foley	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
Fossella	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Myrick	Weldon (PA)
Fox	Nethercutt	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	White
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Whitfield
Gallely	Northup	Wicker
Ganske	Norwood	Wilson
Gekas	Nussle	Wolf
Gibbons	Oxley	Young (AK)

NOES—200

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Becerra	Bonior
Allen	Bentsen	Borski
Andrews	Berman	Boswell
Baesler	Berry	Boucher
Baldacci	Bishop	Boyd
Barcia	Blagojevich	Brady (PA)

Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Pascarell
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Pastor
Capps	John	Paul
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Payne
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Clay	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	Kaptur	Pickett
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Poshard
Condit	Kennelly	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kildee	Rangel
Costello	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Rivers
Cramer	Klecicka	Rodriguez
Cummings	Klink	Roemer
Danner	Kucinich	Rothman
Davis (FL)	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Rush
DeFazio	Lantos	Sabo
DeGette	Lee	Sanchez
Delahunt	Levin	Sanders
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sandin
Deutsch	Lipinski	Sawyer
Dicks	Lofgren	Schumer
Dingell	Lowe	Scott
Dixon	Luther	Serrano
Doggett	Maloney (CT)	Sherman
Dooley	Maloney (NY)	Sisisky
Doyle	Manton	Skaggs
Edwards	Markey	Skelton
Engel	Martinez	Slaughter
Eshoo	Mascara	Smith, Adam
Etheridge	Matsui	Snyder
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Spratt
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Stabenow
Fattah	McDermott	Stark
Fazio	McGovern	Stenholm
Filner	McHale	Stokes
Forbes	McIntyre	Strickland
Ford	McKinney	Stupak
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Tanner
Frost	Meehan	Tauscher
Furse	Meek (FL)	Thompson
Gejdenson	Meeks (NY)	Thurman
Gephardt	Menendez	Tierney
Gordon	Millender	Trafficant
Green	McDonald	Turner
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Hall (OH)	Minge	Vento
Hamilton	Mink	Visclosky
Harman	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Waxman
Hefner	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Hilliard	Murtha	Weygand
Hinche	Nadler	Wise
Hindjosa	Oberstar	Woolsey
Holden	Obey	Wynn
Hooley	Olver	Yates
Hoyer	Ortiz	
Jackson (IL)	Owens	

NOT VOTING—13

Burr	McDade	Towns
Cox	Neal	Waters
Gonzalez	Rahall	Young (FL)
Istook	Riggs	
Linder	Torres	

□ 1627

So the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4276, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 508 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 508

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 508 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4276, the Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of rule 11, requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report, and clause 7 of rule 21, requiring relevant printed hearings and reports to be available for 3 days prior to the consideration of a general appropriations bill. The report has been available for the required time, but a printing mistake necessitates the rules waivers.

The rule also waives section 401(a) of the Budget Act, prohibiting consideration of legislation, as reported, providing new contract, borrowing or a credit authority that is not limited to amounts provided in the appropriations acts. This is simply a technical waiver.

House Resolution 508 provides for one hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority Member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule 21, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, and clause 6 of rule 21, prohibiting reappropriations in a general appropriations bill.

House Resolution 508 provides for the consideration of the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, which may only be offered by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified, and shall not be subject to further amendment or to a demand for a division of the question. The rule also waives all points of order against amendments printed in the Rules Committee report.

The rule also accords priority and recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and allows the chairman to postpone recorded votes and reduce to 5 minutes the voting time on any postponed question, provided voting time on the first in any series of questions is not less than the traditional 15 minutes. These provisions will facilitate consideration of amendments and guarantee the timely completion of the appropriation bills.

House Resolution 508 also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

H.R. 4276 appropriates a total of \$70.89 billion for fiscal year 1999. The bill provides ample funding for the Departments of Justice, State, and local law enforcement, the Violence Against Women Act, and restores Local Law Enforcement block grant funding.

I am also pleased to say that the bill provides \$533 million to combat juvenile crime, including \$283 for juvenile crime prevention programs, \$5 million more than President Clinton has requested.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 508 is an open rule, an open rule, Mr. Speaker, providing Members with every opportunity to amend this appropriations bill.

In addition, the Committee on Rules has made three additional amendments in order. The rule makes in order an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) dealing with fisheries and enforcement.

In addition, we have made in order the Hefley amendment, that will prevent funds from being implemented to enforce Executive Order 13087 and Executive Order 13083. I am concerned, frankly, Mr. Speaker, that the President has decided to use executive order strategy to incrementally implement portions of an agenda.

One of the President's advisers has recently put it best when he described the President's intent with this flurry of executive orders, which I think is causing an immense problem for this Congress: "The stroke of the pen, the law of the land. Kinda cool." Mr. Speaker, it is Congress' sole authority to make law. We must restrain the abuse of executive orders.

The Committee on Rules has made in order an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) dealing with the Census. In this bill, the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) has crafted a plan to ensure that Congress and the administration jointly decide how to conduct the 2000 Census.

Unfortunately, the amendment says that the U.S. Congress has no role to play in the 2000 Census, and the administration can move forward with a risky new plan that uses statistical sampling methods. Let me read the current law: "Except for the determination of population for purposes of apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, the Secretary shall, if he considers it feasible, authorize the use of the statistical method known as 'sampling.'" The law is clear, sampling is illegal for the purposes of reapportionment.

Mr. Speaker, every American must be counted. We should not allow the government bureaucrats to guess. We should not jeopardize the 2000 Census with an idea that the GAO and President Clinton's Commerce Inspector General call "high risk."

In addition, we cannot gamble with the trust the American people have in a successful Census. In the past, by naturalizing criminal aliens in time for the 1996 election, the Clinton administration has proven they will abuse power for political purposes. President Clinton should not be allowed just to

delete certain American citizens from being counted.

Our plan will safeguard the Census. This bill provides \$956 million for the Census, including \$4 million for the Census Monitoring Board, an increase of almost \$600 million over fiscal year 1998, and \$107 million over the President's request. This Congress is insisting that we pay whatever it takes to do a good job counting every American, just as the United States Constitution requires us to do.

It is not a poll, it is not guesswork, it is an enumerated count of the American people. We cannot afford to let this administration guess about the official Census count. We will fulfill our constitutional duty to count the people in full. We must make sure we count every American.

H.R. 4276 was favorably reported out of the Committee on Appropriations, as was the open rule by the Committee on Rules. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so we may proceed directly to the general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of H.R. 4276, pursuant to House Resolution 508, debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) printed in House Report 105-641 be extended to 2 hours.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that this agreed-to increase in debate time on that particular amendment is premised on the understanding that this would be the only amendment offered with respect to the Census.

Is that the understanding of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST)?

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

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. Yes, that is my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of House Resolution 508. This rule is a mixed bag. While it provides for the consideration of the appropriations for the important functions of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, it also makes in order an amendment which overturns an executive order which prohibits discrimination in employment in the Federal Government based on sexual orientation.

While the rule makes in order an amendment by the subcommittee ranking member to allow full debate on the issue of the manner in which the year 2000 Census will be conducted, the Committee on Rules did not allow for an

amendment which would have aided in the hiring of Census enumerators, who will be necessary to ensure that an accurate count is made of all the residents of this country.

While the bill provides \$20 million for programs to combat school violence, the Republican majority did not allow an amendment which would have earmarked \$100 million for specific programs which would give schools and communities even greater opportunities to reduce violence in our public schools.

I hope the bill can be improved and that amendments which may trigger a veto can be defeated. I would also like to address the three issues I have just outlined.

To begin, Mr. Speaker, the provisions in the committee bill relating to the year 2000 Census are unreasonable and, quite frankly, unacceptable to Democratic members and to the administration. The committee has only provided for 6 months of funding for this massive and constitutionally required project, and has placed restrictions on planning that will result in delays and disruption in the management of the project.

The Republican majority, in their quest to force a political showdown with the administration over the issue of sampling, is risking not only a veto of this bill, but also a failed Census. The Republican majority's insistence on denying the Census Bureau the option of using statistical sampling as a means to aid in the gathering of an accurate and complete count of the number of individuals who are residing in this country is dangerous.

I am pleased that the rule will allow for the consideration of an alternative amendment to be offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) which will remove these restrictions on funding, to allow planning for this enormous undertaking to go forward so that the count will be as accurate as possible. Mr. Speaker, we must allow the Census Bureau to go forward in its planning for the year 2000. It is incumbent on the Members of this body to support the Mollohan amendment.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Republican majority has seen fit to include in the rule the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY). The Hefley amendment seeks to reverse Executive Order 13087, which was issued on May 28 by the President. As Members are very well aware, this executive order prohibits discrimination against individuals in Federal hiring because of their sexual orientation.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is nothing but veto bait, and it is unfortunate that the Republican majority must use this issue as material for campaign brochures and speeches. I am sorry that the extreme agenda of the

ultraconservative wing of the Republican Party must use the civil rights of gays and lesbians as a way to hold up funding for the important functions of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

There are other amendments which, if adopted, could trigger a veto. I urge my colleagues to resist adding language or reducing funding which would jeopardize the timely enactment of this bill.

If this bill is vetoed, Mr. Speaker, we risk providing timely funding for important Justice Department programs, such as providing \$25 million to help State and local law enforcement agencies provide bulletproof vests for police officers, which is funded as part of the total \$1.4 billion for the hugely successful COPS program.

To date 76,771 additional police have been put on the beat on the streets of our cities and towns since this program began in fiscal year 1994. The funding in this bill will allow for an additional 17,000 officers to be hired. COPS is a successful program, and has played a large part in the reduction of violent crime in this country. Its funding should not be jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also includes an important earmark of \$20 million for the unobligated balances of the COPS program, to be used for grants to policing agencies and schools for programs aimed at preventing violence in our public schools. This is a fine beginning as we struggle with the issue of violence in our schools. I commend the committee for including these funds.

In June I met with about 30 school administrators and schoolteachers in my congressional district to talk about what can and should be done to instill discipline in the classroom and to combat violence. The times have changed since I grew up in Fort Worth. Listening to these dedicated educators drove home that point.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that more than 6,000 students were expelled from schools across the country last year for bringing a firearm to school, just as I had been shocked and deeply saddened by the violence that has taken the lives of 14 students and teachers and injured 47 others since last October.

But I came away from that meeting with a concrete idea of what we can do here in Washington to help schools in our home towns deal with disruptive students, gangs, drugs, and guns, because those concerned educators told me that one of their most pressing needs was more uniformed police officers in schools. They told me that having law enforcement officers in a school not only cuts down on crime, but also gives the students the opportunity to talk to an authority figure about what is happening on campus.

I have introduced H.R. 4224, the Safe Schools Act of 1998, as a follow-up to

this forum. My bill would provide \$175 million in funding to allow local communities to hire sworn law enforcement officers to patrol in and around their schools. This money will allow up to 7,500 police to be hired, in addition to the 100,000 new police who have been or will be hired under the COPS program.

While these funds are not part of this bill, it is my intention to work to see them included in next year's appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, some schools already have uniformed law enforcement officers. In fact, a number of school districts in my own congressional district already do. I would like to quote Sergeant James Hawthorne of the Arlington Texas Police Department, who has endorsed the continuation and expansion of this idea.

□ 1645

"It is worth every penny. You cannot put a price on a child's life. And above and beyond that, you hope to be a positive influence on kids throughout their lives." I could not agree more, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule specifically because it includes the Mollohan amendment to restore full, uninterrupted funding for the 2000 Census preparations.

Opponents of the Census Bureau's plans for 2000 say that we ought to take the census the same way we have for the last 200 years. They call the plan a "radical new approach to conducting the census." Nothing could be further from the truth.

The truth is that the census has changed immensely throughout its history because it has had to keep pace with a Nation that itself is changing. Counting the population in 2000 the same way we did in 1960, much less the way we did in 1790, would be simple folly.

In 1790, U.S. Marshals, 600 of them, went out on horseback and counted and tabulated information for about 4 million people in the new Nation. They missed about 100,000. They added enumerators over the year, but by 1850, the number of Americans had quadrupled, far too much information for census takers to add up on their own. So, for the first time, they sent the forms to Washington to count.

Thousands of clerks in hot, sticky rooms leafed through millions of forms by hand, while the population doubled again. By then it took 8 years to tabulate the 1880 census. Fortunately, the punch card arrived in 1890, allowing for automated tabulation. A radical new approach, but it saved time and money.

Our population would nearly triple over the next 50 years. By 1940, punch cards could not keep up and by 1950, crude computers took over the job.

In response to Americans' impatience with the growing response burden, the Bureau developed sampling techniques to gather vital data on everything from education to veterans status. But compiling the numbers was not the only problem. There were too many people in too many households spread out across four times more land area than in 1790. Workers knocking on every door were making more mistakes than the Nation could tolerate.

So, in 1970, the census underwent perhaps the most radical change in its history: counting people by mail, not by enumerator. That worked fairly well for a while. In 1970, 80 percent of the people returned their forms, but by 1990, only 65 percent did. That meant a half a million census workers had to knock on 35 million doors. The cost of the census skyrocketed, while the results worsened badly.

The 1990 census missed more than 8 million Americans, counting 4 million people twice and millions more in the wrong place; not because the Census Bureau did not know how to do its job, but because the methods it developed to count the country in previous decades were outdated by 1990.

So once again in 2000, the Census Bureau will make changes. It will make forms more widely available, pay for first-class advertising, and use widely accepted scientific methods to include all Americans this time around.

Take the census the same way we have done for 200 years? There is no "same way." The census has been changing from its beginning, just as the country has.

A radical new approach in 2000? Nope, just trying to keep up with a growing, changing, and moving Nation, the same way they always have.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) who is not only chairman of the committee, but also the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, obviously, of this rule. It is an open rule, as is usual with appropriations bills. It waives all points of order against the bill as reported.

The important fact, I think I need to say, is that we need to take action on this bill as quickly as we can. This is the bill that provides the funding for our Federal law enforcement agencies: all of the Justice Department agencies, the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, most all of the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government.

We provide funding to our State and local law enforcement agencies; all of

our sheriffs, all of our police departments, all of the local law enforcement folks out there who need the Federal assistance is in this bill.

We fund, of course, the Federal courts, from the Supreme Court all the way down, and most of the agencies that work with the courts, such as the Marshals Service.

We provide the funding for the National Weather Service and the modernization efforts of the National Weather Radar System that is increasingly providing advanced warning to our constituents of dangerous weather.

We provide, of course, in the State Department portion of the bill, all of our diplomacy operations around the globe. We provide assistance to small businesses in our communities and a host of other vital and necessary functions.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is important that this bill proceed and be passed and be signed and become law.

There are some controversial matters in the bill, but let us not lose sight of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is vitally necessary in so many areas of our national life.

If we set one priority in this bill, it is to provide increased funding for the fight against crime and to empower Federal, State, and local law enforcement with the resources they need to enforce our laws and prevent crime.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to this Congress and the work of this subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations, but most importantly the Congress, over the last several years we have fundamentally increased the funding for the law enforcement agencies, which I think is having a major impact on crime. We are seeing reductions of crime for the first time in many years in this Nation, a lot of which I think can be attributable to the fact that we have provided the funding in this bill, not just for the Federal agencies, but perhaps more importantly for the local law enforcement agencies by the billions of dollars. Now, over the last couple of years, we have funded the fight against juvenile crime and juvenile delinquency and juvenile crime prevention in this bill.

We provide in the bill that is before us an increase of over a half billion dollars for the Department of Justice crime programs.

We provide \$4.9 billion for State and local law enforcement, \$400 million more than was requested by the White House and \$47 million more than the current spending.

We restore the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant to give local law enforcement agencies monies to spend for their specific needs. We give them maximum flexibility to spend according to their requirements. That figure is \$523 million.

Mr. Speaker, we provide also a juvenile crime block grant to allow States

and localities for their needs to prevent juvenile crime, a quarter of a billion dollars. The President proposed to eliminate this in his budget request. We restore it to the bill.

We provide \$283 million also for juvenile crime prevention, most important in this era, a \$44 million increase over current levels. And for the first time, Mr. Speaker, the Congress passed a bill recently authorizing bulletproof vests for our local police. This bill for the first time provides the money to buy and pay for the bulletproof vests that protect the lives of the people that protect us. That is in this bill.

We provide \$104 million in new funding to help States and localities raise their level of preparedness for chemical and biological terrorism. First time funding, first time we have done this so that our local fire departments, rescue squads and local responders now have funds in this bill to train, to educate, to equip themselves to help fight off the awful things that may happen in our cities or localities that we would call terrorism. In this building, we know now what that really means.

We provide more than \$8.4 billion for the war on drugs, including a \$95 million increase for the Drug Enforcement Administration, \$31 million more than they requested. We put \$10 million more into the drug courts in localities which are doing wonderful work throughout the country, and \$10 million for a new program to help small businesses create drug-free workplaces.

We provide a thousand new Border Patrol agents to guard the border, \$216 million more than they have now for controlling illegal immigration. The bill provides a \$47 million Interior enforcement initiative to force the INS to respond to State and local police in every State when they find suspected illegal aliens. Now, the INS simply does not answer the phone when the State police calls and says they have a vanload of illegals, and they are turned loose. We put money in here to respond to that, to give State and local police a way to have the INS assist in the removal of the illegal aliens they watch.

This rule will allow us to move forward. I am very appreciative of the Committee on Rules. They have done a wonderful job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule to allow us to move ahead with this vitally important bill, vitally important to every Member and every district in the country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON),

chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his fair consideration of our requests. I also want to thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member, for his guidance and advocacy of our interests in the development of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I am pleased that the Committee on Rules recommended an open rule for the consideration of this bill, for the same reasons our chairman just mentioned. It allows for all Members on both sides of the aisle to debate the issues thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that this rule makes in order my 2000 Census amendment, the "Let's Count Everybody Amendment," and allows 2 hours of debate on the issue. It is a very complicated matter, and any less time would not have allowed for a meaningful debate.

First, the 2000 Census is just around the corner, and what does this bill do? It cuts off funding for the census preparation in the middle of the year, putting at risk funding for the census preparation for the rest of the year. That is no way to do business. We cannot plan for a professionally run census with that kind of a funding scheme. My amendment fixes that. It guarantees funding for the whole fiscal year.

Second, I must note the seriousness with which the administration takes its duty to make sure that the 2000 Census is as accurate as possible in accounting for everyone in America: the urban and the rural, majorities and minorities, adults and children, especially the children.

During the 1990 failed census, one-half of those people who were never counted, the missed, the overlooked, the forgotten, were children. The administration is committed to veto this measure unless the Census Bureau is allowed to incorporate the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences by employing scientific sampling in the conduct of the 2000 Census, so that those who were left out of the 1990 Census will be included in the 2000 Census. Everyone in our country.

If the language contained in the bill is not amended, we will end up with a census that is not credible to anyone. I believe my amendment provides an equitable approach to this issue, and hope that it represents a compromise that at the end of the day, everyone can support.

Our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) obviously disagrees with the merits of my amendment, but to his credit, he argued for my right to offer the amendment. The gentleman's friendship and bipartisan nature have made working on this subcommittee a pleasure and an honor and we thank him.

The open rule, of course, also allows for consideration of an additional

amendment I intend to offer to increase funding for the Legal Services Corporation by \$109 million. For the last 2 years, the subcommittee has recommended funding the Legal Services Corporation at \$141 million. Consequently, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX) and I have offered an amendment in each of the last 2 years to increase funding to \$250 million. We again find ourselves in a similar situation and I urge my colleagues to vote for that amendment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my disappointment that this rule makes in order an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY). This amendment would in part prevent funds from being used to enforce an executive order prohibiting employment discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's amendment is misguided. It plays to fears and prejudices, and I hope the debate on this amendment will not degenerate as it has on similar amendments in the past. In any event, this bill is certainly not the appropriate vehicle for this kind of an amendment.

□ 1700

Additionally, I would like to note that my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), testified before the Committee on Rules on two separate and unrelated amendments, and I regret that the rule makes them in order together.

In conclusion, I think that this is a fair rule, and I urge its support.

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

First of all, to respond to the previous speaker, this is a very fair rule. We appreciate his support. We have made it fair because we want open debate on this in regards to the Hefley amendment. This is not where that debate should take place. That debate should take place in the general debate. We are prepared to debate it, but the key here is openness and open debate by the Members of this body.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) is entitled to that open debate, just the same as I am entitled to that debate, just the same as anyone on that side of the aisle is entitled to that debate, so that is why that is in order.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, and I thank the committee for ruling the Mollohan amendment in order.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for his extraordinary leadership in working towards achieving an accurate census for 2000.

The Nation needs an accurate census of our population, one that includes everybody. The Census Bureau has a modern, comprehensive plan for 2000 to eliminate the undercounting of the population and produce a more accurate census.

We should not be satisfied with a census which underrepresents millions of people, as the census did in 1990. Only with modern improvements in the census will we be able to achieve this.

We should not be satisfied with a census which underrepresents people. The Mollohan amendment allows the Census Bureau to move forward with the census by striking a provision in the bill that fences off half of the 1999 fiscal year appropriation. Americans in every community benefit from having a more accurate census. Census data helped direct Federal spending for schools, health care. Programs for seniors and children, businesses, industry, local governments and local communities all rely on accurate census data to make decisions. Without an accurate census, local communities will not receive their fair share.

We need to fund the census for the whole fiscal year. We cannot cut off funding in the middle of the year. They will not be able to do their job. We owe it to our country to ensure that we have the most fair and accurate census of all of our people that we can produce.

Let us put politics aside and allow the professionals at the Census Bureau to do their job. Let us fund it properly. Let us move forward. Let us support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill. I most especially want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for his leadership in bringing forth a bill that is very beneficial to all of the agencies that are affected by this appropriations bill and a bill that is going to be positive for the country.

One of the aspects of the bill that I am proud of is the funding that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has provided for Radio and TV Marti, especially TV Marti. Because year after year this program comes under attack by those who are grabbing at straws, trying to find anything that they can to excuse their long-standing history of supporting excessive government spending and wasting taxpayer funds, and they come and use this bill in order to hide from these attacks. And year after year their target, unfortunately and unfairly, is TV Marti, which is one part of a two-prong strategy to reach the Cuban people, to inform them about the world outside their island prison, and to educate them about the democratic principles

through the implementation of some of democracy's most important liberties, which is freedom of expression and freedom of the press, which are denied to them daily in Cuba.

TV and Radio Marti are reaching the Cuban people. If it were not, the Castro regime would not be obsessed with its demise. If it were not effective, Castro officials would not be roaming the halls of Congress lobbying for an end to these transmissions.

I ask my colleagues to remember the immortal words of a leader like Martin Luther King who said, Let freedom ring. Let the Cuban people then hear and see TV and Radio Marti. Let the echoes of democracy reach the enslaved Cuban people. Let them witness firsthand what it means to be free. Through these transmissions they can see what is going on in our country and in other free countries.

The United States has the tools to accomplish these lofty goals, and one of those tools is Radio and TV Marti. If we are truly committed to bringing all of the countries in our hemisphere into our democratic fold, if we are truly committed to helping the Cuban people free themselves from the enslavement, then we must render our full support for the rule and the bill, Commerce, State, Justice appropriations.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for bringing forth this amendment and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) for his work on the census and my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

The fact of the matter is that the Mollohan amendment made in order by the rule will affect the future of everyone living in this country. We can either choose to miss the 8.4 million people residing in the United States, as we did in 1990, or we can make the best effort possible to count them. That is the choice that will be presented to us after the rule. Five percent of Latinos, 4 percent of African Americans and 2.3 percent of Asian Americans were not counted in the last census, and that is simply not right.

The Census Bureau wants to do the best it can to count every American, but this bill, as it exists, does not allow it. Instead, it ties the Census Bureau's hands and renders them ineffective. When some Americans are not counted, all Americans are diminished.

Undercounts affect the decision-making of 100 Federal programs that disperse over \$100 billion in funds to our communities. Undercounts negatively affect economic empowerment and the decisions that flow from that undercount. Undercounts negatively affect political enfranchisement and political empowerment. Undercounts

negatively affect business decisions, where to invest, what markets to pursue. The lasting effects of undercounts to communities, to Hispanic Americans, to African Americans are devastating in the long run.

So let us count every American in the new millennium. We do that by providing the appropriate resources to the census and by adopting the Mollohan amendment. That is why it is important to vote for the Mollohan amendment. We want to ensure that every American gets counted in this next census, the next census of the new century. It will be important to all of our communities.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the Commerce, Justice and State appropriation bill that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) is presenting and we will be debating next week.

I commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for the handling of the census issue in this bill. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) provides over \$100 million more than was provided, requested in the President's budget. Over \$100 million more has been provided because we want to count everyone. It is going to cost money to do this. We are going to spend \$4 billion.

This is not something we should play around with on polling to do that. We are talking about \$4 billion of real money. We are providing \$100 million more this year. And we all agree, Republicans and Democrats, that we want to count everybody. We should not miss anyone. It is hard work to do the census. We are prepared to put the resources in there to do the hard work.

This has to be done in a nonpartisan fashion. This should not be a partisan issue. We agree it should not be a partisan issue. There should not be a Democratic census. There should not be a Republican census. There should not be a Clinton census. There should not be a Newt Gingrich census. This has to be done in a bipartisan fashion.

It is very unfortunate that the President interjected politics on to this and said, it is going to be done my way or no way. That Congress is irrelevant in the issue, the President is, in effect, saying. Actually, the Mollohan amendment says the same thing, because he says, only let the President make that decision, that we in Congress have no input to the decision. It is only \$4 billion. Let the President decide how to spend that money. Let the President decide whether he wants to have a failed census or not.

Hey, the Constitution says it is Congress' responsibility to design how the census is done. And now the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) says, no, no, no, no, Congress, you are

not relevant anymore. We want to decide, and we are going to do it our way.

What the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has proposed is that we are going to make a decision next March. The Census Bureau agrees the decision should be made in March of next year. The President's own budget talks about a March 1 date. At hearings, under oath, they said, we can decide by March 1 of next year. So let us make the decision together then.

And the reason that date was chosen is partly because we have that much time. The other reason is, we will have dress rehearsals. We will not know the results of the dress rehearsals until the end of this year or the first of next year. The monitoring board will give their results, and we will have a report from them early next year. Some court cases will be heard, and maybe we will have some results from them by then.

So there is no reason the decision has to be made today, and there is no reason we should give the President total choice of the plan he wants to do. Why? Because the plan he has proposed is moving towards failure. It is based on this polling idea.

I know the President loves polling. He makes all his decisions on polling. But this is serious business. We all agree this is serious business. This is a basic democratic system which is dependent on this census. It is a trust in our system of government. Most elected officials in America are dependent on the census, whether it is a school board member, a city council person, State legislators and, yes, the House of Representatives, are going to be impacted by the census.

If we do not have a census we can trust, and that means a bipartisan census, it has got to be done together, then we are not going to have one that is going to be trusted by the American people. We must work together to get a census that is not based on polling, that says this will work out best for me.

We have to do everything we can to count everybody, everyone. Let us put the resources into counting everyone, and we are committed to doing that, as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) put over \$100 million more into the appropriation for the Census Bureau this year alone.

We are moving towards failure. This idea of polling was attempted in the 1990 census. It was a failure in 1990. And now the administration says, we want to totally rely on this failed idea. That is irresponsible, in my opinion.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is chairman of the House Subcommittee on the Census, in charge of authorization and oversight on the census. Before he came to this

body, did the gentleman have any expertise in this field? I know the gentleman does not like to brag. If I may say so, is the gentleman not a professor of statistics?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Well, I taught at Georgia State University Atlanta, taught statistics for many years. It was the Department of Quantitative Methods up there. I taught at the graduate and undergraduate level, and the MBA. I have taught statistics for years at LSU, University of South Florida, Georgia State University.

I respect statistics. Polling has a relevant role. We all use polling all the time, especially if we do not have the time or money to do something else.

But statistics is a very dangerous thing. My first lecture, whenever I taught statistics, was based on a book, *How to Lie with Statistics*, because you can use statistics to achieve your point. People use it all the time. The way graphs are designed, what base years are used, there is a whole variety of ways.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, well, if the Constitution says, as it does, that we have to have an actual enumeration for the purposes of reapportionment of this body, not for business decisions, not for finding out how many people have blue eyes on the third Sunday of every month, but for the reapportionment of the House of Representatives, as a doctor of statistics, what is your opinion that the drafters of the Constitution meant when they said, you must have an actual enumeration?

□ 1715

Mr. MILLER of Florida. We need to have actual counts. We should not use polling. And we need to work together to trust the system of government. It is too important to play politics with this issue. The President is playing politics with it. It is very clear. We need to count everybody. We need to put the resources in. There are a lot of good ideas, from paid advertising this time, and working in outreach programs, whether we need to use the WIC program. Why do we not use the WIC program to help count kids? Why do we not use Medicaid records? We can provide the resources to do that. We can come together and get a good census.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman say we should do away with this vote board up here and just guess on how the vote is going to go?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. That is right.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH).

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Committee on Rules has brought forth an open rule for consideration of the

Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill and I am happy to say that I plan to support that bill. But as a member of the Subcommittee on Census, I would like to express some of my concerns about the portion of the bill which places restrictions on the funding for the Census Bureau.

Withholding or conditioning funds for the Census Bureau places the 2000 census at risk. An inaccurate census affects everyone. More than \$100 billion annually in Federal aid is allocated using census data. And when it comes to the census, the fact is if you are not counted, you do not count. You do not count when it comes to Federal dollars for road repair and mass transit. You do not count when it comes to helping public schools or for using Federal funds to fight juvenile crime. Everyone has a stake in making sure that the 2000 census is counted in a way that is fair and accurate. Just as we do when we determine unemployment statistics and the gross domestic product, just as we do when we determine labor statistics and statistics regarding our economy, we need to use the most modern statistics and methods possible. Let us put politics aside and let the professionals at the Census Bureau do their job. The Mollohan amendment helps us do this. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the Mollohan amendment to remove these restrictions and fully fund the Census Bureau.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for making this rule in order and I would like to thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for his leadership on this issue. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the rule which makes in order the Mollohan decennial census amendment. The debate on this amendment will say volumes about the People's House's desire to conduct the census in a fair, accurate, cost-effective and scientifically based way. It will also send a message to the low-income people living in socially and economically isolated urban and rural areas, especially people of color, women and their children, children who were undercounted by 50 percent. They want to know where they stand and whether they count. If you support a census that is fair, that is accurate, and that is inclusive, then support the Mollohan census amendment. I urge its passage for the sake of all the American people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time.

My father used to tell us that half a loaf is better than none. I would say that that is all right, except we are not talking about bread, we are talking about the census. And we are talking about counting all of the people. I can tell Members when it comes to counting the people, one-half is not enough. Three-fifths is not enough. None is not enough. Somebody is going to be miscounted, disenfranchised and left out. I wonder who those are going to be. It is already clear. They are going to be the poor, those in big urban centers, those in rural America, those who need every dime, every cent, every penny, those communities that are on the verge of collapse, who need all of their entitlement moneys, all of their entitlement programs, but even need representation more than they do anything else. We can cure this defect and we can cure it with the Mollohan amendment. We can cure it because we want to say to every American citizen that your dream of citizenship rights does not need to be deferred.

I know what it means to be uncounted, three-fifths of a person. Women know what it means not to count, not to be able to vote, not to be looked at on the landscape. I would urge that we vote for the Mollohan amendment and count all of the American people so that they will know that they do indeed count.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important subject we are talking about. To set aside sampling and the science is to guess at what the population is.

Let me repeat. In Paterson, New Jersey, in 1995, with two other communities throughout the United States, \$30 million was spent by this Congress, the gentlemen here, the ladies here, to absolutely do sampling and test other methodologies. Are you going to have us conclude, after the science has been supported by the National Academy of Sciences, that what the results were in those three tests are to be put aside so we can really go to the methodology that has been chosen by the other side, to guess?

You cannot count every nose in a census. You know it and everybody else on this side of the aisle knows it. We need to come together on this issue. It is critical. There are too many people out there who do not respond to the census questionnaire as it is. What you are going to do is establish even more questions and more anxiety. Do you want to have wasted \$30 million? That is not including what we are spending right now to go through dress rehearsals. This is wrong. We need to accept the science, we need to understand that it was acceptable in 1995 where we prepared for the sampling, where we prepared for the testing and methodology.

It was not done helter-skelter. Stop the guessing and support sampling.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the test in Paterson, New Jersey is a good illustration of why polling does not work. We have got real problems with polling, especially when you get down to census block level. When you get down to census blocks and census tracts, the error rates are too great. We need to count everyone and we need to put the resources into it. It is hard work to count people. You do not count homeless people from 9 to 5 Monday through Friday. You may have to count them at 2 o'clock in the morning on a weekend. You work through homeless shelters. We are willing to put the resources in so everyone should be counted. Everyone should be counted. We should do it in the best way possible, working together. There are a lot of good ideas that have come out of past census tests and we can do that. But sampling or polling is the dangerous one and it will not be trusted by the American people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the National Academy of Sciences just turned over. To compare sampling with guessing or to compare sampling with any other methodology, they each are very different. It does not mean polling. Polling is a very different kind of situation. Sampling is science. Polling is not. You show me the definition where they both mean the same thing. What you have done is confused those definitions, on purpose, so that we in arguing sampling are going to fall into your trap about guessing and polling. They are very different.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, polling is based on sampling. We use polling all the time as based on sampling. President Clinton was down in Houston here a couple of months ago saying how great polling is for the purposes of the census. He is the one that used the comparison in Houston, Texas and some of your colleagues were right there in Houston when President Clinton specifically used the analogy of polling. Polling is based on sampling. Sampling is very appropriate where you do not have the time and money to go out and do an actual count. This is a \$4 billion thing. This should not be the largest statistical experiment in history. That is what we are talking about, the largest statistical experiment in history. This is not an experiment we should test.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in one short minute I just want to say to my colleagues, let us not fool ourselves. You cannot count everyone.

Now, you say, "Well, the Constitution says enumeration." The Constitution did not define enumeration. It did not say that you could not use a sampling technique. It is going to be difficult and almost impossible for you to count everyone. Show me how you are going to not have the undercount you had in the last two censuses. You overlooked a great proportion of the African-American community and the Hispanic community. Do you want to do that again? Do you want to send that message to this country that we want an undercount? If you look at this chart, you will see that the census had a big undercount in African-Americans. We do not want that again. We want a good count. Let us be real. You cannot do it by counting every head. That is just impossible. Last of all, you cannot count every head. And because you cannot count every head, let us use some scientific methodology that has been proven and approved by the scientific world so there will not be any more of this guessing. Let us have an accurate census. We are tired of inaccurate censuses.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following table for the RECORD:

	Blacks	Non-Blacks
Census:		
1940	8.4	5.0
1950	7.5	3.8
1960	6.6	2.7
1970	6.5	2.2
1980	4.5	0.8
1990	5.7	1.3

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Mollohan amendment which provides full funding for the 2000 census, including the use of statistical sampling. Fundamental to our democracy is the notion that everyone counts. In 1990 the census missed millions of people. The Bureau believes it missed 1.8 million Americans. Most of those who were not counted were low-income people living in cities, in rural communities, African-Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, immigrants and children. Almost 50 percent of the individuals not counted in the 1990 census were children. Are they not a part of this country? Funding for many of our school programs depends on an accurate count of our children. The goal of the Census Bureau is to achieve the most accurate count possible using the most up-to-date scientific methods and the best technology available. We are not talking about polling as you do in political

campaigns. The use of statistical sampling will ensure that people who have historically been left out are counted and are included. Our responsibility is to ensure that every American counts. If you are not counted, you are irrelevant. No one in this country should be rendered irrelevant.

I urge passage of the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Addressing the previous speaker, I am a little surprised by her comments. She says fundamental to our democracy, and I am quoting, everyone counts.

That is exactly why we are going out and counting everybody. That is exactly the benefit. I take it from her comments that she supports our position. So I welcome that. I also would hope that she supports the rule.

In fact, during this debate today, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard anyone say they are going to vote against the rule. That is what we are debating right here. We are going to have, and in fact the Committee on Rules was generous to allocate two full hours to this debate, so I think it is about time that we move rapidly to a vote on the rule. Let us get into the debate.

□ 1730

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal of reference to polling. The fact is that the plan for this 2000 census is very different from a poll.

It starts with an effort to contact personally and count virtually every single person in every single household in the country. Sampling is then used to further improve the results, but with a far larger sample than is ever used in political polls.

Sampling would be used to supplement that basic count in two ways. One is in following up on households that do not respond; and, second, sampling would be used to help check on those who might still have been missed even with these new procedures.

A very large, scientifically-selected sample of blocks would be drawn, 125,000 of them across the country, with approximately 750,000 households. If a poll were taken this way, with a major effort to contact everyone in the district, followed by a very large sample to account for those who did not respond, followed by another large sample of the whole district to further account for nonrespondents and errors, the results would be extremely accurate indeed, vastly more accurate than the failed techniques employed in the 1990 census.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, let me correct what is being

proposed this year by this polling plan of the President.

He is intentionally not going to count 10 percent of the people initially. He is not going to go out and count everyone.

In 1990, they tried to count everyone. They got 98.4 percent of the people. And, yes, we are not going to count everyone, we are going to miss a few people, but we need to do everything that we can to reach that 100 percent level.

But this time around they are only going to count 90 percent of the people intentionally. They are intentionally going to not count 10 percent of the people. Then they are going to do this second sample. That is correct. They are going to count 90 percent of the people.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. Every effort will be made to reach 100 percent of the people more times than ever done in the past.

Mr. MILLER of California. No, that is not true. Reclaiming my time, that is absolutely not true. They are intentionally, intentionally going to not count 10 percent of the people and then use this ICM, this sample, to try to impute what the numbers are. That is where the problem of sampling is. They are going to have 60,000 separate samples to get to that 90 percent number. It is extremely complex. GAO, Inspector General are both saying it is a high-risk plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Mollohan amendment because it restores full funding for a fair and an accurate Year 2000 census.

The goal is to count 100 percent of the people. That is what we are talking about here on our side of the aisle, and let me just tell my colleagues what census data does:

It determines the distributions of 170 billion Federal dollars every single year. The dollars go to basic programs: Social Security, Medicare, better roads, child care for low-income families and middle-income families, school lunches. An accurate census will ensure sufficient funds to protect the well-being of American families, to protect child care, healthy meals for kids and security for our seniors in their golden years.

This should not be a political issue, but my Republican colleagues do not seem to get the message. Instead, they declare war against accuracy.

These tactics are not surprising. They have played politics with campaign finance, with tobacco, with health care and now with the census.

Stop the political games. Put families in this country first. Vote for a fair and accurate census with a hundred percent of the people counted in this country.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear the preceding speaker make the statement we are declaring war against accuracy by saying that we want to count everyone. It kind of does not make much sense, and the statement, I think, would probably be appropriate if it were clarified.

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

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on the last gentlewoman's statement:

They can sample all they want on all of the decisions that they just talked about, such as for Social Security, funding for States and localities—sample all they want. All we are talking about here is not sampling for purposes of the reapportionment of the House of Representatives. We are only talking about prohibiting sampling on the apportionment of who represents whom in this body. We are not limiting sampling on all of the other aspects of the census. Only on the decennial census for the purposes of the apportionment of the House of Representatives do we require actual enumeration.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the gentleman from Florida if I might. I am very impressed with his credentials, and I appreciate his position in this argument and his learned debate. It does puzzle me, though, how the gentleman, and he is a member of the American Statistical Association?

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I taught statistics in the School of Business at Georgia State University on quantitative methods, MBA program.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I am sorry. I misunderstood that.

It puzzles me how he can develop a position with his learned background that is so at odds with not only the National Academy of Sciences, which has had three panels look at this issue and in a very scientific way with lots of, I think the gentleman would concede,

learned people, had a lot of learned people look at this and conclude after the 1990 failed census, when the Congress asked the National Academy of Sciences to look at it and come up with a better technique and they recommended scientific sampling, how the gentleman's position can line up against the National Academy of Sciences' three panels and about six or seven scientific statistic organizations on the issue, all of whom recommended using this new science in trying to count everyone in this country.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. If the gentleman would yield further, I respond there is real division within the academic community, and we have had academics, prominent academics, before our committee, and we are going to have another hearing in September.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time on that point, indeed I am sure we can get individual academicians and statisticians to come up with any view. The thing that impresses me so much is that these associations have come up with a consensus position supporting sampling.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. The Academy of Sciences is a respected organization, but not beyond politics, and sadly I think they have been used.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time of the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has expired.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that I have about 4½ minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Academy of Sciences is generally a respected organization, but it has been politically used. It was a hand-picked panel. For example, the chairman of the panel was a very partisan Democrat, Mr. Schultz, who, as my colleagues know, was head of the Council of Economic Advisors under Jimmy Carter and Lyndon Johnson.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Which organization is that?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. The Academy of Sciences study. It was a very partisan Democrat that led the study. There is a division within the academic community, and if I was a statistician looking at this, I would say, wow, the largest statistical experiment in history? Statisticians love to have experiments; statisticians love to play around with numbers. This is their opportunity, this is a golden opportunity for them to run some tests. That is what they are in favor of.

But let us run a test, and let us conduct a count of everyone to start with. At least use the model of 1990 as a minimum where we try, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) was saying, count everyone and then do a study on a statistical sample for test purposes or an ICM of some type.

So there are ways to do that, but we have to start basically with counting everyone first, and I yield.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. The gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is suggesting that the one panel was compromised in some political way. Is he suggesting that the other two at the National Academy of Sciences was politically compromised? And what about all these other organizations?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Reclaiming my time, they were a hand-picked panel. We can create a panel of prestigious academics, will come up with a different study.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. It is quite a conspiracy.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I have the time, if I might say, so the thing is we need to trust the system. It has to be done where we work together, Republican and Democrats, and we should not delegate it. It is something we do not delegate to some hand-picked group of academics over at the Academy of Sciences. It is our responsibility, not their responsibility.

It is our responsibility to do that. We need the input and advice of all the sources, but it is not going to be trusted if we turn it over to a group of academics who want to have this great statistical experiment, and I think I am excited for them to have this great statistical experiment, but let us just count everyone.

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

It is obvious from the discussion we are going to have a lively evening, and we have got some real substance here as we have two very well-educated gentlemen going back and forth.

I think, in regards to the census part of this rule, I think it was best summarized by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and that is, as my colleagues know, it is fundamental, and I quote her again because I think it was an excellent quote, fundamental to our democracy that everyone counts.

That is exactly the point that the gentleman from Florida is making, and that is this is not the time for a census experiment. This is not the time to put experimental aircraft in the side of this count. This aircraft has to fly and has to fly for a long time. Let us do it, and let us do it right. Sure, it is going to cost a little more money, sure we have got to count everybody, but that is what the Constitution demands.

That issue aside, the issue of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY):

His amendment is certainly to bring up some lively debate that it is in

order that that debate be allowed on this floor.

And finally, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that throughout the number of speakers that we have had today in regards to this rule I have not heard anyone that objects to the rule. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), my good friend from the Committee on Rules, said, I think, and I quote that he reluctantly supported it. We have got the support for the rule. It is time to move the rule. It is time to get on with the general debate.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3736, WORKFORCE IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-660) on the resolution (H. Res. 513) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3736) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes relating to H-1B non-immigrants, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2183.

□ 1744

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHIMKUS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

□ 1745

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Monday, July 20, 1998, the request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SALMON TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SALMON to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —POSTING NAMES OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE ONE PASSENGERS ON INTERNET

SEC. 01. REQUIREMENT THAT NAMES OF PASSENGERS ON AIR FORCE ONE AND AIR FORCE TWO BE MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTERNET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall make available through the Internet the name of any non-Government person who is a passenger on an aircraft designated as Air Force One or Air Force Two not later than 30 days after the date that the person is a passenger on such aircraft.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in a case in which the President determines that compliance with such subsection would be contrary to the national security interests of the United States. In any such case, not later than 30 days after the date that the person whose name will not be made available through the Internet was a passenger on the aircraft, the President shall submit to the chairman and ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and of the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate—

(1) the name of the person; and

(2) the justification for not making such name available through the Internet.

(c) DEFINITION OF PERSON.—As used in this Act, the term "non-Government person" means a person who is not an officer or employee of the United States, a member of the Armed Forces, or a Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I just need to know what list we are following in terms of order. I am not suggesting that the gentleman is out of order. I just do not know.

I thought we were going from the Smith amendment to the Rohrabacher amendment, which is the amendment which eliminates the individual contribution limits. I thought that was the next amendment in order. Is there an order that we are following?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair believes The Committee is following the order under the previous order of the House.

Mr. SHAYS. Right. Do we have that order available so that we could see what that order is?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The order on July 17 was accompanied by a list of amendments in a prescribed order.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I believe it has the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), which is unanimous consent No. 16 to be followed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), which is unanimous consent No. 17, again with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), unanimous consent No. 18. That is what I had down as the order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) was offering Amendment No. 14.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) is next. I am sorry. I thought that amendment had been withdrawn. Okay.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, Air Force One and related aircraft have a noble history. These special aircraft were first put into service for President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1944.

In 1961, the designation Air Force One was first used on behalf of President John F. Kennedy. President Lyndon Johnson took the oath of office on Air Force One in 1963.

Air Force One also provides all presidents with the security and the communications equipment they would need in case of an international crisis, a noble history now sullied.

President Clinton and Vice President GORE created a new use for Air Force One and Air Force Two, taxpayer-funded boondoggles for fat-cat contributors and toys for special interests.

According to the Boston Globe, President Clinton flew aboard Air Force One with 56 major contributors during 1996 and 1997, often with government picking up the tab. Donors who gave \$5,000 or raised at least \$25,000 for the Clinton-Gore campaign accompanied Clinton aboard the presidential aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It requires the President to make available via the Internet the name of any nongovernment person who is a passenger on an aircraft designated as Air Force One or Air Force Two no later than 30 days after that person is a passenger.

An exception is made if there are national security concerns. In such cases, the President shall submit to the chairman and ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House and Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate the name of the person and the jus-

tification for not making the name available through the Internet.

It is time the American people, our constituents, know which special interests are flying on taxpayer-funded aircraft. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) rising in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am rising in opposition. I would like to reserve the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, just by way of explanation, what is the intent of the amendment? Because perhaps we can work out an agreement on it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is simply disclosure. It is not just for this administration, for any administration in the future. I have a concern that there are possibly people who are contributors to either of the parties or to candidates who may be rewarded by flying on Air Force One.

I am simply wanting to make sure that any nongovernmental person that flies aboard Air Force One or Air Force Two, those are the two specified in the amendment, would be disclosed via the Internet so that we would have full disclosure of who those people might be.

If there is a national security concern which would preclude them from disclosing that information, then that would be granted. That would waive them from that requirement.

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, right now the names of the people who fly on Air Force One would be of public record; is that correct?

Mr. SALMON. According to my understanding, not necessarily so, and not necessarily in a timely manner. I am asking that, through my amendment, that it be done within 30 days, just like we do in our campaigns. When we get contributions from special interests, we have to publish that information and fully disclose it to the public. I am simply asking that the White House live by the same standards when it comes to possible perks for contributors.

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, what specifically would be the provisions with regard to something that was in the national security interest not to disclose a name?

Mr. SALMON. That would be determined by members on the Committee on National Security. As I mentioned, they would be required to submit in

writing to the chairman of the committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the ranking member. If they concur there is a national security reason for not disclosing that information, then it is not disclosed.

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, the Pentagon would not be able to make those determinations, or the State Department would not be able to make those determinations?

Mr. SALMON. I am sure that they would work in tandem with those members. If they feel that there is a valid concern, absolutely, their input would be, I am sure, paramount, as it always is. If they feel that there is a literal reason that national security might be compromised by disclosing those names, that would be a compelling reason enough to not have to disclose that information, and that is included in the amendment.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, we would accept the amendment.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. SALMON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree that this is an amendment that we can accept, and I apologize to the gentleman. I thought he had withdrawn it, but I think this amendment does no harm to the bill.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROHRBACHER to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. PARTIAL REMOVAL OF LIMITATIONS ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES WHOSE OPPONENTS USE LARGE AMOUNTS OF PERSONAL FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 411a)

is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) If a candidate for Federal office makes contributions or expenditures from the personal funds of the candidate totaling more than \$1,000 with respect to an election, the candidate shall so notify the Commission and each other candidate in the election. The notification shall be made in writing within 48 hours after the contribution or expenditure involved is made.

“(2) In any case described in paragraph (1), any person who is otherwise permitted under this Act to make contributions to such other candidate may make contributions in excess of any otherwise applicable limitation on such contributions, to the extent that the total of such excess contributions accepted by such other candidate does not exceed the total of contributions or expenditures from personal funds referred to in paragraph (1).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections occurring after January 1999.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to introduce a nonpartisan amendment that will level the campaign playing field. Currently, the campaign playing field is heavily weighted to the advantage of wealthy Americans. By lifting the \$1,000 limit a candidate may raise when a candidate is being faced with a wealthy opponent, this cap will be raised, which will make it possible to match the amount his or her wealthy opponent contributes to his or her own campaign.

In other words, and I know this sounds a little complicated, if my amendment passes, if my wealthy competitor writes a \$1 million check to his or her own campaign, I will no longer be faced with the impossible task of raising the same amount of money that my opponent has donated to his or her campaign in \$1,000 increments. Instead, the cap will be lifted so that it is possible for me to match the amount that my own opponent has spent on his or her own campaign.

As current campaign law stands, wealthy candidates can spend an unlimited amount of their own money, while their unfortunate opponents are stuck with raising small amounts of money in order to match that amount that their wealthy opponent has contributed to their own campaign. This has given the wealthy a tremendous advantage over their opponents.

It is the most glaring inequity of our current campaign finance system, and it has resulted in a spectacle that no one would have predicted. It is the unintended consequence of limiting contributions to political campaigns.

Instead of opening up our elections to the American people, today politics is becoming the arena of the rich, rich candidates who have nonwealthy opponents at a tremendous disadvantage. The rich pour resources into their own campaigns. This means most of us are in a position of getting steamrolled by a wealthy opponent.

So I urge my colleagues to level the campaign playing field and to update our campaign finance laws and give nonwealthy Americans a chance to be elected to Congress. Rather than having to worry and have the parties out always recruiting wealthy people, let us level this field so that if someone is wealthy and pumps \$1 million into their campaign, a nonwealthy opponent can raise an equal amount to have an equal race.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which was, frankly, one of my amendments. I do think that Congress needs to deal with how we respond to those who have unlimited wealth, and one way is to do it the way the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has suggested.

Unfortunately, his amendment, an amendment that I offered on another bill, would kill the coalition that exists for passing bipartisan reform.

Let me explain to my colleagues that the Meehan-Shays bill does three basic things. It bans soft money, the unlimited sums from individuals, corporations, labor unions, and other interest groups that go to the political parties and then get rerouted right back down to individual candidates.

It secondly calls the sham issue ads what they truly are, campaign ads, which means we cannot use corporate money or dues money from labor 60 days from an election. It means that we have to report our expenditures.

The third thing we do is we have FEC enforcement, Federal Election Commission enforcement, and disclosure by way of electronic means in the Internet.

This amendment seeks to do something beyond the scope of our basic bill. I will also say that our basic bill includes the commission bill, the commission bill brought forward on a bipartisan basis. We would suggest that the very issue that the gentleman is presenting to this Congress should be dealt with by the commission.

We have 37 amendments, if no more are withdrawn before we deal with the Meehan-Shays substitute and deal with the various amendments. Sixteen are poison pills, seven are “no” votes in our view, four are leaning “no”, seven are neutral, three are “yes”.

The bottom line to the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), he is one of the 16 poi-

son pill amendments that will kill our coalition. On that basis, I have to encourage defeat of it.

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

□ 1800

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 2½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 3 minutes.

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

I hope everyone is listening very closely to this argument. Supposedly, this will kill the whole purpose of this bill. That is a lot of baloney. If we are talking about campaign finance reform and we are going to leave the whole campaign arena to rich people, what good is that reform?

In fact, without my amendment, the good work of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is going to do nothing but further give very wealthy Americans the leverage to take control of the political process in America. So what is all this reform about if we are not going to handle that problem?

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, the problem with this amendment is we are trying to find a way to reduce the influence of money in American politics; we are not trying to find a way to allow hundreds of thousands of dollars of additional money into the process.

This amendment would potentially create a huge loophole through which wealthy individuals could funnel hundreds of thousands of dollars in contributions to a single candidate through the hard money system. The reason why the Shays-Meehan bill bans soft money is to put an end to the notion of these enormous contributions from private individuals.

This amendment would provide a new way for special interests to influence the legislative process. That is why I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Even when we have a wealthy candidate putting his or her own money into it, that is an excuse for a private individual to then begin to funnel hundreds of thousands of dollars into a campaign.

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

Obviously, if we just listen very closely to what is being said here, these gentlemen are trying to cut off other avenues for ordinary Americans to raise money for their campaigns, leaving the political arena in the control of such wealthy Americans that

every Member of this body who is not rich shudders at the thought of having a wealthy candidate in their district step forward and pump so much money in that he or she will be eliminated just because they just cannot raise the money in small increments.

The Shays-Meehan supposed reform is making this problem worse, and by not accepting this amendment, I am afraid that they are disclosing themselves at just how effective they think their own bill is going to be.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains for both individuals?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 2 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS), our distinguished colleague.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, there is a very interesting debate going on here, because the arguments are being put forward as if there is currently a provision within the system that allows for an offset of one individual, if a wealthy individual runs against them.

The law is very clear right now that if someone chooses to fund their campaign on their own dollars, they are allowed to do that, and a candidate who is running against them can raise money through a variety of ways to do it. They are not limited in how much money they can raise.

Nothing in Shays-Meehan limits the ability of people to raise money. So the argument that Shays-Meehan has to be amended to deal with a problem created by that proposal is ludicrous. It leaves the system exactly as it is now. Someone who is using their own money is free to use as much of that wealth as they would like to. Individuals who rely on contributions can raise as much as they wish, but this is not necessary.

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

Of course, anyone listening to this debate must wonder what bill we are really discussing after listening to that last statement.

The purpose of this bill, as we have heard from the authors of this bill, is to reduce the avenues of money coming into political campaigns. Let us restrict it.

What I am saying is that today, with an unintended consequence of similar legislation in the past, we have given a tremendous advantage to rich people. Both of our parties are going out enlisting very wealthy Americans, rich people, in order to run for office, and more and more millionaires are coming here, because we are restricting the

avenues in which ordinary Americans can raise money for political campaigns. My amendment would correct that unintended consequence of this legislation.

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

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

With the 1 minute I have remaining, I would just like to acknowledge the fact that the amendment that our colleague wants to offer is offering an amendment that would allow unlimited contributions from an individual; he can raise \$1 million from one individual. This is contrary to the reform measure that we are bringing forward.

We ban soft money that goes to the political parties, the unlimited sums from individuals, corporations, labor unions and other interest groups. We call the sham issue ads what they truly are, campaign ads, and we have FEC disclosure and enforcement. We are against allowing unlimited sums from individuals, and that is why we oppose this, and that is why it would break apart the coalition that exists between Republicans and Democrats to pass this bill.

This amendment is offered in good faith by my colleague, but the bottom line is, it will kill Meehan-Shays.

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

First and foremost, this does not permit unlimited contributions, the gentleman is absolutely wrong, and I hope people are paying attention to the debate. The unlimited contributions that we are setting is the limit which a wealthy person puts into his or her own campaign. That is stated very clearly. There is a limit. Why should we permit wealthy Americans to buy these seats because we have not given a fair chance for nonwealthy Americans to have a shot at the election process?

This is not fair, and that is what we are trying to do. I thought that is what this bill was all about. I guess it is not.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

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

The bottom line is if a wealthy person spends \$1 million under my colleague's proposal, he could raise \$1 million from another wealthy individual.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Obviously we would like to be fair to all Americans, and that is not what this bill is all about, if we prevent non-

wealthy Americans from raising the funds they need to deter these attacks on wealthy citizens trying to steal these elections for themselves.

Let us make sure we open up the system, make sure there is more money available to all candidates, not just to the rich.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PAUL to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —BALLOT ACCESS RIGHTS

SEC. 01. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Voting participation in the United States is lower than in any other advanced industrialized democracy.

(2) The rights of eligible citizens to seek election to office, vote for candidates of their choice and associate for the purpose of taking part in elections, including the right to create and develop new political parties, are fundamental in a democracy. The rights of citizens to participate in the election process, provided in and derived from the first and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution, have consistently been promoted and protected by the Federal Government. These rights include the right to cast an effective vote and the right to associate for the advancement of political beliefs, which includes the "constitutional right . . . to create and develop new political parties." *Norman v. Reed*, 502 U.S. 279, 112 S.Ct. 699 (1992). It is the duty of the Federal Government to see that these rights are not impaired in elections for Federal office.

(3) Certain restrictions on access to the ballot impair the ability of citizens to exercise these rights and have a direct and damaging effect on citizens' participation in the electoral process.

(4) Many States unduly restrict access to the ballot by nonmajor party candidates and nonmajor political parties by means of such devices as excessive petition signature requirements, insufficient petitioning periods, unconstitutionally early petition filing deadlines, petition signature distribution criteria, and limitations on eligibility to circulate and sign petitions.

(5) Many States require political parties to poll an unduly high number of voters or to register an unduly high number of voters as a precondition for remaining on the ballot.

(6) In 1983, the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional an Ohio law requiring a nonmajor party candidate for President to qualify for the general election ballot earlier than major party candidates. This Supreme Court decision, *Anderson v. Celebrezze*, 460 U.S. 780 (1983) has been followed by many lower courts in challenges by nonmajor parties and candidates to early petition filing deadlines. See, e.g., *Stoddard v. Quinn*, 593 F. Supp. 300 (D.Me. 1984); *Cripps v. Seneca County Board of Elections*, 629 F. Supp. 1335 (N.D. Oh. 1985); *Libertarian Party of Nevada v. Swackhamer*, 638 F. Supp. 565 (D. Nev. 1986); *Cromer v. State of South Carolina*, 917 F.2d 819 (4th Cir. 1990); *New Alliance Party of Alabama v. Hand*, 933 F.2d 1568 (11th Cir. 1991).

(7) In 1996, 34 States required nonmajor party candidates for President to qualify for the ballot before the second major party national convention (Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming). Twenty-six of these States required nonmajor party candidates to qualify before the first major party national convention (Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and West Virginia).

(8) Under present law, in 1996, nonmajor party candidates for President were required to obtain at least 701,089 petition signatures to be listed on the ballots of all 50 States and the District of Columbia—28 times more signatures than the 25,500 required of Democratic Party candidates and 13 times more signatures than the 54,250 required of Republican Party candidates. To be listed on the ballot in all 50 States and the District of Columbia with a party label, nonmajor party candidates for President were required to obtain approximately 651,475 petition signatures and 89,186 registrants. Thirty-two of the 41 States that hold Presidential primaries required no signatures of major party candidates for President (Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin). Only three States re-

quired no signatures of nonmajor party candidates for President (Arkansas, Colorado, and Louisiana; Colorado and Louisiana, however, required a \$500 filing fee).

(9) Under present law, the number of petition signatures required by the States to list a major party candidate for Senate on the ballot in 1996 ranged from zero to 15,000. The number of petition signatures required to list a nonmajor party candidate for Senate ranged from zero to 196,788. Thirty-one States required no signatures of major party candidates for Senate (Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming). Only one State required no signatures of nonmajor party candidates for Senate, provided they were willing to be listed on the ballot without a party label (Louisiana, although a \$600 filing fee was required, and to run with a party label, a candidate was required to register 111,121 voters into his or her party).

(10) Under present law, the number of petition signatures required by the States to list a major party candidate for Congress on the ballot in 1996 ranged from zero to 2,000. The number of petition signatures required to list a nonmajor party candidate for Congress ranged from zero to 13,653. Thirty-one States required no signatures of major party candidates for Congress (Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming). Only one State required no signatures of nonmajor party candidates for Congress, provided they are willing to be listed on the ballot without a party label (Louisiana, although a \$600 filing fee was required).

(11) Under present law, in 1996, eight States required additional signatures to list a nonmajor party candidate for President on the ballot with a party label (Alabama, Arizona, Idaho, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee). Thirteen States required additional signatures to list a nonmajor party candidate for Senate or Congress on the ballot with a party label (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Idaho, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee). Two of these States (Ohio and Tennessee) required 5,000 signatures and 25 signatures, respectively, to list a nonmajor party candidate for President or Senate on the ballot in 1996, but required 33,463 signatures and 37,179 signatures, respectively, to list the candidate on the ballot with her or his party label. One State (California) required a nonmajor party to have 89,006 registrants in order to have its candidate for President listed on the ballot with a party label.

(12) Under present law, in 1996 one State (California) required nonmajor party candidates for President or Senate to obtain 147,238 signatures in 105 days, but required major party candidates for Senate to obtain only 65 signatures in 105 days, and required no signatures of major party candidates for President. Another State (Texas) required nonmajor party candidates for President or Senate to obtain 43,963 signatures in 75 days, and required no signatures of major party candidates for President or Senate.

(13) Under present law, in 1996, seven States required nonmajor party candidates for President or Senate to collect a certain number or percentage of their petition signatures in each congressional district or in a specified number of congressional districts (Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Virginia). Only three of these States impose a like requirement on major party candidates for President or Senate (Michigan, New York, Virginia).

(14) Under present law, in 1996, 20 States restricted the circulation of petitions for nonmajor party candidates to residents of those States (California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin). Two States restricted the circulation of petitions for nonmajor party candidates to the county or congressional district where the circulator lives (Kansas and Virginia).

(15) Under present law, in 1996, three States prohibited people who voted in a primary election from signing petitions for nonmajor party candidates (Nebraska, New York, Texas, West Virginia). Twelve States restricted the signing of petitions to people who indicate intent to support or vote for the candidate or party (California, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Utah). Five of these 12 States required no petitions of major party candidates (Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah), and only one of the six remaining States restricted the signing of petitions for major party candidates to people who indicate intent to support or vote for the candidate or party (New Jersey).

(16) In two States (Louisiana and Maryland), no nonmajor party candidate for Senate has qualified for the ballot since those States' ballot access laws have been in effect.

(17) In two States (Georgia and Louisiana), no nonmajor party candidate for the United States House of Representatives has qualified for the ballot since those States' ballot access laws have been in effect.

(18) Restrictions on the ability of citizens to exercise the rights identified in this subsection have disproportionately impaired participation in the electoral process by various groups, including racial minorities.

(19) The establishment of fair and uniform national standards for access to the ballot in elections for Federal office would remove barriers to the participation of citizens in the electoral process and thereby facilitate such participation and maximize the rights identified in this subsection.

(20) The Congress has authority, under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States in sections 4 and 8 of article I, section 1 of article II, article VI, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, and other provisions of the Constitution of the United States, to protect and promote the exercise of the rights identified in this subsection.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to establish fair and uniform standards regulating access to the ballot by eligible citizens who desire to seek election to Federal office and political parties, bodies, and groups which desire to take part in elections for Federal office; and

(2) to maximize the participation of eligible citizens in elections for Federal office.

SEC. 02. BALLOT ACCESS RIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual shall have the right to be placed as a candidate on, and to have such individual's political party, body, or group affiliation in connection with such candidacy placed on, a ballot or similar voting materials to be used in a Federal election, if—

(1) such individual presents a petition stating in substance that its signers desire such individual's name and political party, body or group affiliation, if any, to be placed on the ballot or other similar voting materials to be used in the Federal election with respect to which such rights are to be exercised;

(2) with respect to a Federal election for the office of President, Vice President, or Senator, such petition has a number of signatures of persons qualified to vote for such office equal to one-tenth of one percent of the number of persons who voted in the most recent previous Federal election for such office in the State, or 1,000 signatures, whichever is greater;

(3) with respect to a Federal election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, such petition has a number of signatures of persons qualified to vote for such office equal to one-half of one percent of the number of persons who voted in the most recent previous Federal election for such office, or, if there was no previous Federal election for such office, 1,000 signatures;

(4) with respect to a Federal election the date of which was fixed 345 or more days in advance, such petition was circulated during a period beginning on the 345th day and ending on the 75th day before the date of the election; and

(5) with respect to a Federal election the date of which was fixed less than 345 days in advance, such petition was circulated during a period established by the State holding the election, or, if no such period was established, during a period beginning on the day after the date the election was scheduled and ending on the tenth day before the date of the election, provided, however, that the number of signatures required under paragraph (2) or (3) shall be reduced by $\frac{1}{270}$ for each day less than 270 in such period.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—An individual shall have the right to be placed as a candidate on, and to have such individual's political party, body, or group affiliation in connection with such candidacy placed on, a ballot or similar voting materials to be used in a Federal election, without having to satisfy any requirement relating to a petition under subsection (a), if that or another individual, as a candidate of that political party, body, or group, received one percent of the votes cast in the most recent general Federal election for President or Senator in the State.

(c) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to any State that provides by law for greater ballot access rights than the ballot access rights provided for under such subsections.

SEC. 03. RULEMAKING.

The Attorney General shall make rules to carry out this title.

SEC. 04. GENERAL DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title—

(1) the term "Federal election" means a general or special election for the office of—

(A) President or Vice President;
(B) Senator; or
(C) Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress;

(2) the term "State" means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States;

(3) the term "individual" means an individual who has the qualifications required by law of a person who holds the office for which such individual seeks to be a candidate;

(4) the term "petition" includes a petition which conforms to section 02(a)(1) and upon which signers' addresses and/or printed names are required to be placed;

(5) the term "signer" means a person whose signature appears on a petition and who can be identified as a person qualified to vote for an individual for whom the petition is circulated, and includes a person who requests another to sign a petition on his or her behalf at the time when, and at the place where, the request is made;

(6) the term "signature" includes the incomplete name of a signer, the name of a signer containing abbreviations such as first or middle initial, and the name of a signer preceded or followed by titles such as "Mr.", "Ms.", "Dr.", "Jr.", or "III"; and

(7) the term "address" means the address which a signer uses for purposes of registration and voting.

(Participation by presidential candidates in debates with candidates with broad-based support)

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a perfecting amendment, it is not in the nature of a substitute, and that has been cleared in the Committee on Rules.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk designated it as an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, both amendments that I have should be perfecting amendments, and if permissible, I ask unanimous consent that they both be accepted as such.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The gentleman is amending the Shays-Meehan amendment in the nature of a substitute as permitted by the rules.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the Chair for the clarification.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It is an amendment that deals with equity and fairness, so I would expect essentially no opposition to this.

It simply lowers and standardizes the signature requirements and the time required to get signatures to get a Federal candidate on the ballot. There are very many unfair rules and regulations by the States that make it virtually

impossible for many candidates to get on the ballot.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make 4 points about the amendment. First, it is constitutional to do this. Article I, section 4, explicitly authorizes the U.S. Congress to, "At any time by law make or alter such regulations regarding the manner of holding elections." This is the authority that was used for the Voters Rights Act of 1965.

The second point I would like to make is an issue of fairness. Because of the excess petition requirements put on by so many States and the short period of time required, many individuals are excluded from the ballot, and for this reason, this should be corrected. There are some States, take, for instance, Georgia, wrote a law in 1943. There has not been one minor party candidate on the ballot since 1943, because it cannot meet the requirements. This is unfair. This amendment would correct this.

Number 3, the third point. In contrast to some who would criticize an amendment like this by saying that there would be overcrowding on the ballot, there have been statistical studies made of States where the number of requirements, of signature requirements are very low, and the time very generous. Instead of overcrowding, they have an average of 3.3 candidates per ballot.

Now, this is very important also because it increases interest and increases turnout. Today, turnout has gone down every year in the last 20 or 30 years, there has been a steady decline in interest. This amendment would increase the interest and increase the turnout.

The fourth point that I would like to make is that the setup and the situation we have now is so unfair, many are concerned about how money is influencing the elections. But in this case, rules and regulations are affecting minor candidates by pushing up the cost of the election, where they cannot afford the money to even get on the ballot, so it is very unfair in a negative sense that the major parties penalize any challengers. And the correction would come here by equalizing this, making it more fair, and I would expect, I think, just everybody to agree that this is an amendment of fairness and equity and should be accepted.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I request the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, but the real purpose is to focus my remarks on the need for the Shays-Meehan substitute rather than the specifics of this particular amendment, which are not the real issue.

The reason we need Shays-Meehan is quite simple and quite stark. The legitimacy of the American political process is being undermined.

I do not use these words lightly or as a mere rhetorical flourish. We can try to convince ourselves that all is well, salving ourselves with polls showing the approval for Congress is relatively high. Ironically, some argue that all is well because money is flowing into our campaign covers. This is like saying that a cancer patient is in better shape than someone without cancer, because that person might have more cells.

But in any event, a closer look tells a less rosy story. Polls show that many Americans do not know the first thing about Congress, the names of their representatives, which party is in control, and so forth. Discussions with average Americans uncover a deep cynicism about the political process; and looking at what in other circumstances we call the only poll that truly counts, Americans are simply abandoning the election booth.

□ 1815

Turnout is at an alltime low. Alienation from the political system is at an historical high. There could be no greater danger in a democracy. We are in the midst of a silent crisis.

Campaign finance reform does not rank high as a concern in polls simply because no one believes we can truly do it. They believe we are hapless and that the situation is hopeless, so they just continue to turn away. This is as corrosive a disease for the body politic as can be imagined. It is no less serious because the symptoms do not appear fully until it is too late to fashion a cure. So I congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for designing a cure while there is still time.

Some people have said that the side effects of this cure are so severe that we should just let the disease take its course, but that is simply wrong. The cure is as mild as sunshine, ensuring that everyone can see who is spending money to influence the political system. Shays-Meehan is, quite literally, the very least we can do.

Let us look at some of the concerns opponents of this bill raise. They say that, like previous efforts at reform, it has many loopholes and unintended consequences. Yet, their solution is to have no system at all; in short, to get rid of individual loopholes by having a regime that is one giant void. That hardly seems like a positive alternative.

Opponents also raise the specter of a system overrun by Federal bureaucrats, their favored bugaboo, but this is really another way of saying that they do not want any limits on the flow of money into the political system.

Mr. Chairman, George Bernard Shaw once said, "A society's morals are like

its teeth; the more decayed they are, the more it hurts to touch them." It is no accident that it hurts so much to discuss our political morality. It is time to correct it at its roots. I urge my colleagues to vote down this amendment and to support the Shays-Meehan substitute.

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

My amendment, once again, lowers and standardizes the required signatures to get Federal candidates on the ballot. There is a great deal of inequity among the States, and it works against the minor candidates and prevents many from even participating in the process.

For this reason, many individuals have lost interest in politics. They are disinterested, and every year it seems that the turnout goes down. This year is no exception. Forty-two percent of the American people do not align themselves with a political party. Twenty-nine percent, approximately, align themselves with Republicans and Democrats. Yet, the rules and the laws are written by the major party for the sole purpose of making it very expensive and very difficult, and sometimes impossible, to get on the ballot.

If we had more competition and more openness, we would get more people out to vote. It would not clutter the ballot, it would not have overcrowding, but it would allow discourse, and it would be beneficial to the process.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, my problem with this amendment is that it would prohibit States from erecting excessive ballot access barriers to candidates for Federal office. It would set ballot petition signature limits for the President, the Vice President, United States Senate, and House candidates. In addition, it would set ballot petition time limitations.

Protections are important, but individual States should be allowed to control their campaign laws. Assuring there are no undue barriers to prevent individuals from running for Federal office is imperative to keeping our political process fair, but I am concerned with the Federal Government imposing limitations on the States for how they govern ballot access.

This deals with an important set of issues, and should be dealt with not solely with this amendment, but rather, should be fully debated in the House after the Shays-Meehan substitute has passed.

One of the things that the Shays-Meehan bill does is to provide for an opportunity for debate and discussion through the Commission. This is an issue that I think there should be hearings on, I think we should have a dialogue about. But I just do not think

that an amendment to the Shays-Meehan bill is the appropriate place to deal with this issue.

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

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

The gentleman suggests we should leave this to the States. I quoted and cited the constitutional authority for this. It is explicit. We have the authority to do this. There are many, many unfair laws.

Dealing with the President, for instance, the minor candidates, on average, to get on the ballot, are required to get 701,000 signatures. A major candidate gets less than 50,000. To get on an average Senate seat ballot, 196,000 signatures are required for the Senate, 15,000 for the major candidates. In the House, on the average for the minor candidate, it is more than 13,000, where it is 2,000 for a major candidate.

There is something distinctly unfair about this. This is un-American. We have the authority to do it. This is the precise time to do it. We are dealing with campaign reform, and they are forcing these minor candidates to spend unbelievable amounts of money. They are being excluded. They are 42 percent of the people in this country. They are the majority, when we divide the electorate up. They deserve representation, too.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL TO AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PAUL to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —DEBATE REQUIREMENTS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

SEC. —01. REQUIREMENT THAT CANDIDATES WHO RECEIVE CAMPAIGN FINANCING FROM THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND AGREE NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN MULTICANDIDATE FORUMS THAT EXCLUDE CANDIDATES WITH BROAD-BASED PUBLIC SUPPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the requirements under subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in order to be eligible to receive payments from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, a candidate shall agree in writing not to appear in any multicandidate forum with respect to the election involved unless the following individuals are invited to participate in the multicandidate forum:

(1) Each other eligible candidate under such subtitle.

(2) Each individual who is qualified in at least 40 States for the ballot for the office involved.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Federal Election Commission determines that a candidate—

(1) has received payments from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund; and

(2) has violated the agreement referred to in subsection (a); the candidate shall pay to the Treasury an amount equal to the amount of the payments so made.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this title, the term "multicandidate forum," means a meeting—

(1) consisting of a moderated reciprocal discussion of issues among candidates for the same office; and

(2) to which any other person has access in person or through an electronic medium.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. The major candidates receive a lot, a million dollars, to run their campaigns. Then they have national debates, and then they can purposely exclude other candidates. I am not talking about 10 or 20 or 30 very minor candidates, I am talking about candidates who spend weeks, months, years, hundreds of thousands of dollars, just to get on the ballot. Some will not even take the money, but some qualify to be on 40 and 50 ballots, and they are purposely excluded.

This amendment does not dictate to those who hold debates, but it would require that those major party candidates who take the taxpayers' money, they take it with the agreement that anybody else who qualifies for taxpayers' funding, campaign funds, or gets on 40 ballots, would be allowed in the debate.

I cannot think of anything that could boost the interest in the debates more. Fewer and fewer people are watching debates. There was the lowest turnout, the lowest listening audience to the debates in the last-go around. It was the lowest since we have had these debates on television.

Forty-two percent of the people turned out and were interested in the debates prior to the election in 1992, and we had a major candidate, Ross Perot. Of course, the only reason he was able to achieve a significant amount of attention was because he happened to be a billionaire. That is not fair. In 1996, they did a poll right before the election to find out who was paying attention. We were getting ready to pick the President of the United States. It dropped to 24 percent.

If we want people to be civic-minded, interested in what we are doing, feeling like they have something to say about their government, we ought to allow them in. We should not exclude this 42 percent that have been excluded. I think opening up the debates in this way would only be fair and proper. It would be the American way to do it. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this fair-minded amendment.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take the 5 minutes in opposition to this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who has been a leader in our efforts to find a way to pass real campaign finance reform.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. The gentleman is doing a wonderful job on his bill, along with his colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. Chairman, I rise on this amendment in deep concern and in opposition to the amendment. I think the sincerity of the author is true, but I think this is the wrong place. This whole bill is about congressional campaign finance reform. It is how we regulate the money that controls our elections, to get elected to this House. It is not about presidential elections.

There might be a great debate about how to do that, but as the gentleman knows, the presidential election process is controlled by each of the 50 States. We have no national primary in the United States. I think there is room for that kind of debate, whether we ought to move in that direction, whether the process for qualifying for a ballot ought to be more uniform, as the gentleman suggests.

But to take the gentleman's ideas about presidential debates and move them into this bill is, I think, the wrong way to go; the wrong place, the wrong time, and frankly, the wrong issue. So I strongly oppose this amend-

ment. I think the gentleman is going to try to confuse what the underlying bill is all about.

We have to keep that in focus. We have to keep it limited to that issue. We cannot build the coalition that we need to build if we try to put everything in this bill, and make it a Christmas tree on all of the ills about lack of voting in America, lack of enough debate for those who wish to run for President of the United States from minor parties.

With all due respect for the gentleman's sincerity, I strongly oppose this amendment, and recommend that all my colleagues oppose the amendment, because it is probably technically germane, but it is not politically germane to what we are trying to accomplish.

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

It is always interesting that when we have an appropriate amendment that seems to catch the attention of the Members, that it is probably not the appropriate time to bring it up, and that we should hold hearings and do it some other day.

We have been spending months, and I believe both sides of the aisle have been very sincere in their efforts to clarify and to improve our election process. I think this would be a tremendous benefit to the congressional candidates as well, because there would be more interest. People are not even listening to the debates. If they are not even willing to listen to the presidential debates, how can they get interested in Senate races and in House races?

The rating of the debates in 1996 was the lowest in 36 years. The Vice-Presidential debate, we cannot even get people to listen to the Vice-Presidential debates. It had dropped off 50 percent from 1992. In 1992, there was more interest. It is because we happened to have a billionaire interested, and he was able to stimulate some people in some debates.

All I am asking for is for us to endorse the notion, and we have the authority, the money comes from congressional appropriations. We have written these laws. These are election laws. We have this authority. We have the authority under the Constitution and we have the authority under our laws to do this.

So I would strongly suggest if Members are fair-minded and think they would like more interest, or if they want to continue the way we are going now, we are going to have less and less people interested. People are really tired of it. The American people do not understand this debate, but they do understand they would like to have somebody speak up for them.

Forty-two percent of the people have been essentially disenfranchised, and they are important. Hopefully they are important enough to go to the polls

and let us know about it. But they have been disenfranchised because they have lost interest. They have been pushed around, either with ballot access rules and regulations, or not being allowed to appear.

This does not mean those candidates more on the right would happen to be in the debate, or more on the left. It would open it up. This is fair-minded, it is proper, it is a good place to do it. It is a chance to vote on it, and I ask for support on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not use all of my time, but in conclusion, essentially what this does is, a presidential candidate who receives taxpayer-funded matching funds from participating in debates, they will not be able to participate in any debates to which equally qualifying candidates for funds would have participated in.

I agree that there should be more open and free debate, but I am also concerned that the bill might have the opposite effect. It might actually stifle debate, if a candidate who takes matching funds cannot participate in the debate.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Commission on Presidential Debates was established in 1987 to ensure debates are a permanent part of every general election.

□ 1830

It handles the rules of who participates and how the presidential debates will take place. I am concerned with the fact that if this amendment were to pass, Congress would essentially be setting the rules for who can and who cannot participate in presidential debates. I believe that that decision should remain with the independent commission.

Certainly, this is an item that in another forum that we could discuss, have hearings on, and I think that would be in our interest. But in any event, I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we should vote "no" on this amendment and take it up at another point in time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) on this. And in a way I have a lot of sympathy for the amendment, because I am one who feels that everyone should have a right to participate in these debates and opportunities.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are times in almost any election, particularly at the presidential level, in which we need to focus on the candidates who are going to be the major candidates who the majority of people by far in this country are going to vote on.

I think it should be up to the independent commission to make that decision so that they can formulate it, come forward with it, and make absolutely sure that everyone in this country who is going to be voting for the most important person in the United States has the opportunity to focus on how well those individuals know the issues, can handle themselves and deal with one another. So, I rise with some reluctance in opposition to this, but I do feel it should be opposed.

In addition, I would just like to take this moment to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for the extraordinary work which they have done on this piece of legislation. It really has been an exceptional effort by them, and I think that they deserve all the credit we can possibly give them.

Indeed, at some later point perhaps an amendment like this should be considered, but I think in the context of this particular bill, and with the language which is in this amendment, we should rise in opposition to it and I would encourage us all to oppose it.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 27 and 28 offered by me be withdrawn, and my amendments Nos. 25 and 26 be considered one after another, immediately after amendment No. 19, and the text of amendment No. 85 as submitted to the desk today be substituted for amendment No. 29.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain the third element of the gentleman's request.

Is there objection?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. I first did not understand what the Chair cannot entertain.

The CHAIRMAN. The request had three parts.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request that we have an understanding. We are eager to try to comply with the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip, and also to welcome him back into the Chamber, because he has had some very difficult things to deal with with the death of our two colleagues who guard this place. But I would like to take each of those items so we can see what does not remain.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's questions. What I am attempting to do is to group three amendments together. The first amendment would deal with what we call issue alerts, or what I call issue alerts. The second amendment deals with background music. And the third amendment deals with coordination.

And in order to do that, in my unanimous-consent request I am withdrawing completely amendments Nos. 27 and 28. Then I am taking Nos. 25 and 26 and moving them up to this point in time. Mr. Chairman, amendments 25 and 26 are the background music and the coordination amendment.

I am taking the text of an amendment way down below, No. 85 as pointed out in the rules, and submitting that language and substituting that language for amendment No. 29, which was my limit express advocacy communications.

So, I would take out the limit advocacy communications amendment completely and substitute the amendment that deals with issue alerts, if that makes any sense.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, what is No. 85?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEHAN. We would need to know—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. The Committee of the Whole cannot entertain a request to change the form of one of the amendments.

Mr. SHAYS. Then should there be two unanimous consent motions?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman would offer amendment 19, maybe the staff—

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, if I could withdraw my unanimous consent request and make a new one. That would be that I would ask unanimous consent that amendments 27 and 28 be withdrawn completely, and 25 and 26 be considered one after another immediately after amendment 19.

To save confusion, I will go on to amendment 19 and we will work it out with the Parliamentarian.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELAY to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of section 301(20) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(b) of the substitute, the following:

(C) Exception for legislative alerts: The term "express advocacy" does not include any communication which—

(i) deals solely with an issue or legislation which is or may be the subject of a vote in the Senate or House of Representatives; and

(ii) encourages an individual to contact an elected representative in Congress in order to exercise the right protected under the first amendment of the Constitution to inform the representative of the individual's views on such issue or legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

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

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for confusing the Committee. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment in order to ensure issue-oriented citizens groups their first amendment right to urge like-minded citizens to contact their elected representatives about upcoming votes in Congress.

The Shays-Meehan substitute, in my opinion, would restrict communications that express viewpoints to incumbent lawmakers during the period of time that this House could be in session. Now, these communications are intended to encourage like-minded citizens to express themselves regarding upcoming votes on the floor of the House. My amendment makes a distinction between communications that address upcoming votes and communications that endorse candidates for elections, two very real differences.

Due to the time limit, I will concentrate on just one of these restrictions. Under section 201 of Shays-Meehan, if a group sends out a communication at any time of the year, this would include flyers or newspaper ads or any other printed communications, that explain that Congressman Doe, for instance, voted incorrectly on a given issue the last time it came up and the same issue is coming up, say, again the next week. And if voters are interested in Congressman Doe reconsidering his vote, they should give him a call.

Under the onerous provisions of Shays-Meehan, Congressman Doe

would regard this as an attack on him and, therefore, an example of impermissible express advocacy. Congressman Doe's reason would lie in section 201 of the bill which states a given communication is express advocacy if it contains words that can have no reasonable meaning other than to advocate support or defeat, or if it contains words that express unmistakable and unambiguous opposition. These are the words in the bill.

Now, maybe the citizens' groups' words are like, "Do you know that Congresswoman Smith has voted time and again in favor of brutal partial-birth abortion procedures and has repeatedly described partial-birth abortion as a godsend?"

Maybe the words are, and I quote, "Congressman Jones voted to strip women of their constitutional right to choose and call it a great stride for mankind," closed quote.

It does not matter what the issue is. It does not matter what side of the issue a group is on. These groups have a right, a constitutionally protected right, to inform like-minded constituents to contact their representative, to let their representative know how his constituents may feel.

Simply put, issue-oriented citizens' groups have a first amendment right to express their opinions. These citizens deserve an unfettered, unobstructed right, not only to be informed of political issues but also to enjoy freedom of political speech.

I think that section 201 of Shays-Meehan prohibits any citizen group, other than, say, a Federal PAC, from even mentioning the name of a Member of Congress in a broadcast communication for 60 days before a primary election and again for 60 days before a general election, easily the most critical periods in the American electoral process. These are the times during which citizens are frantically seeking to inform and educate themselves as to what candidates stand for and against, and this provision undermines and subverts the entire electoral process.

So my amendment, I think, is a necessary measure to protect and secure free speech and the integrity of our electoral process and allow citizens' groups to participate in the legislative process. So I ask support for my amendment and support for freedom of speech.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is once again an effort to really undermine and cancel out the so-called issue ads and all of the express advocacy and issue advocacy provisions in this bill.

If you look at the language of the amendment of the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. DELAY), you see that there is an exception, an entire exception, to the issue advocacy provisions in case of any communication which deals solely with an issue or legislation which is or may be subject to a vote in the Senate or House of Representatives.

It does not say when. It could be next year. It could be 3 years from now. It could be anything. It encourages an individual to contact an elected representative in Congress in order to exercise the right protected under the first amendment.

So that once again opens the door to these so-called issue ads that attack a candidate in a clear campaign manner and does not say "defeats so and so," but says, after attacking him, after vilifying him or her, after making it clear that that person should be defeated, does not use the term "defeat" but says, contact so and so.

So, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) goes far beyond this instance of where we may be in session and where perhaps a group is truly not trying to campaign against that person but get a message to that person or to his or her constituents about something that is immediately pending.

Also I would urge that the protections we have in here are more than adequate to take care of the problem that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) says he is trying to address. This is the effort of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), all over again to take out of Shays-Meehan the issue advocacy provisions that attempt to get at ads that proclaim or parade as noncampaign ads but are truly nothing but that.

□ 1845

There would be no other reasonable interpretation. So this is bigger than driving a Mack truck through Shays-Meehan. This is one of these amendments that has a huge truck with a lot of poison pills in them which will sink Shays-Meehan. I think it is bad policy in and of itself. It goes way beyond its pretended purpose.

The momentum is now on the side of campaign finance reform. We should defeat amendments, the purpose of which is to throw a huge barrier in front of our reaching the promised land. We can reach it. There are some in this body who want to destroy it by any means. This is one such instance. We do not have to be worried about freedom of speech, in our judgment. We have carefully drafted this.

Defeat the DeLay amendment.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

If I heard the previous speaker correctly, and Shays-Meehan already allows this in all probability, why do we

not just be specific about it? This really just says that you can contact, you can encourage others to contact a Member of the House or a Member of the Senate during this 60-day blackout period, if in fact there is an issue before the Congress or likely to come before the Congress, and encourage that they be contacted on how they would vote. When we come back in September, everything we deal with would be in that 60-day period, where it is arguable whether you could contact, whether you could encourage the contact of a Member of Congress.

I think it is probably not arguable that you could call a Member of Congress and say, we would like you to do this. It is probably not arguable that you could write your own letter. But Shays-Meehan appears to say that you cannot encourage others to do that.

We have got appropriations bills that will be coming, that we will send to the Senate, others that will be coming back in conference from the Senate. Are we saying that no group could send out a postcard that says, contact your Member of Congress about this issue that is coming up next week or a specific Member of Congress and mention their name? Are we saying that nobody could send out a postcard and say, last time this issue came up, this Member of Congress voted yes, contact them and encourage them to vote no on the bill that is coming up this week?

I think really this gets down to the very fundamental point of issues before the Congress at a time, if the gentleman from Michigan is correct and it is in there, what does it hurt to make it even more specific?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. My point is not that the DeLay amendment is in there. The way it is drafted, it refers to all of these sham ads, whenever they are produced, whether 60 days in advance or not. If you read section C, it applies to subsection A and B and all the provisions therein.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would help me here for a minute, figure this out, if you cannot mention the name of a Member of Congress on anything you pay for, including a postcard, within 60 days of the election, how do you alert others who feel the same way you do about an issue to contact a given Congressman who may be, a given Member of Congress who may be thinking about which way they want to vote on that issue?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, first of all, again, I urge that anyone who is thinking of supporting this amendment read it. It applies to all of the provisions on express advocacy, whenever an ad would be launched, whether it is 60

days, 90 days, 120 days or whatever. It destroys the entire issue advocacy provisions. That is number one.

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time, the amendment says that this deals solely with an issue or legislation which is or may be the subject of a vote in the Senate or House of Representatives.

Mr. LEVIN. But, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that could be 120 days before, it could be any time and something that is subject to a vote that could be a year away. So I just urge that the gentleman read the amendment.

Number two, in relation to the 60-day provision, that only relates to paid advertisements transmitted through radio or television 60 days preceding an election. And if it is a notification through paid media that is truly not an effort to influence a vote but influence an election, then it should come under the same rules and regulations as all other methods of communication relating to elections and candidates.

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just say that if we begin to say that we cannot, with a radio ad or some other communication, some instant communication, try to encourage that specific Members of the Congress be contacted, we are a long way down, I think, the wrong road.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to maintain the express advocacy standard championed by the Shays-Meehan legislation, and we need to do that, we cannot go halfway on this. The distinguished whip, the distinguished leader from the other side, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) knows that quite well. This is a complex issue. Folks listening and watching are trying to still figure out what is the difference between soft and hard money, maybe like some Members. But there is a very, very severe distinction here.

We are not saying in Shays-Meehan that the candidate or dollars cannot be spent on behalf of the candidate by other groups. What we are saying is it must be hard money or else it is wrong and it is banned. The whole purpose of this legislation is to ban soft money. We know how that has grown. We are talking about two political parties that have raised \$67 million between them in the first 3 months of this year.

So we can really boil this down into two very basic things. There are those of us on both sides of the aisle who believe there is too much money in politics, too much money in our campaigns.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman tell me how much money is

enough money in politics? Could the gentleman tell me how much money is enough? The gentleman said there is too much money in it. How much money is enough?

Mr. PASCRELL. If the average, Mr. Chairman, if the average campaign costs \$660,000, we know that we cannot put a cap on it due to a Supreme Court decision, but working together I am sure we can come to specific advocacy issues of ourselves, such as banning soft money. Because if you have \$10 to spend in your campaign and not \$660,000, and third-party advocacy groups can spend whatever they wish, that is not controlling expenditures in a campaign. The gentleman knows it, and I know it.

So I believe this Shays-Meehan is simply attempting to ban soft money so that all of the hard money that is spent is disclosed. That is a critical issue, Mr. Chairman.

We want the dollars, we want the names and the addresses of people who contributed to our campaigns. That is a very underlying argument within Shays-Meehan, disclosure, the banning of soft money. And the sooner we do it, the better.

I think that this is what this is all about, what we are going to open up here, and trying to go in the opposite direction. What we are going to open up is more advocacy, more issue advocacy, more spending of money, not only 6 months or 6 weeks but 6 days before a campaign.

I believe Shays-Meehan is on target. I believe we cannot equivocate. This amendment is a poison pill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the discussion that we are having right now goes to the very crux of this entire issue of campaign finance reform. Those who have been advocating reform talk about special interest money. One thing is pretty clear, special interest money is the money of any group you do not agree with.

Second of all, too much money, no one has been able to define what is too much money. Third of all, sham ads. What is a sham ad? It is an ad that you do not like. Then fourth of all, disclosure.

Now, I find it ironic that I am up here this evening speaking in favor of the majority whip's amendment to allow groups to take out ads in the newspaper or radio or whatever to express their concern about issues before the Congress; and you all want to stop that, in essence.

Yet a group called Public Campaign ran ads in every newspaper in my district 2 days ago saying that Ed WHITFIELD does not think politicians are hooked on special interest money so he wants to triple the dose.

Now, I did not like this. It made me feel bad to read this, every newspaper

in my district, but I think this group has a constitutional right to run this ad if they want to run it.

But in your definition of express advocacy, you expand it so far that you are going to eliminate and curtail the rights of groups like Public Campaign to talk about these issues.

In fact, the third way you expand express advocacy, it says, express advocacy is expressing unmistakable and unambiguous support for or opposition to one or more clearly identified candidates when taken as a whole and with limited reference to external events such as proximity to an election.

This ad meets that definition. And under the Shays-Meehan, this ad would be illegal. So here I am, up here defending the right of this third party, independent group to run these ads, and all that the majority whip's amendment does is to be sure that they have a right to do that.

I might further say that the third way you expand the definition of express advocacy, the Supreme Court already, in a case FEC versus Maine Right to Life, has declared that specific language, not approximate language, but specific language unconstitutional.

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

First off, we do not ban anything. This is just totally a misstatement. The issue is whether it is an issue ad or a campaign ad. The issue is whether you come under campaign rules or do not come under campaign rules.

First and foremost, Mr. Chairman, we ban soft money. I do not think that there is any amendment to try to deal with that, so that is off the table.

The issue is dealing with sham issue ads that are truly campaign ads. It is not that they do not have a right to do it, but they are campaign ads and should come under the campaign rules. Organizations and labor unions and other interest groups have tried to get around the campaign laws by simply pretending that they are issue ads, by not saying vote for or vote against, but mentioning the name of the candidate and showing a picture. We have the bright line test expanded by the name of the picture or the name of the candidate. That is for radio and TV.

□ 1900

This is not radio or TV. This does not ban it based on the issue of 60 days before an election.

Now, there is the issue of unambiguous and unmistakable support for or opposition to a clearly identified Federal candidate can run at any time. Telling an individual that he should vote for something or vote against to me does not meet that test at all. It does not meet the unambiguous and unmistakable test that would affect this paper.

So the bottom line is radio and TV, yes. Name or the picture of the candidate 60 days to an election, that is right. We are trying to get at these campaign ads so people do not get around disclosure of them and are not able to use corporate and dues money. That is the purpose of it.

The bottom line to the gentleman's amendment is it is an exemption that totally swallows the rule. He basically abolishes by this amendment any attempt to deal with the whole issue of not dealing with the recognition of sham issue ads. It basically allows for this loophole because all you have to do is say, "Contact your representative," and then two days before the election you can then say, "Contact your representative and say whatever you want," which is the reason why I have objection to it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would just say to the gentleman that I think he has confirmed my concern and his third method of expanding express advocacy can be by newspaper, radio, television or whatever. Reasonable minds can disagree about what is unmistakable and what is unambiguous, and that is the reason that the court has adopted a bright line test. Your expansion of express advocacy is going to end up right back in the courts.

Mr. SHAYS. The bright line test is emphatically what we do have, and the name or the picture of the candidate has been what is expanded to it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker said that this issue goes to the crux of what this bill is about and it does.

A couple of weeks ago I very facetiously read a little poem by Dr. Seuss or in a Dr. Seuss like manner and I said that what this bill was about was about calling what waddles and quacks a duck, and that is what this bill is about. It is about ending the ability of some individuals and some groups to do an end run around the laws that we have in place for electing candidates.

This seems like a very innocent proposal. But frankly to pass it would allow some very pernicious political behavior to continue. This proposal includes a huge loophole, and the gentleman from Michigan did mention this to some extent. But I want to be very clear. The provision that the majority whip proposes would include not just issues that are scheduled to come up in front of a legislative body but issues that might or may be scheduled in the future. This is a huge issue. This means that any issue, any issue that conceivably could be put in front of a legislative body should fall within this particular exemption.

A couple of weeks ago when I spoke on issue advocacy, I read from the New York Times and other newspapers the express script of a campaign ad, really a whole series of campaign ads that ran in Staten Island. But they had similar gists to them. They went like this. Because one of the candidates was a member of the New York legislature, the ads ran talking about the number of times that that legislator had raised taxes, a number of things that he had done as a State legislator, they finished up by saying, even though there was no vote scheduled in the New York legislature on taxes, "Call Representative A and tell him to stop raising your taxes."

Would that fit within the exemption that the majority whip is proposing? Absolutely. Are we dealing with an express attempt to influence the election or defeat of a particular candidate? Yes. Are we talking about a legislative issue that just might at some time be in front of the legislative body that this individual belongs to? Yes. But this is the sort of behavior we are trying to stop. We are trying to make the rules clear and we are trying to make sure that everyone follows them. If you are attempting to elect or defeat a candidate, there are clear laws with which you must comply. What the majority whip tries to do is to blur those rules and to continue to provide an end run opportunity for those people who do not wish to follow the laws.

Please do not accept this. Let us do what I said a couple of weeks ago. Let us make sure that we call what waddles and quacks a duck.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This is exposing Shays-Meehan for what it is. The opposition to my amendment is trying to confuse the Members. In one section of 202, they do talk about 60 days before an election. But in other sections in 202, they talk about other parts of the year. And 60 days it is radio or television communication. But in other parts of the year it could be the kind of ad that the gentleman from Kentucky was talking about.

My amendment is very, very simple. It simply states that an exemption to the express advocacy part of their bill that deals solely with an issue or legislation. I do not understand why the proponents of Shays-Meehan are scared to death to have ads run against them dealing with issues while we are in session or the next week of the session.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I did want to clarify. Obviously if you have an ad that is running and under the new definition of express advocacy of Shays-Meehan that ad is included and, as I

said, I think it is so broad and so ambiguous and subject to so many interpretations, the Supreme Court has already declared part of this language unconstitutional. But obviously you can run those ads. The gentleman was correct. You can run the ads, but the group would have to form a PAC, the group would have to have an attorney, the group would have to file all those reports with the FEC and that is precisely the type of chilling effect that the Supreme Court has repeatedly said you cannot require.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for their extraordinary commitment to this issue and their hard work on it for many years.

Many of the amendments that come before us tonight collectively serve only one purpose, and, that is, to sidetrack reform. We have the power to change that today by passing and voting for Shays-Meehan, voting down absolutely every single amendment. We have a commission that is attached to it that can review all of these. The Shays-Meehan as we have said bans soft money and it also prevents the so-called independent groups from running sham issue advocacy ads whose true aim is to elect or defeat a particular candidate. This particular amendment really would create a sham legislative alert. Whether it is a sham issue advocacy ad or a sham legislative alert, all we are saying is disclose who is paying for it. Let the American public know who is wooing whom and pay for it, not with the huge loophole of soft money but with hard money.

I think that all of us have been attacked by these so-called independent groups in our campaigns. What is very troubling, in many cases I believe these independent groups are spending more money than the candidates themselves. But I am all for free speech. We all support free speech. Just let the American public know who is paying for it. Is that too much to ask? But the real point is that we have before us a very carefully crafted bill that has what I call the fragile flower of consensus. We have a majority of Members in this Congress that support Shays-Meehan. We can pass it and enact it into law. We can consider other important amendments in the commission bill. That is what we should be doing tonight.

What I find particularly troubling is that I suspect that many of the Members who have offered amendments this evening have absolutely no intention for voting for Shays-Meehan. Their real agenda is to try to destroy it with poison pills or with amendments that disrupt the balance that we have created.

Vote for Shays-Meehan. Vote against all amendments.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. I would like to get back to the original intent of the maker of the amendment which I think is to preserve the right to give legislative alerts. I do not quarrel with the gentleman's motivation. I think the motivation is proper. I do think that the bill protects that right, because there is clearly a voting record or voting guide exception. The term express advocacy does not include printed communication that presents information in an educational manner solely about the voting record or positions on a campaign issue. I think that the gentleman's concern is well covered in the bill.

Let me tell Members the problem I think we are trying to solve with this legislation. I think the laws of this land with regard to campaign finance and campaign communication worked pretty well until the relatively recent number of years. And the intensity of the fight across the country for this Congress, for this House in particular, has been such that it has distorted the laws. It troubles me that whenever there is a special election in America now, we no longer rely upon the people of that community to listen to a good debate among the candidates, to identify who stands for which issue, participate in the campaign and they go vote. Instead, immediately out rushes Planned Parenthood, out rushes the Family Research Council, out rushes the AFL-CIO, out rushes the business organizations, term limits, every organization in America rushes out and starts dumping millions and millions of dollars into these sham ads which are just sham ads. They are sham ads not because, as my friend from Kentucky said, we do not agree with them, because they masquerade as something they are not. They masquerade as information when in fact they are the most clever and deceptive and non-productive and nonsubstantive attacks on character and the record of the candidates, and they need to be managed as free speech does throughout our society.

I ask for a negative vote on the DeLay amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), a distinguished freshman Member of Congress.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment like others is a poison pill. It is designed to undermine campaign reform. It is designed to change the Shays-Meehan bill in a way to reduce its support.

I simply want to raise a couple of things, go back to a couple of things that have been said here. This is not about denying any group its right to speak in American politics. This is not about preventing groups from sending postcards. It is not about preventing people from communicating about their representatives. What it is about is saying, if you are going to communicate in a way that pretends to be about an issue but in fact is meant to influence an election, we need to know who is paying for the ads. We need to get disclosure. That is what this is about.

There are those on the other side who preach disclosure, disclosure, disclosure as one approach to the abuses of this campaign season, except when it comes to outside groups running ads. And then they say, "Oh, no, we can't have disclosure." We need disclosure when it comes to issue advocacy. That is why I think this is an amendment that needs to be defeated.

The second point I will make is just this. It was asked earlier how much money is too much money in politics. Well, this is not about free speech. It is about big money. It is not about protecting the free speech of a constituent. It is about preserving big money in this system. Too much money is unlimited money flowing to the national parties to run ads. Too much money in politics is unlimited money with no disclosure of who it is that is spending that money by outside groups.

The Shays-Meehan bill is a good approach to campaign reform. I believe there are other approaches.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. I would just like to ask the gentleman whom I think is well motivated and well intentioned in this debate, in your sense of an effort to persuade someone on an issue or to encourage a vote on the issue but you said that masquerades as that when it is really something else, who decides that is I think really my concern. Who draws the line between what masquerades as an ad or what is really clearly encouraging a result on an issue?

□ 1915

What we do not want to do here is shut the door on people's ability to rightly influence the legitimate debate of the Congress. And who decides where that line is? What is the standard?

Mr. ALLEN. I believe that in this, as in many other areas of law, that the law, the standard, will be developed. It will be developed by the FEC, it will be developed by the courts over time until we have a fairly clear understanding of what that standard is.

And we do this all the time. We write standards into law, and we hope they

are clear enough to be effectively enforced.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Meehan-Shays substitute bans soft money, and then what we also do is we recognize that the sham issue ads are truly campaign ads, and that is the key point. They are not sham in the sense that they do not have a right to speak, but they are not issue ads, they are campaign ads, and we call them such. One of our provisions is obviously already in existing law. Vote for or vote against it; it makes it a campaign ad. And people get around the sham issue ads by not saying vote for or vote against, but they might as well based on what they say. When they mention the name or show a picture of a candidate by radio or TV, we call them campaign ads; that is true. The fact is, though, that these voter alerts, we do not impact the voter alerts through that process of the picture or the name.

The bottom line is, this is an amendment that is an exemption that truly does swallow the rule. It abolishes any attempt whatsoever to deal with sham issue ads. It is a gigantic loophole that is intending to deal with something that is not a problem.

Now my colleague used the word "manage." I do not agree it is managed. I think it is simply saying playing by the same rules. People have a right to speak out. They can do their legislative alerts. But if they are on radio or TV 60 days to an election, it is going to be a campaign ad and they come under the campaign rules with all the voice that is allowed under that process.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The time of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the opponents to my amendment are very upset with this amendment because this amendment may pass, and they are upset with this amendment and oppose this amendment because it exposes the biggest part of the Shays-Meehan bill that we object to, and that is the part that manages free speech.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania used the term we need to "manage" free speech. To me, that is an oxymoron. We cannot manage free speech, particularly in the part of political advocacy and political participation that my amendment addresses.

My amendment is very simple. It just exempts from the section of the bill any ads or alerts sent out by groups that deal solely with an issue or legislation which is or may be subject to a vote in the Senate or the House of Representatives. Now why would they be afraid of issue ads that express opposition for or support for a vote in the

House of Representatives or the Senate?

And it also exempts any communication that encourages an individual to contact an elected representative in Congress in order to exercise the right protected under the first amendment of the Constitution to inform the representative of the individual's views on such an issue of legislation.

Now, if we look at some of the opponents and what they have actually been saying, I am going to dissect a little of it. Number one, they confuse the whole issue by talking about bigger issues, smaller issues, loopholes, sham ads. In fact, the gentlewoman from New York has turned a new term of art in addition to the term of art "sham ads" that has been started by the Shays-Meehan. Now we have sham issue alerts.

Can my colleagues imagine in this country of free speech, free speech guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, we are talking about sham issue alerts in the House of Representatives? We want to manage the free speech of groups that may want to tell the American people how we vote? This is what we have been talking about all along. The proponents of Shays-Meehan are proponents, number one, that are incumbents, and they are sick and tired of people around America revealing, using our communication services in this country to reveal how they vote, and so they want to get rid of these sham ads. Or they want to manage them in such a way as to discourage them.

The gentleman from New Jersey was talking about capping spending. The gentleman from Maine was talking about we need to know who these subversive people are that are writing ads that may tell the American people how we vote. And we need to know who is we? Who decides? Is we the big-brother government at the Federal Election Commission? Of course it is. They want big-brother government to manage free speech, if we put all the opponents' speech together. That is what they have been saying here.

What we are saying is very simple: As the gentleman from Connecticut has said, we take care of issue alerts in our bill. It is no problem. Of course, we cannot find it in their bill, but they just arbitrarily say we take care of it. Well, if they take care of it, why are they afraid of my amendment? They are afraid of my amendment because they are afraid for people to gather together, raise some money, send out an ad, do a radio spot that tells the American people and District 22 of Texas how the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TOM DELAY) votes.

Mr. Chairman, I am not afraid of how I vote, and I am not afraid to stand up and stand toe-to-toe and debate those groups that are against the way that I vote. That is the American process.

What Shays-Meehan does in its limitation of free speech and its now-management of free speech is wants to shut down organizations' abilities and rights to freely express themselves in the political process because in their bill they say communications, radio and TV, that is run 60 days before an election, which means when we get back from the August recess in September, if my colleagues run a radio spot that happens to say, "Tom DeLay voted to ban partial-birth abortions and he is a bad dude for doing it," that organization could come under attack by the Federal Election Commission, and they have no defense to say we are just advocating a vote on the floor of the House during a pre-election period. But in my amendment that group, whether it be Planned Parenthood or others, could stand up and say, no, in the law it says that we are dealing with a vote on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

It just amazes me every time I debate this campaign reform why people want to limit people's freedom of speech to participate in the political process, and it all comes back to the same reason: They are afraid for the American people to know what is going on in this town, to know what is going on on the floor of this House, and they are uncomfortable sometimes by some of the ads that groups run, and they want to do away with them once and for all.

So I just ask the Members to look at my amendment, digest it, understand it and vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) will be postponed.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Amendments 27 and 28 offered by me be withdrawn and my amendments 25 and 26 in the order of July 17 on H.R. 2183 may be considered in the sequence at this point and that 26 be modified by the form at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that request in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous consent, and I have Amendment No. 25 at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman intend to offer Amendment No. 20?

Mr. DELAY. No, Mr. Chairman. No. 25, I ask unanimous consent to take No. 25 out of order and consider it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That being the case, it is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON). The Committee of the Whole may not entertain a request to consider an amendment that deviates from the previous order of the House.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

**TITLE —VOTER ELIGIBILITY
CONFIRMATION PROGRAM**

SEC. 01. VOTER ELIGIBILITY PILOT CONFIRMATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall establish a pilot program to test a confirmation system through which they—

(1) respond to inquiries, made by State and local officials (including voting registrars) with responsibility for determining an individual's qualification to vote in a Federal, State, or local election, to verify the citizenship of an individual who has submitted a voter registration application, and

(2) maintain such records of the inquiries made and verifications provided as may be necessary for pilot program evaluation. In order to make an inquiry through the pilot program with respect to an individual, an election official shall provide the name, date of birth, and social security account number of the individual.

(b) INITIAL RESPONSE.—The pilot program shall provide for a confirmation or a tentative nonconfirmation of an individual's citizenship by the Commissioner of Social Security as soon as practicable after an initial inquiry to the Commissioner.

(c) SECONDARY VERIFICATION PROCESS IN CASE OF TENTATIVE NONCONFIRMATION.—In cases of tentative nonconfirmation, the Attorney General shall specify, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, an available secondary verification process to confirm the validity of information provided and to provide a final confirmation or nonconfirmation as soon as practicable after the date of the tentative nonconfirmation.

(d) DESIGN AND OPERATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The pilot program shall be designed and operated—

(A) to apply in, at a minimum, the States of California, New York, Texas, Florida, and Illinois;

(B) to be used on a voluntary basis, as a supplementary information source, by State and local election officials for the purpose of assessing, through citizenship verification, the eligibility of an individual to vote in Federal, State, or local elections;

(C) to respond to an inquiry concerning citizenship only in a case where determining whether an individual is a citizen is—

(i) necessary for determining whether the individual is eligible to vote in an election for Federal, State, or local office; and

(ii) part of a program or activity to protect the integrity of the electoral process that is uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.);

(D) to maximize its reliability and ease of use, consistent with insulating and protecting the privacy and security of the underlying information;

(E) to permit inquiries to be made to the pilot program through a toll-free telephone line or other toll-free electronic media;

(F) subject to subparagraph (I), to respond to all inquiries made by authorized persons and to register all times when the pilot program is not responding to inquiries because of a malfunction;

(G) with appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to prevent unauthorized disclosure of personal information, including violations of the requirements of section 205(c)(2)(C)(viii) of the Social Security Act;

(H) to have reasonable safeguards against the pilot program's resulting in unlawful discriminatory practices based on national origin or citizenship status, including the selective or unauthorized use of the pilot program.

(2) USE OF EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY CONFIRMATION SYSTEM.—To the extent practicable, in establishing the confirmation system under this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall use the employment eligibility confirmation system established under section 404 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-664).

(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—As part of the pilot program, the Commissioner of Social Security shall establish a reliable, secure method which compares the name, date of birth, and social security account number provided in an inquiry against such information maintained by the Commissioner, in order to confirm (or not confirm) the correspondence of the name, date of birth, and number provided and whether the individual is shown as a citizen of the United States on the records maintained by the Commissioner (including whether such records show that the individual was born in the United States). The Commissioner shall not disclose or release social security information (other than such confirmation or nonconfirmation).

(f) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE.—As part of the pilot program, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall establish a reliable, secure method which compares the name and date of birth which are provided in an inquiry against information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided, the correspondence of the name and date of birth, and whether the individual is a citizen of the United States.

(g) UPDATING INFORMATION.—The Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall update their information in a manner that promotes the maximum accuracy and shall provide a process for the prompt correction of erroneous information, including instances in which it is brought to

their attention in the secondary verification process described in subsection (c) or in any action by an individual to use the process provided under this subsection upon receipt of notification from an election official under subsection (i).

(h) LIMITATION ON USE OF THE PILOT PROGRAM AND ANY RELATED SYSTEMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, nothing in this section shall be construed to permit or allow any department, bureau, or other agency of the United States Government to utilize any information, data base, or other records assembled under this section for any other purpose other than as provided for under this section.

(2) NO NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, directly or indirectly, the issuance or use of national identification cards or the establishment of a national identification card.

(3) NO NEW DATA BASES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, directly or indirectly, the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Social Security to create any joint computer data base that is not in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) ACTIONS BY ELECTION OFFICIALS UNABLE TO CONFIRM CITIZENSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an election official receives a notice of final nonconfirmation under subsection (c) with respect to an individual, the official—

(A) shall notify the individual in writing; and

(B) shall inform the individual in writing of the individual's right to use—

(i) the process provided under subsection (g) for the prompt correction of erroneous information in the pilot program; or

(ii) any other process for establishing eligibility to vote provided under State or Federal law.

(2) REGISTRATION APPLICANTS.—In the case of an individual who is an applicant for voter registration, and who receives a notice from an official under paragraph (1), the official may (subject to, and in a manner consistent with, State law) reject the application (subject to the right to reapply), but only if the following conditions have been satisfied:

(A) The 30-day period beginning on the date the notice was mailed or otherwise provided to the individual has elapsed.

(B) During such 30-day period, the official did not receive adequate confirmation of the citizenship of the individual from—

(i) a source other than the pilot program established under this section; or

(ii) such pilot program, pursuant to a new inquiry to the pilot program made by the official upon receipt of information (from the individual or through any other reliable source) that erroneous or incomplete material information previously in the pilot program has been updated, supplemented, or corrected.

(3) INELIGIBLE VOTER REMOVAL PROGRAMS.—In the case of an individual who is registered to vote, and who receives a notice from an official under paragraph (1) in connection with a program to remove the names of ineligible voters from an official list of eligible voters, the official may (subject to, and in a manner consistent with, State law) remove the name of the individual from the list (subject to the right to submit another voter registration application), but only if the following conditions have been satisfied:

(A) The 30-day period beginning on the date the notice was mailed or otherwise provided to the individual has elapsed.

(B) During such 30-day period, the official did not receive adequate confirmation of the citizenship of the individual from a source described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (2)(B).

(J) AUTHORITY TO USE SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBERS.—Any State (or political subdivision thereof) may, for the purpose of making inquiries under the pilot program in the administration of any voter registration law within its jurisdiction, use the social security account numbers issued by the Commissioner of Social Security, and may, for such purpose, require any individual who is or appears to be affected by a voter registration law of such State (or political subdivision thereof) to furnish to such State (or political subdivision thereof) or any agency thereof having administrative responsibility for such law, the social security account number (or numbers, if the individual has more than one such number) issued to the individual by the Commissioner.

(K) TERMINATION AND REPORT.—The pilot program shall terminate September 30, 2001. The Attorney General and the Commissioner of Social Security shall each submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports on the pilot program not later than December 31, 2001. Such reports shall—

(1) assess the degree of fraudulent attesting of United States citizenship in jurisdictions covered by the pilot program;

(2) assess the appropriate staffing and funding levels which would be required for full, permanent, and nationwide implementation of the pilot program, including the estimated total cost for national implementation per individual record;

(3) include an assessment by the Commissioner of Social Security of the advisability and ramifications of disclosure of social security account numbers to the extent provided for under the pilot program and upon full, permanent, and nationwide implementation of the pilot program;

(4) assess the degree to which the records maintained by the Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are able to be used to reliably determine the citizenship of individuals who have submitted voter registration applications;

(5) assess the effectiveness of the pilot program's safeguards against unlawful discriminatory practices;

(6) include recommendations on whether or not the pilot program should be continued or modified; and

(7) include such other information as the Attorney General or the Commissioner of Social Security may determine to be relevant.

SEC. 02. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 1998, such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHAYS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I just need to know. We have gone from Amendment 19, and now we are going to Amendment 21. Does that mean Amendment 20 has been dropped?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas did not offer Amendment 20.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I seek to take the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer today is an amendment that is a pilot program. It would allow the Attorney General, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to establish a pilot program to test a confirmation system through which they respond to inquiries made by State and local officials, including local voting registrars with responsibility for determining an individual's qualification to vote in a Federal or State or local election, to verify the citizenship of an individual who has submitted a voter registration application and maintain such record of the inquiries made and verifications provided as may be necessary for pilot program evaluation.

This is a pilot project that would expire in 2001. It would give State and local officials the option, only an option if they want to use it, to verify the citizenship of voters using Social Security and INS records. It is totally voluntary. It is not a State mandate. It is a pilot program to be used in five States that already are testing an employee verification program for non-citizens: California, Florida, Illinois, New York and Texas. And this expires in the year 2001, and then a report would be written on how this system worked and if it was effective.

Currently, the law requires citizenship to vote. The Federal law requires it. All 50 States require it. I guess the question is, should we enforce the law? Or should we repeal the law and not require citizenship if one does not agree with this pilot? Currently, I would ask the question: Do we have the ability to enforce this law? And the answer is no.

□ 1930

Can local election officials currently stop the fraud that is far too common? Not often enough. So why do we have

the requirement for citizenship? Elections are the very lifeblood of democracy. Fraud in election poisons our electoral system and undermines the trust that is essential to democracy.

Under this amendment we are introducing today, State and local election officials would be able to make inquiries to the Social Security Administration, which has a record of citizenship when they assign a Social Security number, and to the Immigration Naturalization Service which can also help verify people who have submitted to naturalization and citizenship. This would be set up by the Attorney General.

Voting, as I suggested, is the most fundamental act of citizenship. The people who administer our elections ought to have the access to the information they need to ensure integrity at the ballot box.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. It is perhaps the most significant poison pill amendment that has been offered to the underlying Shays-Meehan reform bill.

The motor voter law which passed this Congress in the early 1990s has proven to be a helpful way of bringing new people to the political process. If there is a need in this country, it is to engage people in the public debate, to bring them on to the voter rolls and to get them to participate.

People across the country have chronicled the decline in voter participation in primary elections and general elections. The public interest is not served when less than a third of the American people take the opportunity to participate in the elections that keep this representative form of democracy vibrant.

The motor voter law was established with broad bipartisan support so that we would remove impediments to becoming registered voters. By all accounts, it is working. In fact, there are even those who would argue that it is probably working far more to the benefit of Members of the other party than many anticipated when Republicans lead the opposition to this law.

This amendment would take on motor voter by setting up a very difficult and unworkable voter eligibility system using Social Security and the INS. The amendment would have, I think, a chilling effect on the effort to bring more people into the political process and would, as well, raise serious questions, not only of individual privacy, but of administrative workability.

All it would take would be a brief recollection of the difficulty we had in the case of my colleague from California Rep. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ, attempting to get information from the

INS in any timely fashion to give Members an impression that this proposal is a recipe for potential disaster.

There is no need for us at the moment to make any significant change in the motor voter law. There has been an outpouring of support for it from the League of Women Voters and many other groups who strive to introduce new participants to the American political process.

There has been no justification offered for this amendment. To the degree that we have people voting inappropriately, I know of no reason why our district attorneys, our State election officials, and others responsible at the State and local level do not have the authority today to step in and eliminate whatever minor amount of voter fraud may exist.

So this is really a solution in search of a problem. But in real terms, it threatens the passage of reform in this Congress, which we all know is far more important than tinkering with the motor voter law that, by all odds, has been implemented successfully.

If we were to take this amendment tonight and put it into this bill, we would destroy the coalition, the bipartisan coalition that is on the verge of enacting one of the most significant reforms in the last 25 years and under the guise of doing something to solve a problem that I believe no one can attest to in terms of the reality of its existence in any significant way anywhere in the country, including my home State of California.

It goes far beyond the scope of campaign finance reform. It would override innumerable anti-discrimination safeguards which must remain in the law to make sure that all Americans, regardless of birth place or appearance, ethnicity, race, creed, have equal access to the voter rolls.

Mr. Chairman, I am in strong opposition to the Peterson amendment. I would hope Members who care about the enactment of Shays-Meehan, who want to go right at the heart of the dilemma we face today, and that is that voters are opting out of the process because they do not believe that they can impact it. They think it is only for those with money who control our political system.

The Shays-Meehan campaign reform bill will do more to instill confidence in the average American that it still matters if they bother to vote. That is something that we ought to be working on, not this fictitious problem, which I know some people on the other side of the aisle are fixated on, that holds that there are somehow illegal voters determining the outcome of the elections.

If we really want to make sure that elections are fought fair and square, we ought to be encouraging more people to vote, not suppressing their interest, as this amendment does.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield 10 seconds to me?

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful. I would simply ask that, at some point, the author might give me 30 seconds to ask a question, and that could come after the gentleman's prepared remarks.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, that is very polite. I just wanted to ask about the bill's provision of what is called a final confirmation. If the Social Security or the INS does not have a record of you, as, for example, if you do not have a Social Security card, or you are born here so you do not have an INS record, the bill specifies that there must be what is called a "secondary verification," and it must provide "final confirmation." I just wonder what that might be. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, let me talk about the bill a little bit while the gentleman from Pennsylvania is getting that answer for the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Let me also say that I think this is essentially the same kind of campaign reform that the House voted for on February 12, a bill that the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) introduced, a bill that the chief election official from California said he thought was an improvement and an important addition to the ability of States to be able to, once again, manage the election process.

Until motor voter, with the exception of establishing age qualifications for voting for Federal office, which almost always, then, for reasons of practicality required the States to adopt that same age, we have left election administration to the States. This just simply allows the States to look at this to see if, in their State, this would work.

A majority of Members of this body said just a few months ago, on February 12, that this kind of thing was a good idea. It was a good addition to campaign reform.

I rise in support of the concept of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), that if we are going to reform campaigns, let us reach campaigns. A number of States already require that citizens give the Social Security number for registration.

So in Georgia, in Hawaii, in Kentucky, in New Mexico, in South Carolina, and Tennessee and Virginia, the

only change in this law would be that we also would have access to INS records. We would only have access to those records until 2001 to see if this concept is helpful or harmful.

It allows a pilot project for the States that want to do it. It does not require a single State to do a single thing. It was approved by a majority of voters that voted on the floor of this House in February.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) brings it as an additional element of campaign reform. It is not a mandate. It is a pilot program. I would suggest it is the kind of thing that we ought to return back to the States while we are talking about election reform.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) to answer his question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I would be so grateful. Of course it is the gentleman's time. If he would yield to me, I have a follow-up.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman's question. It is my understanding that, if the INS records and the Social Security records did not prove one to be a citizen, then the body requiring that information could, if they choose, remove one from the rolls or refuse to enroll one as a voter.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me just a second longer?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Sure.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the start, the gentleman has been very courteous to me and also my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The gentleman says, at least as I read it, that if one is not going to be picked up by INS, which is going to be the case for those of us born in the United States, and, for some reason, one is not picked up by Social Security, which might be the case if one has not worked yet, it may be true for an 18 year old, then it says the Attorney General shall specify a secondary verification process to confirm the validity of information provided and to provide final confirmation or nonconfirmation.

So my question, if someone does not have a Social Security card because that person has not started working, and is born in this country, so there is no INS record, what would the secondary verification process be?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I think, one, if one has some record as a person to prove that one is a citizen, and one should have if one is, then one would provide that; and that serves the bill. Or the Attorney General could come forth with other means that he felt was ample proof.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for two seconds further?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's answer. I will not use his time to make a comment about it.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago, as a new Member of the House of Representatives, I was so proud to support the motor voter bill, a bill which made it easier for people to vote. It made it easier by allowing more convenient access to voter registration for new voters or for voters who had moved to a new area.

The motor voter bill is a symbol of our country's belief that it is every citizen's right to have access to the ballot box, every citizen's right, not just some citizens.

Today, I am ashamed that some in this body would turn the clock back, back to a time when the Federal Government would make it more difficult, not less difficult, for every person to vote in this country, every legitimate person.

For example, the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) would unreasonably burden some would-be voters by requiring them to show proof of citizenship at the polls on election day. Because of what? Their appearance? The color of their skin? That they have an accent?

I would ask my colleagues, at a time when voter turnout is embarrassingly low in this democratic country of ours, do we really want to make it more difficult for citizens to exercise the right to vote? Of course the answer is no, which is exactly how we should vote on this ill-conceived amendment: "No" on the Peterson amendment, "yes" on the Shays-Meehan bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself what time is needed to respond.

It is interesting. A few moments ago, we were told that this was the most significant poison that is being attempted to be added to this bill. That is a pretty significant statement, that it is poison to try to eliminate fraud. I have a hard time understanding that.

I am going to say it again. It has been said that this is the most significant poison that will be offered to this bill that only has a pilot program that allows States, if they choose, to try to eliminate fraud. I find that hard to understand.

Someone else just said that it was unthinkable to amend motor voter. Motor voter had some problems and has some problems today because there

is no system of verification. I could register my dog "Ralph" by calling him Ralph Peterson, and he would be registered. I could register my cat. I do not happen to have one, but I could.

Motor voter has opened the registration process to fraud. That is one of the weaknesses of motor voter. Just to share with you, a Committee on House Oversight task force uncovered serious voter fraud in California during the 1996 election.

□ 2045

They conducted an exhaustive year-long examination and found 820 individuals who were not citizens at the time of registration that likely voted. In 1996 the California Secretary of State found over 700 noncitizens on the California voter rolls and invalidated their registrations, and he would like this legislation to help him do that more effectively.

Texas Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Tom Harrison reports that 750 resident aliens from Guadalupe, Texas filed applications for absentee ballots in November of 1994 elections, after campaign workers told them that their green cards enabled them to vote by mail.

The Los Angeles Times reported in May of 1994 that Jay McKama, an undocumented immigrant, was sentenced to 16 months in State prison for registering noncitizens to vote. The bounty hunter worked for Steve Martinez, a Los Angeles political activist who paid \$1 per registration. The practice of paying bounty hunters to register individuals to vote has contributed to an increase in noncitizen voting. In some cases noncitizens have been targeted by those bounty hunters.

Every time someone votes illegally, they cancel our vote. They cancel a good vote.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman made that point, because our colleague from California just made the point that every legitimate voter, that is exactly the statement she made, should be allowed to register to vote and should be allowed to vote, and that is certainly right, and they should be allowed to do that with as little encumbrance as is reasonably possible. The least encumbrance would be no registration at all.

We tried that for generations in America, and finally we found out that that did not work, because people voted more than once, they voted at more than one location. We decided we had to have voter registration, and every legitimate voter should be allowed to register, every legitimate voter should be allowed to vote. But every time we let someone cast a ballot who is not a legitimate voter, who does

not meet the requirements to vote in that election or in this country, we do just exactly what the sponsor of the amendment said; we cancel out the vote of voters who had a right to vote. That is every bit as big a problem as any other problem we could have in this process.

If people begin to think that there is no reason to go to the polls because their vote is going to be canceled by somebody who should not have been allowed to register because they were not a citizen, they stop going to the polls for that reason as well. Every legitimate voter should be able to vote.

This amendment, which the House has already passed in the form of a bill one other time and needs to be included in this reform package, merely says to the States, if the States want to try this as a way to verify that, in fact, the people who are casting ballots at your election have a right to do that as American citizens, give it a try until 2001 and we will see if that produces better results.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to convey to the gentleman that I rise to support the gentleman's idea and to oppose his amendment, and let me say why and why it is we call it a poison pill.

I think it was in 1995 when we voted for motor voter legislation. I voted against it and I drafted legislation to change it, not because I did not want to encourage Americans to register and to vote, but because I was afraid that we would never be able to purge people who should not vote, that, in fact, it would become a system too easily defrauded; and it does need to be changed, and I agree entirely with the gentleman and his proposal here.

It is a poison pill because the coalition that we need to pass this legislation consists of a lot of Democrats, and the motor voter bill is based on relatively party lines. What we do not want to happen, those of us who are just determined to do away with soft money in these sham ads, what we do not want to do is let the perfect become the enemy of the good.

We think that the gentleman's proposal, while it is a good one, becomes the enemy of the passage of our bill. It is not the idea that is poison, it is the way that it breaks up our coalition. I am sure that is not the gentleman's purpose.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding. I have

a warning to libertarians. Libertarians, please be worried, be very worried about a bill that creates, and I quote, ". . . the Attorney General shall specify . . . an available secondary verification process . . . to provide final confirmation," regarding citizenship status.

I do not see how this can be done without a new federal record system on individuals. "Secondary" means if one cannot prove citizenship by INS records, cannot prove it by Social Security records. I do not see how this can lead to anything but a national I.D. system. That is in the gentleman's amendment. Therefore, I oppose it.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for that warning to all of the libertarians and others. I appreciate that very articulate presentation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), another leader in the bipartisan effort to pass campaign finance reform.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise regretfully in opposition to this amendment. I do not rise in opposition to the intention and the spirit of the amendment.

I think that, quite appropriately, the gentlewoman from California pointed out that qualified voters should vote. I think that the gentleman from California who spoke in opposition to this motion probably made his point clear, by saying that we want people to vote. We want people to be able to vote. We want people to be able to register to vote.

In all fairness, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that citizens should be able to vote. Qualified citizens, not just any person. I strongly support the intention of the gentleman's amendment.

I think that, sadly, as somebody who was a county supervisor and supervised the electoral process for over 2.7 million people, that too often we talk about quantity, and not the quality of the process. The fact is that the integrity of our electoral process needs to be defended.

But tonight I must speak in opposition to this special vehicle, which is asking Shays-Meehan to carry this burden, while trying to keep enough votes together to be able to pass comprehensive campaign finance reform. There are people on both sides of the aisle who will use this as an excuse to oppose our campaign finance reform, Shays-Meehan, if we at this point require the system to require people to basically prove that they are qualified voters, that they are over 18, that they are a citizen of the United States.

I strongly support the intention that the gentleman is trying to make with his amendment. It is just that the vehicle, at this time, will kill campaign finance reform, because there are people

in this Congress who will adamantly kill any piece of campaign finance legislation, no matter how good it is, if it means that we will address this problem of unqualified people being able to register and vote.

So I sadly have to oppose this, and I would ask the gentleman to join with those of us on both sides of the aisle that believe that the integrity of finance campaign reform and the integrity of our electoral process needs to be finally addressed one way or the other.

Campaign finance reform. We are trying to do it with this bill. I hope that, at the appropriate time in the future, Democrats will come across the aisle and join us in supporting the gentleman's thoughtful effort to ensure for the integrity of the electoral vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) has 10½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) has 5½ minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, if a national I.D. card is what we are concerned about, take some of those aspects out in conference. I heard some Members say this is good, but it is so good, it might hurt the bill.

Bob Dole cannot write a check in a supermarket without proving his identity. One cannot get on a plane without proving some identity. One cannot get a driver's license in America without proving some identity.

What is more important, and I always hear, "This is good, but not now, do not do it now." This is campaign finance reform. If we do not do it now, this turkey is dead in the future. If we are going to do it, do it now, if this thing is going to fly. I support it.

Citizens should vote. Noncitizens should not vote. We insult no one by ensuring that an illegal vote does not cancel out our legal votes. In America the people govern. There is nothing more important in this bill than foreign money influence, attempts to corrupt us for foreign interests and illegal votes cast in elections.

Mr. Chairman, I took a lot of heat on the Democrat side, the only one who took a parliamentary stand in the matter of the Dornan-Sánchez race, and I think the gentlewoman has done a great job. But I think that should be straightened out, and we should have the facts before we certify anybody's election, especially when there is a taint of illegal votes.

So look, if Bob Dole cannot write a check in a supermarket without proving that check with some identification, if one cannot get a driver's license, if one cannot get on a plane, then by God, in America, one should be able to do some reasonable identifica-

tion to prove one is a citizen. Citizens govern.

Mr. CAMPBELL's concerns are very important, and Mr. Chairman, let me say this. We keep making it easy for illegal citizens and illegal votes in campaigns, and we will have done nothing with campaign finance reform. All we do is massage the politics of the American theater as far as politics is concerned.

Mr. CAMPBELL has a legitimate concern. He is a very astute man. That could be worked out in conference, but the concept of illegal votes not in elections must be determined. If we do not do it this way, how the hell do we do it?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has nothing to do with campaign finance reform, absolutely nothing to do with campaign finance reform. This bill, as we are on the verge of passing, is not an excuse for anyone who has any idea about anything to come into this House floor and try to defeat this bill. This has nothing to do with campaign finance reform. We are on the verge of making history with the most significant campaign finance reform bill in 20 years. Let us get on and pass this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank him for all of his hard work on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), my friend, says that in America people govern, and that is true. All of the people govern, including those who have surnames such as mine, and who were born in this country. And they do not deserve the right to be discriminatorily applied against, which is in essence what this amendment does.

I heard before the suggestion of the fact that what is wrong with the pilot program? Well, nothing is wrong with a pilot program, but even abridging rights in a pilot program does not make it constitutionally firm, it makes it constitutionally infirm.

I also heard the discussion about cancelling out of a vote, but what happens to the American citizen who, through your process, is denied the ability to vote because of some problem with the INS, some problem with Social Security; is not their cancellation of their vote equal to the cancellation we are so worried about?

For members of my family who live in Cuba and others throughout the world who do not have the right to vote for this, basic freedom is only a cherished dream. Well, what the author of this amendment, however, forgot about is that in America, voting is not a dream, it is not just another government benefit or program to be means

tested, it is a constitutional guarantee, what all who come to this Chamber were sworn to uphold.

□ 2000

Americans should not be subjected to a government background check when they register to vote. But that is just what this amendment does, it turns the ballot box into an interrogation zone, where Americans are guilty until they have proven themselves innocent.

Imagine going to vote, myself going to vote, having been born in this country, a member of the United States Congress, and having to be interrogated at the ballot box to try to prove that I should be able to vote. Particularly, I would urge some of my colleagues to look at the history of what has happened in different States where ballot security squads were created to disenfranchise minority voters. The application at that table by those election judges will be discriminatorily applied, if they wish to do so.

What will be the guarantee? How will Members ensure that my vote is not annulled, as the gentleman is concerned about his being annulled? And to show they are citizens, Republicans want the Social Security Administration and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to run background checks and share private information on American voters.

If it is not to be discriminatorily applied, everyone who seeks to register would have all of their private information given to electoral officials. Is that what they want, Big Brother? I have heard so many of them rail against that.

Now, where is this test going to take place? This test of this security check-out program will take place in California, Florida, Texas, New York, and Illinois, States with large minority populations, especially Americans with Hispanic descent.

We already know the problems with identical names and dates of birth, especially among minority voters, that caused many legal voters to be targeted by what is now the discredited Dornan investigation. If this new program goes forward, many, many other innocent Americans may find government officials targeting them, too.

Clearly, the right to vote in this Nation should not be subject to government intrusion, and I say specifically that Hispanic American voters will not forget Members' continuing persecution of their rights. Vote against the Peterson amendment and keep Shays-Meehan in order.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), a leader in our bipartisan effort.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as a person who was one of the strong supporters of the

pilot program of the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), and I not only voted for it, I promoted it back in March, that would deal with the eligibility of voters and the reforms that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was just referring to, and to the essence of the proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), here, I have to say that this is only an effort to really sabotage this bill.

We are so close. I am not going to let us take victory from the jaws of defeat, or defeat from the jaws of victory, either way that you want to say it. We must stick with Shays-Meehan. This is the golden opportunity in this Congress to get genuine campaign finance reform. The other issue is entirely separate, and we can take that up in a separate matter. I will be strongly supportive of that. But for now, we cannot sabotage Shays-Meehan. We must defeat the Peterson amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant—yet clear-eyed opposition—to the amendment offered by my Colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON.

I want my Colleagues to know that I support the substance of this amendment. The events of the past several years have uncovered a disturbing trend in elections.

Without referring to a specific election or a specific state or a specific region, there is more than anecdotal evidence that more than a few of our elections are being tainted.

Tainted by voters who should not be voters. As Mr. PETERSON has reported—but this is not new. That's why we have had these legal actions.

Voters who have no right to participate in our electoral process.

My Colleagues, the very foundation of our representative democracy is "one man-one vote." We—in this body—have a solemn responsibility to preserve that foundation by protecting the integrity of the electoral process.

In this regard, I think it is a worthwhile exercise that we test new methods to verify the eligibility of all voters in all elections. Indeed, I voted for Rep. HORN's pilot program back in March.

And I have never been an enthusiastic supporter of the various motor-voter programs. I think they present an engraved invitation for fraud and abuse.

So I would support this legislation. But not here, Not now. Not on this bill. The clear purpose of this amendment is to undermine and divide support for this major reform that goes to the heart of abuses.

As you know, I have been an original co-sponsor of the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform bill—in all of its various iterations. I think the lack of comprehensive campaign reform has been one of the most glaring failures of this Congress . . . the last Congress . . . the Congress before that . . . and several Congresses before that.

It just reinforces the cynicism of the American people about our motives and our actions.

We have here in the Shays-Meehan substitute a golden opportunity to snatch victory

from the jaws of defeat. We have a real opportunity to pass genuine campaign reform.

Unfortunately, the Peterson amendment threatens our efforts here.

I support the goals of the Peterson amendment and would pledge to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania to pass this amendment as a free-standing bill. But I cannot support it as an amendment to Shays-Meehan.

Defeat the Peterson amendment.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment on two grounds. I first oppose this amendment on the logic that says, because when you go to the supermarket and pay money, you sometimes have to show your license; and I oppose it on the logic that says when we go to get an airplane ride and we pay money, we have to show our license. Good grief, this is a constitutionally protected right. We do not have to pay money to vote, and why should we have to show a picture to vote?

On that ground, the logic of comparing this to airline traffic, or when we go to supermarkets, is beyond me. This is a constitutionally protected right. We should not have to pay money and we should not have to show our picture.

But I oppose it on other grounds, as well. The bottom line is, this is campaign finance reform we are debating. This legislation does not deal with campaign finance reform, it deals with motor voter. We are in the majority as Republicans, and we are pushing this proposal, this amendment. Just bring it out on its own separate merit and vote it up-or-down. Do not tie it in with campaign finance reform.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to another leader in our bipartisan effort, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, the operative word is "finance." This is about campaigns, this amendment. I agree, frankly, with the intent of the author of this amendment. I agree so many times with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT). But campaign finance is about raising money and spending money and reelecting Federal candidates. That is what we have been working on here.

This actually is a legitimate issue. It is like combining school vouchers with a higher education bill. They are both education, but they do not belong together. This issue does not belong in this bill. We need to pass this bill clean, and we need to vote down this amendment, even though I agree with the intent of the author, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP).

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, the people that come before us and say

they are for campaign finance changes say it will protect the integrity of elections. What about protecting the integrity of elections? Why do they want to so narrowly define it that they only stick to the subject areas they want to?

Kentucky is one of the States where we have to have a Social Security number to register. We did not do that to discriminate, we did that with a Democratic Party legislature, because we had such fraud in our voting process. We did it to protect the integrity of the election.

What the people who oppose this today say is that, we would rather make our bed and pass a law with people who do not want to protect certain portions of the integrity of the election process in order to pass our own version. This is exactly what I fear about campaign finance reform, that we will pass laws that certain people will not want enforced, they will not pursue, they will not really protect the election process.

If they are not willing to protect the laws that say only citizens can vote, I would never want to be on their team to pass any other laws.

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

I would point out that the gentleman has no intentions of supporting campaign finance reform, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) is recognized for 3½ minutes, the balance of time.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, but more, I thank him for his efforts to get this to the floor and finally get it passed. I think we are going to get there.

Mr. Chairman, this is truly a poison pill, but it is a poison bill for a number of different reasons. Perhaps the most important to a number of people is the fact that it poisons the well to people who wish to become for the first time ever participants in our democracy, because they have just become U.S. citizens.

Let us make no mistake, this is not an effort to try to make sure that only American citizens vote. This is an effort to try to exclude those who are our newest American citizens from participating. Because if it were an effort to try to address the issue of all of our citizens, all of the people who live in this country being eligible to vote, then it would not target just the States where the most new citizens happen to reside, States like mine in California.

If we look at page 2 of the bill, there it is, States of California, New York, Texas, Florida, and Illinois. If I were to name the five States with the highest

Latino population in the Nation, they would be States like California, New York, Texas, Florida, Illinois. What a coincidence that this bill goes after those States where the most Hispanics happen to reside. That is where there are a lot of new Hispanic voters.

What else does this bill do? It tells us that somehow, through the Social Security Administration and the INS, we are going to be able to determine the citizenship of the 267 some-odd million people who live in this country.

Wake up. Social Security has never been able to determine citizenship for anyone. Wake up, the INS cannot determine the citizenship for even all the folks who have immigrated into this country. Wake up, they are targeting only those who were not born in this country, and somehow in their mind they are not eligible to vote. Wake up, how will someone determine if this individual should or should not be checked in terms of citizenship?

Tell me how a county registrar of voters is supposed to determine which individual to ask, "Can I get your Social Security number?" How will someone at the Motor Vehicle Department, when someone is filling out an application for registration for voting, say, "Wait a minute, you have passed your license test to drive, but can I see your Social Security number? Because I need to check to find out if you are a citizen?"

What will determine when someone gets asked whether or not they are citizens or not? Will it be the way they speak or the way they look, or will it be by the spelling on the last name? When that official tries to check with the INS and SSA and finds out that they cannot do this, what happens to that person's eligibility to vote? This is a targeted effort, unfortunately, at people who are beginning to participate. It scares some people. I am sorry that it does. The intentions may be good, but the mechanics of this amendment are totally wrong.

Someone said, let us protect the integrity of elections. Absolutely, let us do that. Let us do so. But let us protect the integrity of the Bill of Rights. Let us protect the integrity of the right to privacy. Let us protect the integrity of the right to freedom. Let us protect the integrity of this effort to reform our campaign finance laws.

Let us not get involved in this whole debate about how we tell which of the 267 million people who reside in this country are or not citizens through a process that we know cannot work, because the Social Security Administration and the INS have told us they cannot give us that information.

Please defeat this amendment. This is not the way to do it, and certainly we send the wrong message to our newest citizens who are trying to live in this greatest of democracies.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to respond to two issues first. Someone talked about safeguards. It says right in the bill, to have reasonable safeguards against the pilot program resulting in unlawful discriminatory practices based on national origin or citizenship status, including the selective or unauthorized use of this pilot program.

Someone else said a national ID card. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, directly or indirectly, the issuance or use of national identification cards, or the establishment of a national identification card. Those are false, bogus arguments against this bill.

Is Shays-Meehan perfect? We are being told it is perfect. I get mail every day that says it is not perfect. I get phone calls every day that say it is not perfect. This is only a pilot program. If it works, we expand it. If it does not work in 2001, we throw it away. Why are we afraid about stopping voter fraud?

In my view, the two worst problems we face about elections are illegal foreign money and noncitizen voting, and Shays-Meehan does not do anything about either of them. The States that we have listed, many of them are asking for help. Local registrars are asking for help. How do they know if people are citizens when they register them? They are begging for us to help.

Mr. Chairman, this is an argument, and those who think we should not stop voter fraud, those who think we should not require citizenship, then should stand up and support a bill that does away with it, that you do not have to be a citizen to vote, that you just have to be here.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple pilot project that makes sense, that can work. I urge all the Members to support it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 9 offered

by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), amendment No. 10 offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER); amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT); an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH); amendment No. 16 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER); amendment No. 17 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL); amendment No. 18 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL); amendment No. 19 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY); amendment No. 21 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

THE CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. GOODLATTE to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:
Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —VOTER REGISTRATION REFORM

SEC. —01. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR STATES TO PROVIDE FOR VOTER REGISTRATION BY MAIL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding “and” at the end;

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO UNIFORM MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.**—

(1) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.) is amended by striking section 9.

(2) Section 7(a)(6)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-5(a)(6)(A)) is amended by striking “assistance—” and all that follows and inserting the following: “assistance a voter registration application form which meets the requirements described in section 5(c)(2) (other than subparagraph (A)), unless the applicant, in writing, declines to register to vote;”.

(c) **OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—(1) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.) is amended by striking section 6.

(2) Section 8(a)(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(a)(5)) is amended by striking “5, 6, and 7” and inserting “5 and 7”.

SEC. —02. REQUIRING APPLICANTS REGISTERING TO VOTE TO PROVIDE CERTAIN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

(a) **SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5(c)(2) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-3(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(F) shall require the applicant to provide the applicant’s Social Security number.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 5(c)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-3(c)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting after “subparagraph (C)” the following: “, or the information described in subparagraph (F)”.

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect January 1, 1999, and shall apply with respect to applicants registering to vote in elections for Federal office on or after such date.

(b) **ACTUAL PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP.**—

(1) **REGISTRATION WITH APPLICATION FOR DRIVER’S LICENSE.**—Section 5(c) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-3(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) The voter registration portion of an application for a State motor vehicle driver’s license shall not be considered to be completed unless the applicant provides to the appropriate State motor vehicle authority proof that the applicant is a citizen of the United States.”.

(2) **REGISTRATION WITH VOTER REGISTRATION AGENCIES.**—Section 7(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-5(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) A voter registration application received by a voter registration agency shall not be considered to be completed unless the applicant provides to the agency proof that the applicant is a citizen of the United States.”.

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 8(a)(5)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(a)(5)(A)) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: “, including the requirement that the applicant provide proof of citizenship;”.

(4) **NO EFFECT ON ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES AND OVERSEAS VOTERS.**—Nothing in the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (as amended by this subsection) may be construed to require any absent uniformed services voter or overseas voter under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to provide any evidence of citizenship in order to register to vote (other than any evidence which may otherwise be required under such Act).

SEC. —03. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN REGISTRANTS FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF ELIGIBLE VOTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 8(d) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

“(3)(A) At the option of the State, a State may remove the name of a registrant from the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office on the ground that the registrant has changed residence if—

“(1) the registrant has not voted or appeared to vote (and, if necessary, correct the registrar’s record of the registrant’s address) in an election during the period beginning on the day after the date of the second previous general election for Federal office held prior to the date the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent and ending on the date of such notice;

“(1i) the registrant has not voted or appeared to vote (and, if necessary, correct the

registrar’s record of the registrant’s address) in any of the first two general elections for Federal office held after the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent; and

“(iii) during the period beginning on the date the confirmation notice described in subparagraph (B) is sent and ending on the date of the second general election for Federal office held after the date such notice is sent, the registrant has failed to notify the State in response to the notice that the registrant did not change his or her residence, or changed residence but remained in the registrar’s jurisdiction.

“(B) A confirmation notice described in this subparagraph is a postage prepaid and pre-addressed return card, sent by forwardable mail, on which a registrant may state his or her current address, together with information concerning how the registrant can continue to be eligible to vote if the registrant has changed residence to a place outside the registrar’s jurisdiction and a statement that the registrant may be removed from the official list of eligible voters if the registrant does not respond to the notice (during the period described in subparagraph (A)(iii)) by stating that the registrant did not change his or her residence, or changed residence but remained in the registrar’s jurisdiction.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 8(i)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(d)) is amended by inserting “or subsection (d)(3)” after “subsection (d)(2)”.

SEC. —04. PERMITTING STATE TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PRIOR TO VOTING.

(a) **PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.**—Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

“(j) **PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.**—A State may require an individual to produce a valid photographic identification before receiving a ballot (other than an absentee ballot) for voting in an election for Federal office.”.

(b) **SIGNATURE.**—Section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

“(k) **PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PROVIDE SIGNATURE.**—A State may require an individual to provide the individual’s signature (in the presence of an election official at the polling place) before receiving a ballot for voting in an election for Federal office, other than an individual who is unable to provide a signature because of illiteracy or disability.”.

SEC. —05. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT STATES PERMIT REGISTRANTS CHANGING RESIDENCE TO VOTE AT POLLING PLACE FOR FORMER ADDRESS.

Section 8(e)(2) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2)(A)” and inserting “(2)”; and

(2) by striking “election, at the option of the registrant—” and all that follows and inserting the following: “election shall be permitted to correct the voting records for purposes of voting in future elections at the appropriate polling place for the current address and, if permitted by State law, shall be

permitted to vote in the present election, upon confirmation by the registrant of the new address by such means as are required by law."

SEC. 06. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office occurring after December 1999.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote of this series.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 260, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

AYES—165

Aderholt	Fowler	Oxley
Archer	Gallegly	Packard
Armey	Gekas	Paxon
Bachus	Gibbons	Pease
Baker	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Goodling	Pickering
Barr	Goss	Pitts
Bartlett	Graham	Pombo
Barton	Granger	Pryce (OH)
Bateman	Gutknecht	Radanovich
Bereuter	Hansen	Redmond
Billirakis	Hastert	Riley
Bliley	Hastings (WA)	Rogan
Blunt	Hayworth	Rogers
Boehner	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Herger	Royce
Bono	Hilleary	Ryun
Bryant	Hobson	Salmon
Bunning	Hoekstra	Scarborough
Burr	Horn	Schaefer, Dan
Burton	Hostettler	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Hulshof	Sessions
Callahan	Hunter	Shadegg
Calvert	Hyde	Shaw
Camp	Inglis	Shimkus
Canady	Jenkins	Shuster
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Chambliss	Jones	Smith (MI)
Christensen	Kastch	Smith (OR)
Coble	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Coburn	Knollenberg	Snowbarger
Collins	Kolbe	Solomon
Combest	LaHood	Spence
Cooksey	Largent	Stearns
Cox	Latham	Stump
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Talent
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Cunningham	Lipinski	Taylor (NC)
Davis (VA)	Livingston	Thomas
Deal	Lucas	Thornberry
DeLay	McColum	Thune
Dickey	McCrery	Tiahrt
Doolittle	McHugh	Trafficant
Dreier	McInnis	Upton
Duncan	McIntosh	Wamp
Dunn	McKeon	Watkins
Ehlers	Mica	Watts (OK)
Ehrlich	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Weldon (PA)
Ensign	Myrick	Weller
Everett	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Ewing	Neumann	Wicker
Fawell	Ney	Wilson
Foley	Norwood	Wolf
Fossella	Nussle	Young (AK)

NOES—260

Abercrombie	Berry	Brown (CA)
Ackerman	Bilbray	Brown (FL)
Allen	Bishop	Brown (OH)
Andrews	Blagojevich	Campbell
Baesler	Blumenauer	Capps
Baldacci	Boehler	Cardin
Barcla	Bonior	Carson
Barrett (NE)	Borski	Castle
Barrett (WI)	Boswell	Chabot
Bass	Boucher	Chenoweth
Becerra	Boyd	Clay
Bentsen	Brady (PA)	Clayton
Berman	Brady (TX)	Clement

Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Condit	Kanjorski	Petri
Conyers	Kaptur	Pickett
Cook	Kelly	Pomeroy
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Porter
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Portman
Cramer	Kennelly	Poshard
Crapo	Kildee	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Quinn
Danner	Kim	Rahall
Davis (FL)	Kind (WI)	Ramstad
Davis (IL)	King (NY)	Regula
DeFazio	Kieczka	Reyes
DeGette	Klink	Rivers
Delahunt	Klug	Rodriguez
DeLauro	Kucinich	Roemer
Deutsch	LaFalce	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Lampson	Rothman
Dicks	Lantos	Roukema
Dingell	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard
Dixon	Lazio	Rush
Doggett	Leach	Sabo
Dooley	Lee	Sanchez
Doyle	Levin	Sanders
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin
Engel	LoBlundo	Sanford
English	Lofgren	Sawyer
Eshoo	Lowey	Saxton
Etheridge	Luther	Schaffer, Bob
Evans	Maloney (CT)	Schumer
Farr	Maloney (NY)	Scott
Fattah	Manton	Serrano
Fazio	Manzullo	Shays
Finler	Markey	Sherman
Forbes	Martinez	Sisisky
Ford	Mascara	Skaggs
Fox	Matsui	Skelton
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)	Slaughter
Franks (NJ)	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	McDermott	Smith, Adam
Frost	McGovern	Smith, Linda
Furse	McHale	Snyder
Ganske	McIntyre	Souder
Geldenson	McKinney	Spratt
Gephardt	McNulty	Stabenow
Gilchrist	Meehan	Stabenok
Gillmor	Meek (FL)	Stenholm
Gilman	Meeks (NY)	Stokes
Goode	Menendez	Strickland
Gordon	Metcalf	Stupak
Green	Miller-	Sununu
Greenwood	McDonald	Tanner
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Tauscher
Hall (OH)	Minge	Taylor (MS)
Hall (TX)	Mink	Thompson
Hamilton	Mollohan	Thurman
Harman	Moran (VA)	Tierney
Hastings (FL)	Morella	Torres
Hefner	Murtha	Turner
Hill	Nadler	Velazquez
Hilliard	Neal	Vento
Hinchey	Northup	Visclosky
Hinojosa	Oberstar	Walsh
Holden	Obey	Waters
Hooley	Oliver	Watt (NC)
Houghton	Ortiz	Waxman
Hoyer	Owens	Wexler
Hutchinson	Pallone	Weygand
Jackson (IL)	Pappas	White
Jackson-Lee	Parker	Wise
(TX)	Pascarell	Woolsey
Jefferson	Pastor	Wynn
John	Paul	Yates
Johnson (CT)	Payne	
Johnson (WI)	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—9

Gonzalez	McDade	Riggs
Istook	Moakley	Towns
Linder	Rangel	Young (FL)

2035

Messrs. CRAPO, LAZIO of New York, WAXMAN, MCGOVERN, and HALL of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HILLEARY, WAMP, and LEWIS of California changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings. The chair would request Members to remain in the chamber and to vote in the allotted time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WICKER TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE, NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKER to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —PHOTO IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR VOTERS

SEC. 01. PERMITTING STATE TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE PHOTOGRAPHIC IDENTIFICATION.

Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg-6) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(i) PERMITTING STATES TO REQUIRE VOTERS TO PRODUCE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.—A State may require an individual to produce a valid photographic identification before receiving a ballot for voting in an election for Federal office."

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 231, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

AYES—192

Aderholt	Bliley	Buyer
Archer	Blunt	Callahan
Armey	Boehner	Calvert
Bachus	Bonilla	Camp
Baker	Bono	Canady
Ballenger	Boswell	Cannon
Barr	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Bartlett	Bryant	Chambliss
Barton	Bunning	Chenoweth
Bereuter	Burr	Christensen
Billirakis	Burton	Coble

Coburn Hulshof
Collins Hunter
Combest Hyde
Condit Inglis
Cooksey Jenkins
Cox Johnson, Sam
Crane Jones
Crapo Kasich
Cubin Kim
Cunningham King (NY)
Davis (VA) Kingston
Deal Klug
DeLay Knollenberg
Dickey Kolbe
Doolittle LaHood
Dreier Largent
Duncan Latham
Dunn Lazio
Ehlers Lewis (CA)
Ehrlich Lewis (KY)
Emerson Linder
English Livingston
Ensign Lucas
Everett Manzullo
Ewing Martinez
Fawell McCollum
Foley McCrery
Fossella McHugh
Fowler McInnis
Gallegly McIntosh
Gekas McKeon
Gibbons Mica
Gillmor Miller (FL)
Goode Moran (KS)
Goodlatte Myrick
Goodling Nethercutt
Goss Neumann
Graham Ney
Granger Northup
Gutknecht Norwood
Hall (TX) Nussle
Hansen Oxley
Hastert Packard
Hastings (WA) Pappas
Hayworth Paul
Hefley Paxon
Herger Pease
Hill Peterson (PA)
Hilleary Petri
Hobson Pickering
Hoekstra Pitts
Horn Pombo
Hostettler Portman

Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traffant
Upton
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)

Lee Oberstar
Levin Obey
Lewis (GA) Olver
Lipinski Ortiz
LoBiondo Owens
Lofgren Pallone
Lowrey Parker
Luther Pascrell
Maloney (CT) Pastor
Maloney (NY) Payne
Manton Pelosi
Markey Peterson (MN)
Mascara Pickett
Matsui Pomeroy
McCarthy (MO) Porter
McCarthy (NY) Poshard
McDermott Price (NC)
McGovern Quinn
McHale Rahall
McIntyre Ramstad
McKinney Reyes
McNulty Rivers
Meehan Rodriguez
Meek (FL) Roemer
Meeks (NY) Ros-Lehtinen
Menendez Rothman
Metcalf Roukema
Millender Roybal-Allard
McDonald Rush
Miller (CA) Sabo
Minge Sanchez
Mink Sanders
Mollohan Sandlin
Moran (VA) Sanford
Morella Sawyer
Murtha Schumer
Nadler Scott
Neal Serrano

NOT VOTING—11
Bateman McDade
Gonzalez Moakley
Istook Rangel
Kennedy (MA) Riggs

□ 2042
So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALVERT to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

TITLE —RESTRICTIONS ON NONRESIDENT FUNDRAISING
SEC. 01. LIMITING AMOUNT OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS NOT RESIDING IN DISTRICT OR STATE INVOLVED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1)(1) A candidate for the office of Senator or the office of Representative in, or Dele-

gate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress may not accept contributions with respect to an election from persons other than local individual residents totaling in excess of the aggregate amount of contributions accepted from local individual residents (as determined on the basis of the information reported under section 304(d)).

“(2) In determining the amount of contributions accepted by a candidate for purposes of this subsection, the amounts of any contributions made by a political committee of a political party shall be allocated as follows:

“(A) 50 percent of such amounts shall be deemed to be a contributions from local individual residents.

“(B) 50 percent of such amounts shall be deemed to be contributions from persons other than local individual residents.

“(3) As used in this subsection, the term ‘local individual resident’ means—

“(A) with respect to an election for the office of Senator, an individual who resides in the State involved; and

“(B) with respect to an election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, an individual who resides in the congressional district involved.”.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) Each principal campaign committee of a candidate for the Senate or the House of Representatives shall include the following information in the first report filed under subsection (a)(2) which covers the period which begins 19 days before an election and ends 20 days after the election:

“(1) The total contributions received by the committee with respect to the election involved from local individual residents (as defined in section 315(1)(3)), as of the last day of the period covered by the report.

“(2) The total contributions received by the committee with respect to the election involved from all persons, as of the last day of the period covered by the report.”.

(c) PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF LIMITS.—Section 309(d) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) Any candidate who knowingly and willfully accepts contributions in excess of any limitation provided under section 315(1) shall be fined an amount equal to the greater of 200 percent of the amount accepted in excess of the applicable limitation or (if applicable) the amount provided in paragraph (1)(A).

“(B) Interest shall be assessed against any portion of a fine imposed under subparagraph (A) which remains unpaid after the expiration of the 30-day period which begins on the date the fine is imposed.”.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 278, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]
AYES—147

NOES—231

Abercrombie Cramer
Ackerman Cummings
Allen Danner
Andrews Davis (FL)
Baesler Davis (IL)
Baldacci DeFazio
Barcia DeGette
Barrett (NE) Delahunt
Barrett (WI) DeLauro
Bass Deutsch
Becerra Diaz-Balart
Bentsen Dicks
Berman Dingell
Berry Dixon
Billbray Doggett
Bishop Dooley
Blagojevich Doyle
Blumenauer Edwards
Boehler Engel
Bonior Eshoo
Borski Etheridge
Boucher Evans
Boyd Farr
Brady (PA) Fattah
Brown (CA) Fazio
Brown (FL) Filner
Brown (OH) Forbes
Campbell Ford
Capps Fox
Cardin Frank (MA)
Carson Franks (NJ)
Castle Frelinghuysen
Clay Frost
Clayton Furse
Clement Kucinich
Clyburn Gejdenson
Conyers Gephardt
Cook Gilchrist
Costello Gilman
Coyne Gordon

Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
Engel (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klippatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
LaTourrette
Leach

Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barella
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bereuter
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Brady (TX)
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss

Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Costello
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary

Hoekstra
Horn
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis
Jenkins
Jones
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pombo

Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wolf
Young (AK)

Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne

Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen

Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

“(b) VOTING RECORD AND VOTING GUIDE EXCEPTION—The term “express advocacy” does not include a communication which is in printed form or posted on the Internet that—

“(1) presents information solely about the voting record or position on a campaign issue of 1 or more candidates, provided however, that the sponsor of the voting record or voting guide may state its agreement or disagreement with the record or position of the candidate and further provided that the voting record or voting guide when taken as a whole does not express unmistakable and unambiguous support for or opposition to 1 or more clearly identified candidates,

(ii) is not made in coordination with a candidate, political party, or agent of the candidate or party, or a candidate's agent or a person who is coordinating with a candidate or a candidate's agent; provided that nothing herein shall prevent the sponsor of the voting guide from directing questions in writing to candidates about their position on issues for purposes of preparing a voter guide, and the candidate from responding in writing to such questions, and

“(iii) does not contain a phrase such as ‘vote for,’ ‘re-elect,’ ‘support,’ ‘cast your ballot for,’ ‘(name of candidate) for Congress,’ ‘(name of candidate) in 1997,’ ‘vote against,’ ‘defeat,’ or ‘reject,’ or a campaign slogan or words that in context can have no reasonable meaning other than to urge the election or defeat of 1 or more clearly identified candidates.”

NOES—278

Abercromble
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Billrakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehrlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)

Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gordon
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner

Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
Doyle
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey

NOT VOTING—9

Buyer
Fox
Gonzalez

Istook
McDade
Moakley

Riggs
Towns
Young (FL)

□ 2050

Mr. PICKERING changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 360, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. LINDA SMITH OF WASHINGTON TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Shays) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

In Section 301(20) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(a) of the substitute, strike subparagraph (b) and add the following:

In Section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, strike paragraph (D) and insert:

“(D) For purposes of subparagraph (C), the term ‘professional services’ means polling, media advice, fundraising, campaign research or direct mail (except for mailhouse services solely for the distribution of voter guides as defined in section 431(20)(B)) services in support of a candidate's pursuit of nomination for election, or election, to Federal office.”

In Section 301(8)(C)(v) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, add at the end thereof,

“, provided however that such discussions shall not include a lobbying contact under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in the case of a candidate holding Federal office or consisting of similar lobbying activity in the case of a candidate holding State or elective office.”

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 343, noes 84, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

AYES—343

Abercromble	Berman	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Berry	Brady (TX)
Allen	Bilbray	Brown (CA)
Andrews	Bishop	Brown (OH)
Archer	Blagojevich	Bunning
Bachus	Bliley	Buyer
Baesler	Blumenauer	Calvert
Baldacci	Blunt	Campbell
Ballenger	Boehrlert	Canady
Barcia	Boehner	Capps
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Cardin
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Carson
Bass	Borski	Castle
Becerra	Boswell	Chabot
Bentsen	Boucher	Christensen
Bereuter	Boyd	Clay

Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hayworth
Hefner
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Hooley

Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lahood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrary
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone

Parker
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Traffant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller

Wexler
Weygand
White

Aderholt
Army
Baker
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bilirakis
Bono
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Cannon
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Cox
Deal
DeLay
Doolittle
Dreier
Ehrlich
Gephardt
Goode
Goodling
Hansen

Wilson
Wise
Wolf

Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOES—84

Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Lewis (CA)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McInnis
Meek (FL)
Mollohan
McKeon (KS)
Murtha
Northup
Norwood
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Pappas

Gonzalez
Istook
McDade

Moakley
Riggs
Towns

NOT VOTING—7

□ 2057

Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Lucas
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Fossella
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Granger
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson

Paxon
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Radanovich
Riley
Rogers
Royce
Ryun
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaeffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Everett
Stump
Sununu
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Whitfield
Wicker
Woolsey

Young (FL)

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bibray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner

Holden
Hostettler
Hyde
Inglis
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
King (NY)
Klink
Kolbe
Kucinich
Largent
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Livingston
Shaw
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
Dunn
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Norwood
Packard
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pombo
Pryce (OH)

NOES—272

Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)

Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Lahood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewin
Lewis (GA)

Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 272, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

AYES—155

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Bartlett
Bateman
Billirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss

Linder	Pallone	Smith (NJ)	[Roll No. 363]	Luther	Pelosi	Smith (OR)
LoBlundo	Pappas	Smith (OR)		Maloney (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Smith (TX)
Lofgren	Parker	Smith (TX)	AYES—62	Maloney (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Smith, Adam
Lowey	Pascarell	Smith, Adam		Manton	Petri	Snowberger
Luther	Pastor	Smith, Linda	Abercrombie	Manzullo	Pickering	Snyder
Maloney (CT)	Payne	Snyder	Army	Markey	Pickett	Solomon
Maloney (NY)	Pelosi	Spratt	Bartlett	Martinez	Pitts	Souder
Manton	Peterson (MN)	Stabenow	Billrakis	Mascara	Pomeroy	Spence
Markey	Pickett	Stark	Boswell	Matsui	Porter	Spratt
Mascara	Pitts	Stearns	Campbell	McCarthy (MO)	Portman	Stabenow
Matsui	Pomeroy	Stenholm	Chenoweth	McCarthy (NY)	Poshard	Stark
McCarthy (MO)	Porter	Stokes	Leach	McCollum	Price (NC)	Stearns
McCarthy (NY)	Portman	Strickland	McIntosh	McCrery	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
McDermott	Poshard	Stupak	Coble	McDermott	Quinn	Stokes
McGovern	Price (NC)	Tanner	Cook	McGovern	Radanovich	Strickland
McHale	Quinn	Tauscher	Cooksey	McHale	Ramstad	Stump
McHugh	Rahall	Tauzin	Crane	McHugh	Rangel	Stupak
McIntyre	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)	Cunningham	McInnis	Regula	Talent
McKinney	Rangel	Thompson	Davis (IL)	McIntyre	Reyes	Tanner
McNulty	Reyes	Thurman	Deal	McKeon	Riley	Tauscher
Meehan	Rivers	Tierney	Doggett	McKinney	Rivers	Tauzin
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Torres	Doyle	McNulty	Rodriguez	Taylor (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Turner	Ehlers	Meehan	Rogers	Thomas
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton	Filner	Meek (FL)	Rohrabacher	Thompson
Metcalf	Rothman	Velazquez	Foley	Meeks (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Millender-	Roukema	Vento	Fox	Menendez	Rothman	Thune
McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky	Goodling	Millender-	Roukema	Thurman
Miller (CA)	Rush	Walsh	Ackerman	McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Minge	Sanchez	Wamp	Aderholt	Miller (CA)	Rush	Turner
Mollohan	Sanders	Waters	Allen	Miller (FL)	Ryun	Upton
Morella	Sandlin	Watt (NC)	Andrews	Minge	Sabo	Velazquez
Nadler	Sanford	Waxman	Archer	Mollohan	Salmon	Vento
Neal	Sawyer	Weller	Bachus	Morella	Sanchez	Visclosky
Neumann	Schumer	Wexler	Baessler	Myrick	Sandlin	Walsh
Ney	Scott	Weygand	Baker	Neal	Sawyer	Wamp
Northup	Serrano	Whitfield	Baldacci	Neumann	Saxton	Waters
Nussle	Shays	Wise	Ballenger	Ney	Scarborough	Watkins
Oberstar	Sherman	Wolf	Barcia	Northup	Schaffer, Bob	Watt (NC)
Obey	Sisisky	Woolsey	Barr	Schumer	Schumer	Waxman
Olver	Skaggs	Wynn	Barrett (NE)	Oberstar	Scott	Weldon (FL)
Ortiz	Skelton	Yates	Barrett (WI)	Obey	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Owens	Slaughter		Barton	Olver	Serrano	Wexler
Oxley	Smith (MI)		Bass	Ortiz	Shadegg	Weygand

NOT VOTING—7

Gonzalez	Moakley	Young (FL)
Istook	Riggs	
McDade	Towns	

□ 2105

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 17 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 62, noes 363, not voting 9, as follows:

Hill	Rahall
Hilleary	Redmond
Hoekstra	Roemer
Hostettler	Rogan
Hulshof	Royce
Largent	Sanders
LaTourette	Sanford
Leach	Schaefer, Dan
McIntosh	Sessions
Metcalf	Sherman
Mica	Shimkus
Mink	Smith, Linda
Moran (KS)	Sununu
Moran (VA)	Taylor (NC)
Murtha	Tiahrt
Nadler	Torres
Nethercutt	Trafiacant
Norwood	Watts (OK)
Pastor	Weller
Paul	Young (AK)
Pombo	

NOES—363

Cramer	Hansen
Crapo	Harman
Cubin	Hastert
Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Danner	Hastings (WA)
Davis (FL)	Hayworth
Davis (VA)	Hefley
DeFazio	Hefner
DeGette	Hilliard
Delahunt	Hinchey
DeLauro	Hinojosa
DeLay	Hobson
Deutsch	Holden
Diaz-Balart	Hooley
Dickey	Horn
Dicks	Houghton
Dingell	Hoyer
Dixon	Hunter
Dooley	Hutchinson
Doolittle	Hyde
Dreier	Inglis
Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Dunn	Jackson-Lee
Edwards	(TX)
Ehrlich	Jefferson
Emerson	Jenkins
Engel	John
English	Johnson (CT)
Ensign	Johnson (WI)
Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Etheridge	Johnson, Sam
Evans	Jones
Everett	Kanjorski
Ewing	Kaptur
Farr	Kasich
Fattah	Kelly
Fawell	Kennedy (MA)
Fazio	Kennedy (RI)
Forbes	Kennelly
Ford	Kildee
Fossella	Kilpatrick
Fowler	Kim
Frank (MA)	Kind (WI)
Franks (NJ)	King (NY)
Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Frost	Kleczka
Furse	Klink
Gallely	Klug
Ganske	Knollenberg
Gejdenson	Koibe
Gekas	Kucinich
Gephardt	LaFalce
Gibbons	LaHood
Gilchrest	Lampson
Gillmor	Lantos
Gilman	Latham
Goode	Lazio
Goodlatte	Lee
Gordon	Levin
Goss	Lewis (CA)
Graham	Lewis (GA)
Granger	Lewis (KY)
Green	Linder
Greenwood	Lipinski
Gutierrez	Livingston
Gutknecht	LoBlundo
Hall (OH)	Lofgren
Hall (TX)	Lowey
Hamilton	Lucas

McDonald	Roybal-Allard
Miller (CA)	Rush
Miller (FL)	Ryun
Minge	Sabo
Mollohan	Salmon
Morella	Sanchez
Myrick	Sandlin
Neal	Sawyer
Neumann	Saxton
Ney	Scarborough
Northup	Schaffer, Bob
Nussle	Schumer
Oberstar	Scott
Obey	Sensenbrenner
Olver	Serrano
Ortiz	Shadegg
Owens	Shaw
Oxley	Shays
Packard	Shuster
Pallone	Sisisky
Pappas	Skaggs
Parker	Skeen
Pascarell	Skelton
Paxon	Slaughter
Payne	Smith (MI)
Pease	Smith (NJ)

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman	Istook	Riggs
Gonzalez	McDade	Towns
Herger	Moakley	Young (FL)

□ 2112

Mr. DICKEY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 18 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 88, noes 337, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

AYES—88

Abercrombie	Hobson	Regula
Barcia	Hoekstra	Rivers
Bartlett	Hookey	Royce
Bilirakis	Hulshof	Salmon
Camp	Hunter	Sanderson
Campbell	Jackson-Lee	Sanford
Chambliss	(TX)	Scarborough
Chenoweth	Kasich	Schaefer, Dan
Coble	LaTourette	Sessions
Coburn	Leach	Shadegg
Collins	Luther	Sherman
Conyers	Maloney (CT)	Shimkus
Cook	McCarthy (MO)	Shuster
Cooksey	McHugh	Smith, Linda
Crane	McIntosh	Snowbarger
Cublin	Metcalf	Sununu
Cunningham	Mink	Taylor (NC)
Davis (IL)	Moran (KS)	Thune
Deal	Nethercutt	Tiahrt
DeFazio	Neumann	Torres
DeGette	Ney	Trafficant
Doolittle	Norwood	Visclosky
Duncan	Pappas	Walsh
Ensign	Pastor	Wamp
Filner	Paul	Watkins
Foley	Pease	Watts (OK)
Gibbons	Pombo	Weller
Hayworth	Pryce (OH)	Whitfield
Hill	Rahall	Young (AK)
Hilleary	Redmond	

NOES—337

Ackerman	Christensen	Ganske
Aderholt	Clay	Gejdenson
Allen	Clayton	Gekas
Andrews	Clement	Gephardt
Archer	Clyburn	Gilchrist
Armey	Combust	Gillmor
Bachus	Condit	Gilman
Baessler	Costello	Goode
Baker	Cox	Goodlatte
Baldacci	Coyne	Goedling
Balenger	Cramer	Gordon
Barr	Crapo	Goss
Barrett (NE)	Cummings	Graham
Barrett (WI)	Danner	Granger
Barton	Davis (FL)	Green
Bass	Davis (VA)	Greenwood
Bateman	Delahunt	Gutierrez
Becerra	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Bentsen	DeLay	Hall (OH)
Bereuter	Deutsch	Hall (TX)
Berman	Diaz-Balart	Hamilton
Berry	Dickey	Hansen
Bilbray	Dicks	Harman
Bishop	Dingell	Hastert
Blagojevich	Dixon	Hastings (FL)
Billey	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	Dooley	Hefley
Blunt	Doyle	Hefner
Boehlert	Dreier	Herger
Boehner	Dunn	Hilliard
Bonilla	Edwards	Hinchee
Bonior	Ehlers	Hinojosa
Bono	Ehrlich	Holden
Borski	Emerson	Horn
Boswell	Engel	Hostettler
Boucher	English	Houghton
Boyd	Eshoo	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Hutchinson
Brady (TX)	Evans	Hyde
Brown (CA)	Everett	Inglis
Brown (FL)	Ewing	Jackson (IL)
Brown (OH)	Farr	Jefferson
Bryant	Fattah	Jenkins
Bunning	Fawell	John
Burr	Fazio	Johnson (CT)
Burton	Forbes	Johnson (WI)
Buyer	Ford	Johnson, E. B.
Callahan	Fossella	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fowler	Jones
Canady	Fox	Kanjorski
Cannon	Frank (MA)	Kaptur
Capps	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (MA)
Carson	Frost	Kennedy (RI)
Castle	Furse	Kennelly
Chabot	Gallegly	Kildee

Kilpatrick	Minge	Schumer
Kim	Mollohan	Scott
Kind (WI)	Moran (VA)	Sensenbrenner
King (NY)	Morrell	Serrano
Kingston	Murtha	Shaw
Klecza	Myrick	Shays
Klink	Nadler	Sistisky
Klug	Neal	Skaggs
Knollenberg	Northup	Skeen
Kolbe	Nussle	Skelton
Kucinich	Oberstar	Slaughter
LaFalce	Obey	Smith (MI)
LaHood	Olver	Smith (NJ)
Lampson	Ortiz	Smith (OR)
Lantos	Owens	Smith (TX)
Largent	Oxley	Smith, Adam
Latham	Packard	Snyder
Lazio	Pallone	Solomon
Lee	Parker	Souder
Levin	Pascroll	Spence
Lewis (CA)	Paxon	Spratt
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Stabenow
Lewis (KY)	Pelosi	Stark
Linder	Peterson (MN)	Stearns
Lipinski	Peterson (PA)	Stenholm
Livingston	Petri	Stokes
LoBiondo	Pickering	Strickland
Lofgren	Pickett	Stump
Lowey	Pitts	Stupak
Lucas	Pomeroy	Talent
Maloney (NY)	Porter	Tanner
Manton	Portman	Tauscher
Manzullo	Poshard	Tauzin
Markey	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Martinez	Quinn	Thomas
Mascara	Radanovich	Thompson
Matsui	Ramstad	Thornberry
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Thurman
McCollum	Reyes	Turney
McCrery	McDermott	Turner
McGovern	McGovern	Upton
McHale	Rogan	Velazquez
McInnis	Rogers	Vento
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Waters
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt (NC)
McKinney	Rothman	Waxman
McNulty	Roukema	Weldon (FL)
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Weldon (PA)
Meek (FL)	Rush	Weygand
Meeke (NY)	Ryun	White
Menendez	Sabo	Wicker
Mica	Sanchez	Wilson
Millender-	Sandlin	Wise
McDonald	Sawyer	Wolf
Miller (CA)	Saxton	Woolsey
Miller (FL)	Schaffer, Bob	Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Gonzalez	Moakley	Wexler
Istook	Riggs	Yates
McDade	Towns	Young (FL)

□ 2119

Mr. KASICH and Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELAY TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 241, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

AYES—185

Aderholt	Gallegly	Oxley
Archer	Gekas	Packard
Armey	Gibbons	Pappas
Baker	Goode	Paul
Balenger	Goodlatte	Paxon
Barcia	Goodling	Pease
Barr	Goss	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Barton	Granger	Pickering
Bateman	Gutknecht	Pitts
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Bilirakis	Hansen	Portman
Billey	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Boehner	Hayworth	Redmond
Bonilla	Hefley	Regula
Bono	Herger	Riley
Brady (TX)	Hill	Rogan
Bryant	Hilleary	Rogers
Bunning	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Burr	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hostettler	Royce
Buyer	Hulshof	Ryun
Callahan	Hunter	Salmon
Calvert	Hyde	Saxton
Camp	Inglis	Scarborough
Canady	Jenkins	Schaefer, Dan
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer, Bob
Chabot	Jones	Scott
Chambliss	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Kim	Sessions
Christensen	King (NY)	Shadegg
Coburn	Kingston	Shaw
Collins	Klink	Shimkus
Combust	Kolbe	Shuster
Cook	LaHood	Skeen
Cooksey	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Costello	Latham	Smith (OR)
Cox	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Snowbarger
Crapo	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Cublin	Linder	Spence
Cunningham	Livingston	Stearns
Davis (VA)	Lucas	Stump
Deal	Manzullo	Sununu
DeLay	McCollum	Talent
Diaz-Balart	McCrery	Tauzin
Dickey	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	McInnis	Thomas
Dreier	McIntosh	Thornberry
Duncan	McKeon	Thune
Dunn	Mica	Tiahrt
Ehlers	Miller (FL)	Trafficant
Ehrlich	Mollohan	Watkins
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
English	Murtha	Weldon (FL)
Ensign	Myrick	Weller
Everett	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Ewing	Neumann	Wicker
Fawell	Ney	Wilson
Fossella	Northup	Young (AK)
Fowler	Norwood	

NOES—241

Abercrombie	Bishop	Cardin
Ackerman	Blagojevich	Carson
Allen	Blumenauer	Castle
Andrews	Boehlert	Clay
Bachus	Bonior	Clayton
Baessler	Borski	Clement
Baldacci	Boswell	Clyburn
Barrett (NE)	Boucher	Coble
Barrett (WI)	Boyd	Condit
Bass	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Becerra	Brown (CA)	Coyne
Bentsen	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Berman	Brown (OH)	Cummings
Berry	Campbell	Danner
Bilbray	Capps	Davis (FL)

Davis (IL) Kennedy (RI) Porter
DeFazio Kennelly Poshard
DeGette Kildee Pishra (NC)
Delahunt Kilpatrick Quinn
DeLauro Kind (WI) Rahall
Deutsch Kleczka Ramstad
Dicks Klug Rangel
Dingell Knollenberg Reyes
Dixon Kucinich Rivers
Doggett LaFalce Rodriguez
Dooley Lampson Roemer
Doyle Lantos Rothman
Edwards Lazio Roukema
Engel Leach Roybal-Allard
Eshoo Lee
Etheridge Levin Sabo
Evans Lewis (GA) Sanchez
Farr Lipinski Sanders
Fattah LoBiondo Sandlin
Fazio Lofgren Sanford
Filner Lowey Sawyer
Foley Luther Schumer
Forbes Maloney (CT) Serrano
Ford Maloney (NY) Shays
Fox Manton Sherman
Frank (MA) Markey Siskis
Franks (NJ) Martinez Skaggs
Frelinghuysen Mascara Skelton
Frost Matsul Slaughter
Furse McCarthy (MO) Smith (MI)
Ganske McCarthy (NY) Smith, Adam
Gejdenson McDermott Smith, Linda
Gephardt McGovern Snyder
Gilchrist McHale Souder
Gillmor McIntyre Spratt
Gilman McKinney Stabenow
Gordon McNulty Stark
Green Meehan Stenholm
Greenwood Meek (FL) Stokes
Gutierrez Meeks (NY) Strickland
Hall (OH) Menendez Stupak
Hamilton Metcalf Tanner
Harman Millender Tauscher
Hastings (FL) McDonald Taylor (MS)
Hefner Miller (CA) Thompson
Hilliard Minge Thurman
Hinchey Mink Tierney
Hinojosa Moran (VA) Torres
Holden Morella Turner
Hooley Nadler Upton
Horn Neal Velazquez
Houghton Nussle Vento
Hoyer Oberstar Visclosky
Hutchinson Obey Walsh
Jackson (IL) Oliver Wamp
Jackson-Lee Ortiz Waters
(TX) Owens Watt (NC)
Jefferson Pallone Waxman
John Parker Weldon (PA)
Johnson (CT) Pascrell Wexler
Johnson (WI) Pastor Weygand
Johnson, E.B. Payne White
Kanjorski Pelosi Wise
Kaptur Petri Wolf
Kelly Pickett Woolsey
Kennedy (MA) Pomeroy Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Gonzalez Moakley Yates
Istook Riggs Young (FL)
McDade Towns

□ 2127

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on which further

proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 260, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

AYES—165

Aderholt Gekas Paxon
Archer Gibbons Pease
Baker Gillmor Peterson (PA)
Ballenger Goode Petri
Barr Goodlatte Pickering
Bartlett Goodling Pitts
Barton Goss Pombo
Bateman Granger Pryce (OH)
Bereuter Gutknecht Radanovich
Billray Hansen Redmond
Billirakis Hastert Regula
Bliley Hastings (WA) Riley
Blunt Hayworth Rogan
Boehner Herger Rogers
Bonilla Hill Rohrabacher
Bono Hilleary Royce
Brady (TX) Hobson Ryan
Bryant Hoekstra Salmon
Burr Horn Saxton
Burton Hostettler Scarborough
Buyer Hulshof Schaefer, Dan
Callahan Hunter Sensenbrenner
Caldert Hyde Sessions
Camp Jenkins Shadegg
Canady Johnson, Sam Shaw
Cannon Jones Shimkus
Chambliss Kasich Shuster
Christensen Kingston Skeen
Coble Klug Smith (MI)
Coburn Knollenberg Smith (TX)
Collins Lazio Snowbarger
Combest Lewis (CA) Solomon
Cooksey Linder Waters
Cox Livingston Spence
Crane Lucas Stearns
Cubin Manzullo Stump
Cunningham McCollum Talent
Davis (VA) McCrery Tautzin
Deal McHugh Taylor (NC)
DeLay McInnis Thomas
Dickey McIntosh Thornberry
Doolittle McKeon Thune
Dreier Mica Tiahrt
Duncan Miller (FL) Traficant
Dunn Moran (KS) Upton
Ehlers Myrick Wamp
Ehrlich Nethercutt Watkins
Emerson Neumann Watts (OK)
English Ney Weldon (FL)
Ensign Northup Weller
Everett Norwood Whitfield
Fawell Oxley Wicker
Fossella Packard Wilson
Fowler Pappas Wolf
Gallegly Paul Young (AK)

NOES—260

Abercrombie Bishop Cardin
Ackerman Blagojevich Carson
Allen Blumenauer Castle
Andrews Boehlert Chabot
Armey Bonior Chenoweth
Bachus Borski Clay
Baesler Boswell Clayton
Baldacci Boucher Clement
Barclay Boyd Clyburn
Barrett (NE) Brady (PA) Condit
Barrett (WI) Brown (CA) Conyers
Bass Brown (FL) Cook
Becerra Brown (OH) Costello
Bentsen Bunning Coyne
Bertram Campbell Cramer
Berry Capps Crapo

Cummings Kennedy (RI) Pickett
Danner Kennelly Pomeroy
Davis (FL) Kildee Porter
Davis (IL) Kilpatrick Portman
DeFazio Kim Poshard
DeGette Kind (WI) Price (NC)
Delahunt King (NY) Quinn
DeLauro Kleczka Rahall
Deutsch Klink Ramstad
Dicks Kolbe Rangel
Dingell Kucinich Reyes
Dixon LaHood Rivers
Doggett Lampson Rodriguez
Dooley Lantos Roemer
Doyle Largent Ros-Lehtinen
Edwards Latham Rothman
Engel LaTourette Roukema
Eshoo Leach Roybal-Allard
Etheridge Lee Rush
Evans Levin Sabo
Ewing Lewis (GA) Sanchez
Farr Lewis (KY) Sanders
Fattah Lipinski Sandlin
Fazio LoBiondo Sanford
Filner Lofgren Sawyer
Foley Lowey Schaffer, Bob
Forbes Luther Schumer
Ford Maloney (CT) Scott
Frank (MA) Maloney (NY) Serrano
Franks (NJ) Manton Shays
Frelinghuysen Markey Sherman
Frost Martinez Siskis
Furse Mascara Skaggs
Ganske Matsul Skelton
Gejdenson McCarthy (MO) Slaughter
Gephardt McCarthy (NY) Smith (NJ)
Gilchrist McDermott Smith (OR)
Gilman McGovern Smith, Adam
Gordon McHale Smith, Linda
Graham McIntyre Snyder
Green McKinney Spratt
Greenwood McNulty Stabenow
Gutierrez Meehan Stark
Hall (OH) Meek (FL) Stenholm
Hall (TX) Meeks (NY) Stokes
Hamilton Menendez Strickland
Harman Metcalf Stupak
Hastings (FL) Millender Sununu
Hefner Hefley McDonald Tanner
Hefner Miller (CA) Tauscher
Hilliard Minge Taylor (TX)
Hinchey Mink Thompson
Hinojosa Mollohan Thurman
Holden Moran (VA) Tierney
Hooley Morella Torres
Houghton Murtha Turner
Hoyer Hoyer Nadler
Hutchinson Neal Velazquez
Ingalls Nussle Vento
Jackson (IL) Oberstar Visclosky
Jackson-Lee Obey Walsh
(TX) Olver Waters
Jefferson Ortiz Watt (NC)
John Owens Waxman
Johnson (CT) Pallone Weldon (PA)
Johnson (WI) Parker Wexler
Johnson, E.B. Pascrell Weygand
Kanjorski Pastor White
Kaptur Payne Wise
Kelly Pelosi Woolsey
Kennedy (MA) Peterson (MN) Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Fox McDade Towns
Gonzalez Moakley Yates
Istook Riggs Young (FL)

□ 2134

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 366, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BLUNT, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I missed rollcall votes 356 and 357 because I was unavoidably detained in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 356 and "aye" on rollcall vote 357.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4354) to establish the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund on behalf of the families of Detective John Michael Gibson and Private First Class Jacob Joseph Chestnut of the United States Capitol Police, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I will not object, but under my reservation, I would yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill establishes the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund on behalf of the families of detective John Michael Gibson and Private First Class Jacob Joseph Chestnut.

I want to make sure people understand that this bill establishes by law an official fund in the United States Treasury. Because of that, it is not only permissible, but obviously appropriate, to use official House resources in support of and to solicit contributions to the memorial fund.

In addition to that, the reason the Committee on Ways and Means had jurisdiction over this measure is that those donations to this fund are considered charitable and are, therefore, tax deductible. In addition, there is a provision which says that Federal campaign committees may, in fact, donate funds to the memorial fund.

It is an appropriate gesture, structured in the appropriate way, that it is a tax deduction and no tax would be levied against it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding under his reservation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, continuing under my reservation, many of us attended the funeral of Detective Gibson today, and tomorrow morning we will be attending the funeral of Officer Chestnut. It has been a sad week for all of us; in some ways, however, a very proud week as well when we consider the actions of these two brave and courageous men, and indeed, the actions of their colleagues on the Capitol Police Force and other emergency response teams that came to the Capitol to assist our own Capitol Police.

Mr. Speaker, as we drove from the church, there were literally thousands upon thousands of Americans who stood by the curb and watched the procession go by, waved, saluted, placed their hands on their hearts, in recognition of the contribution to their own welfare and the welfare of their country, that these two brave and courageous Americans had performed and the sacrifice they had made.

This will allow all of us, all Americans and indeed others, in a very tangible way to participate in showing to the families of Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson that our words are not the only thing that we are prepared to raise on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for this action.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's words are quite appropriate and timely in terms of the death of these two particular officers.

I do want to underscore that the establishment of this United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund is dedicated on an even basis to the families of these two gentlemen for a 6-month period. It means that this fund will live beyond these two families' needs, and that it will become a perpetual memorial fund available to the Capitol Police; entirely appropriate for this occasion, but available in the future, unfortunately, if needed. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I am in strong support, as I know every Member of this House is, of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation for just a minute, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me.

I would just like to mention at this point, there is another organization that has fulfilled a complementary role. That organization's name is Heroes, Incorporated. They responded immediately with cash assistance to the family and are also prepared to provide scholarship funds, as they have for every police officer killed in the District of Columbia, I think it is over 300 now, and dozens of children are receiving college scholarships as a result of this organization. This is a wonderful fund, and I mean nothing pejorative, and I wholly support it. But I think it might be appropriate to mention the fact that the Heroes also responded in a very generous fashion and deserve some credit for doing that as well.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would point out that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip, when he made his initial presentation, did, in fact, speak directly of Heroes and the wonderful work they had done, not only with respect to their immediate response for these two officers, but the work that they had done for so many other officers, and indicated as well that the Hero scholarship is probably the most generous scholarship that is given in America and will ensure that the children of Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut will not need to worry about their educational expenses.

But I thank the gentleman for his very appropriate remarks.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I temporarily withdraw the bill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONVENTION CENTER AND SPORTS ARENA AUTHORIZATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4237) to amend the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 to revise the revenues and activities covered under such Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4237

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

SECTION 1. REVENUES AND ACTIVITIES COVERED UNDER WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER AND SPORTS ARENA AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports

Arena Authorization Act of 1995 (DC Code, sec. 47-396.1) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

"The fourth sentence of section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (DC Code, sec. 47-304) shall not apply with respect to the expenditure or obligation of any revenues of the Washington Convention Center Authority for any purpose authorized under the Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994 (D.C. Law 10-188)."

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING REVENUE BOND REQUIREMENTS UNDER HOME RULE ACT.—Nothing in the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 may be construed to affect the application of section 490 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to any revenue bonds, notes, or other obligations issued by the Council of the District of Columbia or by any District instrumentality to which the Council delegates its authority to issue revenue bonds, notes or other obligations under such section.

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER AUTHORITY FINANCING AMENDMENT ACT OF 1998.

Notwithstanding section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, the Washington Convention Center Authority Financing Amendment Act of 1998 (D.C. Act 12-402) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4237, which we have just passed, is a bill that permits the District of Columbia to move forward with a financing plan for the purpose of building a new state-of-the-art convention center in downtown Washington.

This bill authorizes the Washington Convention Center Authority, an independent agency, to issue bonds and waive the 30-day waiting period for the D.C. City Council enactment to go into effect. Its passage this evening is important so they can get immediate Senate consideration and be signed by the President, and we can be in the ground and starting construction the 1st of September.

Our subcommittee has followed the effort to build a new convention center in downtown Washington with great interest. We think this is critical for the city to reestablish a tax base in downtown Washington, and working with the MCI Center, we will build, we think, a revitalization of the downtown area.

Over time it is estimated that the situation only gets worse in terms of attracting tourism if we were to go with the existing center. The District of Columbia's existing Convention Center is now only the 30th largest in the country, and it can accommodate only approximately 55 percent of national conventions and exhibition shows. That is a serious blow to the District's economy. A new convention center will

provide much needed jobs for the city, and an increase in locally-generated local tax base revenue. It will boost morale for the entire region.

I want to thank the General Accounting Office and the General Services Administration for their respective roles in analyzing the development of the financing plan for the new Washington Convention Center. Their thorough analysis has reinforced our confidence in permitting the District to move forward with this project.

I also want to thank the District's Financial Control Board for their hard work and oversight on the development of this project. The Control Board is empowered to approve or disapprove all city borrowing, and this sign-off of the financial package I think gives everyone more confidence in its viability.

After reviewing information from both the proponents and opponents of the project, our committee has unanimously approved the project, and the Control Board has, in effect, reported to Congress that all aspects of the project, including borrowing and costs, are compatible with the interests of the District of Columbia. The next step is for Congress to go ahead and pass this bill. Our action this evening is a giant step forward for the District.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation that moves the convention center forward for the District of Columbia. Frankly, having a world class convention center in the Washington metropolitan area is something that the entire region needs, and there are suburban jurisdictions that would have loved to have had this center within their jurisdiction. I can say, quite frankly, we had some great sites for it.

But the fact is, it belongs in the center city. Had the business community, the residential community, the political community not gotten their act together they might have lost this, but this is a credit to the fact that there is that kind of symbiotic relationship that is acting in a constructive manner today, particularly the hotel, the restaurant, and the tourism industry.

They deserve this convention center. Most importantly, the people of the District of Columbia deserve this convention center and all the economic benefits it will provide.

I thank the gentleman who chairs the District of Columbia authorizing committee for moving this legislation forward at a rapid pace, and I look forward to the day that we can all go to this convention center and enjoy not only the center itself, but all the economic and social benefits it will bring to this great capital city.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Trey Hardin and Peter Sirh of my staff for the staff work they have done on this.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to amend the D.C. Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 in order to enable the Washington Convention Center Authority (Authority) to finance revenue bonds for the cost of constructing a new convention center in downtown D.C. This legislation moves forward the hope and promise of the 1995 legislation for a sports arena and a convention center, twin centerpieces of economic development and jobs in the city and revitalization of downtown in the District. The quick and efficient construction of the MCI Center and the new jobs and revenue the arena has brought to D.C. residents have encouraged the city to complete its work on a convention center, where the need has long been conceded.

In every other city in the United States, this matter would not come before any but the local city council. Unfortunately, unlike every other city, the District does not have legislative and budget autonomy and therefore cannot spend its own funds unless authorized by Congress.

Extensive hearings in the D.C. City Council have been held on the underlying issues, with an informed and vigorous debate by members of the City Council. On June 16, the City Council approved legislation to finance the new convention center, and on July 7, the City Council passed a bond inducement resolution to approve the Authority's proposal for the issuance of dedicated tax revenue bonds to finance construction of the convention center. On July 13, the D.C. Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (Control Board) gave its final approval to the financing plan for the project, leaving only congressional authorization, which is necessary for the District to proceed to the bond market.

On July 15, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia heard testimony from Mayor Marion Barry, City Council Chair Linda Cropp, City Council Member Charlene Drew Jarvis, Control Board Chair Andrew Brimmer, Authority President Terry Golden, and representatives of the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the General Services Administration (GSA) on the financial aspects of the project. After hearing this testimony, I am satisfied that the Authority is ready to proceed with the issuance of bonds to secure financing, allowing the Authority to begin to break ground possibly as early as September. Considering the many years' delay and the millions in lost revenue to the District, ground breaking cannot come too soon.

Although the GAO testified that the cost of constructing the new convention center would be \$708 million, \$58 million more than the \$650 million estimate, this \$58 million is not attributable to the cost of the center but to certain costs that should be borne by entities other than the Authority. For example, vendors who will operate in the facility are anticipated to contribute \$17.7 million in equipment costs; the District government will provide \$10 million for utility relocation from expected Department of Housing and Urban Development grants; and the President has requested \$25 million in

his budget to expand the Mount Vernon Square Metro station.

The GSA testified that the agency had worked closely with the Authority to keep the costs of the project down. With the GSA's assistance, the Authority secured a contract with a construction manager for a "Guaranteed Maximum Price," whereby the private contractor is given incentives to keep costs down and assumes the risk for any cost overruns.

Mayor Marion Barry testified, among other things, regarding the promise of additional jobs for District residents. He said that the new convention center would create nearly 1,000 new construction jobs, and that once the facility is completed, it would generate nearly 10,000 jobs in the hospitality and tourism industries. He testified that, using some of the approaches that were successful with the MCI Center, special training and goals for jobs for D.C. residents would be met.

The District of Columbia Subcommittee hearing was not a reprise of the lengthy D.C. City Council hearings, and, on home rule grounds, did not attempt to repeat issues of local concern. However, since the issues of financing and bonding before the Congress implicate other areas, the Subcommittee asked extensive questions and received testimony concerning many issues, including location, size, and job creation, in addition to the strictly financial issues.

This convention center has an unusual financial base, which I believe other cities might do well to emulate. The financing arises from a proposal by the hotel and restaurant industry for taxes on their own industry that would not have been available to the city for any other purpose. The proposal was made at a time when the city's need for revenue and jobs has been especially pressing. For many years, the District had been unable to attract large conventions. Not only has the District lost billions as a result; the local hotel and restaurant industry has suffered from the absence of a large convention center. It is estimated that the inadequacy of the current facility led to the loss of \$300 million in revenue from lost conventions in 1997 alone. My legislation will enable the District to compete for its market share in the convention industry for the first time in many years.

The delay in building an adequate convention center has been very costly to the District. In a town dominated by tax exempt property, especially government buildings, a convention center is one of the few projects that can bring significant revenues. To that end, the District intends to break ground this September. I ask for expeditious passage on this bill.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4194. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4328. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4194) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. BOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAIG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4328) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BYRD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. INOUE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

□ 2145

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2183.

□ 2150

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for

Federal office, and for other purposes, with Mr. BLUNT (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF GEORGIA TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 23 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. BARR of Georgia to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —PROHIBITING BILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS

SEC. 01. PROHIBITING USE OF BILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No State may provide voting materials in any language other than English.

(2) VOTING MATERIALS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "voting materials" means registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information relating to the electoral process, including ballots.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by striking section 203 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa-1a);

(2) in section 204 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa-2), by striking ", or 203"; and

(3) in section 205 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa-3), by striking ", 202, or 203" and inserting "or 202".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have introduced an amendment which bans the use of bilingual ballots in Federal elections. We know that almost 25 years ago this Congress provided for bilingual ballots. Back then our country was just beginning to see a huge influx of immigrants to our shores who wished to exercise their right to vote when they became American citizens.

We need to recognize that if an individual becomes a naturalized citizen of this country, they are required to demonstrate a knowledge of English before they can achieve citizenship status. This Congress, in 1950, explicitly added

a specific requirement that persons who wish to become citizens must "demonstrate an understanding of English language, including an ability to read, write, and speak words in ordinary usage in the English language."

While we require individuals to learn English, bilingual ballots contradict this by allowing them to vote in their native language, a language other than the English language.

We all recognize, Mr. Chairman, that our Nation is made up of more nationalities than any other country in the world. We are all proud of that fact, because it demonstrates and confirms to us what we have always known about America, that it remains the best country in the world.

However, all we need do is look to our neighbor in the north, Canada. Canada is a divided nation, a deeply divided nation, a sometimes violently divided nation, because of the acceptance of but two, but two, national languages, only two. Look at the problems they have: near secession, rioting. These are the wages of lingual disunity. It is essential to our national interest to maintain one language, the English language, in the transaction of our Nation's business, government services, and, most importantly, voting.

What business of government is more important to the government and the people of a country than voting? By making the choice to become an American citizen, immigrants take upon themselves the responsibility to learn the English language and to become productive citizens of this country. A foreign language on a Federal ballot provides that an individual can still easily exercise one civic duty, and yet completely neglect their other duty of mastering the English language.

Mr. Chairman, let us also note a paradox which exists with respect to this issue. Supporters of bilingual ballots have argued that they are desperately needed. Claims have been made that citizens who speak foreign languages would be less likely to register and vote if they could not vote with a bilingual ballot. Studies, I might add parenthetically, do not prove this to be the case.

Yet, the same people who support bilingual ballots because people are not learning English turn right around and say a constitutional amendment making English the official language of American government is unnecessary because everybody is already learning the language.

Mr. Chairman, the only essential thing is that when languages other than English appear on a ballot, the language of the "immigrant ancestors" is given official status by the Federal Government co-equal with the English language. That is neither contemplated nor appropriate. It is certainly not contemplated in our citizenship laws,

which require proficiency in the English language to become a citizen.

Bilingual ballots are just one more way that well-meaning people hinder the progress of certain groups in this country of foreign ancestry. English is the language of this Nation. Those who do not learn it will be unable to take their rightful place and excel in the political arena, in the economic arena, in the education arena, and every other arena in this land.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this important amendment, which simply reaffirms existing law on citizenship and brings that down to the ballot box, where it is perhaps the most important indice and most important chore and responsibility, and indeed, right that any citizen has, naturalized or native born.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. MEEHAN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Again, the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) has nothing to do with campaign finance reform. Mr. Chairman, Republicans have a great idea to improve democracy: let us hold an election, but make sure some specially singled out voters do not have the chance to read fully about what the issues are, or who they are voting for.

Who do they seek to single out? True to form, they single out immigrants who fled political persecution or economic repression, who encourage their children to study hard, who attend weekend classes to improve their English skills, all the while holding down two jobs to support their families. These are people proud to be American citizens.

Yes, there is an elementary language provision under the immigration law to become a United States citizen, but there are also exceptions for those seniors who are elderly and who are exempted. They would be not having the access to understand what they are voting for.

Think about the ballot questions that come forth and the complexity of those ballot questions. These are people Republicans want to punish. I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, people who use bilingual voting materials are people who want to participate in the process, who want to be informed about the issues, who want to know where the candidates stand. Oth-

erwise, they would not be using these materials in the first place.

Come November, I believe these hard-working Americans who pay their taxes, serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, and are Americans in all other respects, will remember the contempt this amendment treats them with.

We should vote down this amendment and at the same time keep Shays-Meehan free from anything that is not campaign finance reform.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I begin by saluting my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), for their tremendous patience. Because as we are seeing with this amendment, we have been offered everything but the kitchen sink as an amendment to this bill.

This really has nothing to do with the underlying issue of campaign finance reform. It does have to do with a movement concerning proficiency in English, which I agree is an important part of being an American. But I also know that there are many people that are some of our strongest and best Americans whose first language is, in my community, Spanish or Vietnamese. They are some of our hardest working citizens. They pay taxes, they contribute to our community, and they deserve a right to participate in the electoral process.

□ 2200

As I review the specifics of this amendment that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) is offering, it allows the ballots to be bilingual, which they certainly should be. It is the voting materials that he says cannot be in another language.

My goodness, in our State, we provide instructions, we use bilingual instructions to teach people how to get a driver's license. Why can we not provide the same manner of instruction for those who want to exercise their franchise as Americans? I can tell my colleagues that in the State of Texas, unlike some other parts of the world, language is not dividing us. It is only those who attack other languages and other cultures from their own misunderstanding who divide us.

Mr. Chairman, let us come together and support what this bill is all about and not get divided over a question of bilingual information for voters.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. BARR) has 1 minute remaining, and has the right to close.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND), a leader in the effort of campaign finance reform.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for yielding me this time, and for the great work he has been doing on this. In closing, let me remake a couple of the points that have been said so eloquently by my colleagues here.

First, this proposed amendment is not about campaign finance reform. This is more properly before discussion and debate on voters' rights and the Voting Act.

Number two, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) talks about this is not an allowable provision under the Voting Act. He in fact says that it is not allowable for people who do not understand English to be American citizens under the 1975 Voting Act.

Mr. Chairman, that is not true. The fact is that people that are older and have been here for 15 or 20 years, depending upon their age, are allowed to become citizens of the United States by taking a test in their own language. This, therefore, would discriminate against many of the older immigrant Americans who have been naturalized from participating in the voting process that they have worked so hard and so dearly to attain.

Last but not least is the complexity by which many questions are placed on the ballot. Again, they need some description, some assistance. By having such a referendum in their own language, it provides an easy way for people who are truly Americans to be able to participate in the voting process that we so rightly and so richly deserve.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, of course, that the opponents of this very simple and straightforward amendment regarding the fact that voting materials provided by the government should be in English, not in other languages, it is very interesting that they refer several times to an amendment to the laws of this land that provide for a small category of persons, elderly, who speak another language who have been in this country for a certain lengthy number of years. They keep referring to that, yet I am sure that they would not agree to a friendly amendment that those people indeed could have bilingual materials. They are just opposed to having these materials in the English language.

Mr. Chairman, they are so opposed to it, that they call this a poison pill. A poison pill, simply saying that ballot materials, voting materials shall be in

the English language. That is somehow poisonous to this country, that is poisonous to the standards, to voting procedures in this country.

That, I think, says perhaps more than anything else, more than all of the great eloquent words on the other side that this to them is poisonous, simply standing up for the English language.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE —EXPULSION PROCEEDINGS FOR HOUSE MEMBERS RECEIVING FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 01. PERMITTING CONSIDERATION OF PRIVILEGED MOTION TO EXPEL HOUSE MEMBER ACCEPTING ILLEGAL FOREIGN CONTRIBUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a Member of the House of Representatives is convicted of a violation of section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (or any successor provision prohibiting the solicitation, receipt, or acceptance of a contribution from a foreign national), it shall be in order in the House at any time after the fifth legislative day following the date on which the Member is convicted to move to expel the Member from the House of Representatives. A motion to expel a Member under the authority of this subsection shall be highly privileged. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of the House

of Representatives, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the language that will be sent to the desk forthwith.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read it and send it up to the Clerk here. It would strike on page 1, line 12, after "foreign national" and all that follows through line 14, page 2, and insert the following:

"The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall immediately consider the conduct of the Member and shall make a report and recommendation to the House forthwith concerning that Member, which may include a recommendation for expulsion."

Mr. Chairman, I will send it to the Committee and I would like to, if the Committee is satisfied and there is no objection, proceed with my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will treat the modification as having been read.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

Pursuant to the order of the House on Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to bypass the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It is my intention, however, to highlight the importance of the infusion of illegal foreign money into our campaigns.

If we are to truly reform this system, there must be that statement which exists within this reform. The original Traficant language said within 5 days it must be brought to the floor, once a Member has been convicted of having knowingly accepted an illegal campaign contribution.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and some of the Members who have done a good job, including the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), believe that perhaps it would be seen as an effort to circumvent and to bypass the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It is not my intentions to do that, but I will say this.

The key words in there, "it shall be immediately referred" to that committee and "it shall be brought forthwith" without placing any specific dates on that.

And the original Traficant amendment never did say that that Member had to be expelled, but there had to be a vote on expulsion. It would still be subject to the same constitutional requirements. I am hoping that this will satisfy, but it will still associate with that heinous crime some punishment timely with the deed.

Mr. Chairman, the House should not let those matters be carried over too long. And having conferred with our ranking member of that committee, I am comfortable with it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask to claim the time in opposition, but I am not in opposition but in support of the gentleman's amendment. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) yielding me this time. Perhaps we could conclude debate on this quite quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put on the record that I appreciate two things: the conscientious concern of the gentleman from Ohio about the conduct of Members of this body; and, secondly, his accommodating the concerns that have been expressed about the appropriate functioning of our committee structure by the amendment that he made.

I think the gentleman's amendment leaves the authority with the committee. It does not compel an answer one way or the other.

So, I would rise in support, and yield back with my compliments to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a fellow graduate of the University of Pittsburgh. I think his improvement of this amendment is well worth his time.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) for his willingness to work with us on this amendment. The point that he is raising is a very important point, and that is if a Member has been convicted of violating the foreign contribution ban, that that matter must be immediately considered by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and a report must come back forthwith to the House for action.

I think that that is the appropriate way to handle it. I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. It is very important that the House have an opportunity to act promptly when these types of circumstances develop. Hopefully, it will never happen, but it is important that

that statement be made. I congratulate my colleagues.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, for those that may be following this debate and wonder at times what "poison pill" and some of the references actually mean, I want to point to the motives of the Shays-Meehan effort. That is really to try to remove the influence that special interests have on Federal election campaigns.

I also want to point out, with this amendment being an example, that we are not killing everything that comes up. If it is germane, if it is special interest, if it is about money in Federal elections, and it is something that is going in the same direction of real reform, we are willing to work with the authors of amendments such as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and this is a great example.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his work and his persistence on this legitimate issue of foreign money coming into the American Federal political process. There is some domestic money that we think is also egregious and we are trying to put some reasonable limitations on soft money and the proliferation of these outside interests. I thank the gentleman for his work.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the efforts of the committee in helping to fashion this amendment. It was no intent to circumvent the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. They have done a fine job.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time otherwise reserved for one who is in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL)?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUNT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 25 as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. BLUNT to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. EXPRESS ADVOCACY DETERMINED WITHOUT REGARD TO BACKGROUND MUSIC.

Section 301 (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(20) In determining whether any communication by television or radio broadcast constitutes express advocacy for purposes of this Act, there shall not be taken into account any background music used in such broadcast."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in defense of music. I represent one of the music capitals of the world, Branson, Missouri. In Branson, we do not quote Voltaire often but if we did, we might paraphrase Voltaire by saying, "I may not like your choice of music but I will defend to the death your right to play it."

We may ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, what does music have to do with campaign reform? I asked that very question myself. Yet the Federal Election Commission speech police deemed background music relevant.

I, like most reasonable people, do not think that the FEC has the authority or the right to decide what background music can or cannot be used in issue ads. This amendment prohibits that kind of regulatory intimidation.

Now, I am not joking about this, Mr. Chairman. The FEC has a history of prosecuting on the basis of background music. For instance, in the case of Christian Action Network versus FEC, the FEC stated that background music should be a determining factor in establishing the presence of express advocacy. Thankfully, this case was dismissed and the FEC was severely castigated in court for pursuing it.

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals even awarded the victims of the FEC, the Christian Action Network, attorneys' fees because the prosecution was not substantially justified.

The Shays-Meehan bill is extremely vague and the expansive definition of express advocacy gives the FEC even more rope to strangle speech by private citizens and groups. Without my amendment, the FEC could again cite background music as a basis for persecution. Without my amendment, who knows what would happen if Shays-Meehan became the law of the land.

The Battle Hymn of the Republic, express advocacy if I ever heard it; John Philip Souza, forget it. You would have to have a legal defense fund. Francis Scott Key in the background, you better call your lawyer.

We are not just whistling Dixie with this amendment, Mr. Chairman. The FEC has already tried using background music in an enforcement action. If not for the Fourth Circuit Court, they would have gotten away with it. Do not let them try it again. It is time for the FEC to face the music, Mr. Chairman. Stand up for freedom of speech and freedom of music. Vote for this amendment. It is in tune with the first amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I have strongly supported campaign finance reform legislation for years and I have worked very hard for Washington State's excellent campaign finance reform bill, but our basic task today is to pass the Shays-Meehan bill.

Many of the amendments offered are good amendments, concepts I have supported for years. In fact, I would have voted for most of the amendments if they had not been added to this particular bill, but there is a larger goal here today to pass the Shays-Meehan bill.

We must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We cannot afford, in striving for a perfect bill, to add amendments that split off key voting blocks and thus sink the only chance for real reform this year. Some of these amendments have that purpose.

I have the faith that we will enact real and honest campaign finance reform. This bill is just the first step, not a complete fix. I have faith that my colleagues will not vote for the amendments that will kill this first step toward the reform that the American people are asking for.

□ 2215

I ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment and subsequent amendments that put the Shays-Meehan reform bill in jeopardy.

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

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

Our good friend and distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. DELAY), who offered this amendment, and I had a discussion. He is not present here, no doubt in connection with his duties of consoling the family of the heroic agent who died in his office and the other officer as well. But before this day, before that sad event, I discussed with the whip whether the phrase "music" may be ambiguous, and I certainly doubt it was the whip's intention, that lyrics be included in "music." That is just obvious.

The lyrics might say, and in giving this example, I will not sing, and impose that on my colleagues. Vote for DELAY, DELAY, DELAY; vote for DELAY, DELAY, DELAY," to allow that would obviously undermine the heart of the amendment.

What I am offering is, if my good friend and colleague from Missouri would be able, in the absence of the distinguished whip, to take a unanimous consent to amend so that the phrase "not including lyrics" is included right after the word "music."

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

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUNT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the words "not including lyrics" be added after the word "music."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I just, again, would like to urge that we clarify this and take the FEC clearly out of this realm of expression and, in defense of music, that we add this modified amendment to the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCINTOSH TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to offer amendment No. 84 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. MCINTOSH to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

In section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended by section 205(a)(1)(B) of the substitute, add at the end the following:

(F) For purposes of subparagraph (C), no communication with a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives (including the staff of a Senator or Member) regarding any pending legislative matter, regarding the position of any Senator or Member on such matter, may be construed to establish coordination with a candidate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I understand there would be agreement to limit the time on each side to 3 minutes, which I would be willing to do, and I ask unanimous consent to so limit the debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to understand the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I have seen it numbered 84. I have also seen it numbered 16 in some of the materials. And 26 is the number I understand that it is.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman read the amendment so we are clear?

Mr. MCINTOSH. "For purposes of subparagraph (C), no communication with a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives (including the staff of a Senator or Member) regarding any pending legislative matter, regarding the position of any Senator or Member on such"

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

This amendment secures the right of Members of Congress and our staffs to receive information on pending legislative matters and to transmit information regarding our positions on issues without them being deemed to be coordinated with the various outside organizations that provide or receive such information.

This includes all two-way communication, whether it be questionnaires, conversations of any sort and exchange of letters or any other communication. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH) does not protect this right, as I will explain in a moment, and so it is necessary to bring this amendment forward.

Section 205 of the Shays-Meehan bill defines "coordination with a candidate" as any of 10 broad categories of direct or indirect contacts, actual or presumed, between a candidate, including offices of incumbent Members of Congress and a citizen group. This coordination includes all types of contact that are routine for issue-oriented groups that lobby Congress, whether it be an environmental group, a health issues group or an abortion control group, gun control or any other issue.

For example, section 205 can easily be construed to prohibit issue-oriented groups from soliciting information from candidates, including incumbent Members of Congress, regarding their positions on issues, then communicating that information to citizens in grassroots lobbying or voter education campaigns.

The bill states that "coordination with a candidate" includes "a payment made by a person pursuant to any general or particular understanding with a candidate or an agent."

I am afraid that this could apply, for example, to the common practice of issue-oriented groups sending candidates a survey regarding their positions on an issue or group of issues or sending a Member of Congress a letter soliciting his position on an issue and then subsequently using it in a grassroots communication.

Some groups use forms by which a lawmaker or other candidate can indicate his or her endorsement of a certain legislative initiative, for example, the balanced budget or even the Shays-Meehan bill. Of course, these questionnaires are submitted with the general understanding, as the bill says, that the sponsoring organization will disseminate the answers to interested citizens.

But under this bill, that coordination is an activity that would be defined as prohibited coordination. Any and all two-way communications, a phone call, an interview, a meeting or exchange of letters, all of these perfectly legitimate activities would be considered coordination under this bill.

I am sure that was not the intent of the authors, and we are offering this amendment as a way to correct that and construe the matter in a way that allows those type of communications.

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Let us really look at the wording. I cannot believe that we want to suggest what this amendment does.

This amendment weakens the existing law, weakens the ability for the FEC to enforce the law. This amendment allows Members to conspire about a campaign issue.

Let us take the tobacco issue. This amendment allows you to meet with a lobbyist for the tobacco industry to figure out how you are going to vote and what Members are going to vote on it and devise a campaign out of that. I do not think that is really what you want to happen.

Look at the language, no communication with a Senator or Member of the House, including a staff member, regarding any pending legislative matter regarding the position of the Senator or the Member on such matter may be construed to establish coordination with a candidate. You are saying that you cannot use that collaboration as being construed as collaboration under the law. Therefore, illegal.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of any current law that makes that type of communication illegal currently.

Mr. FARR of California. It does. You cannot sit down in your office with a group that wants to do a campaign and figure out and coordinate how you are going to be working on legislation and then go out and run a campaign on it. That is just totally illegal. You are making an exception for legislation.

I think it is an exception being made, frankly, that the big political battle here is for the tobacco interests. This bill would allow the tobacco interests and the legislators to sit down and figure out a plan of how to run a national campaign. Maybe that is not what you intended, but that is what the law allows. And I do not think it is good, and I would oppose it.

This is not about campaign finance reform. This is essentially about how to let more lobbyists into the door of legislative offices and be involved in designing and collaborating for campaigns.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana that the present FEC law where there is that kind of a communication would

result in an in-kind contribution. You really are changing, with your amendment, unintentionally perhaps, present FEC regulations. I would urge very much that you take another look, because we would have to oppose this as loosening present law. I think that is clear.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, certainly the intent is not to loosen existing law, though I am not convinced that existing law puts those types of limits on issue-oriented campaigns. There is coordination as to helping a candidate with his or her election. Then that is a different matter. It is certainly not the intention to change existing law.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it does. And the language, just look at it, no communication may be construed to establish coordination. Those are the operative words. I do not think that is in the best interest of campaign reform.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27. The Chair understands that the amendment will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28. It is the Chair's understanding that that amendment will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29. It is the Chair's understanding that that amendment will not be offered as well.

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there a designee for the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT)?

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER). Is there a designee for the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER)?

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORN TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 32 offered by Mr. HORN to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE—REDUCED POSTAGE RATES

SEC. 01. REDUCED POSTAGE RATES FOR PRINCIPAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3626(e)(2)(A) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the National Republican Congressional Committee” and inserting “the National Republican Congressional Committee, and the principal campaign committee of a candidate for election for the office of Senator or Representative in or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress”.

(b) LIMITING REDUCED RATE TO TWO PIECES OF MAIL PER REGISTERED VOTER.—Section 3626(e)(1) of such title is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, except that in the case of a committee which is a principal campaign committee such rates shall apply only with respect to the election cycle involved and only to a number of pieces equal to the product of 2 times the number (as determined by the Postmaster General) of addresses (other than business possible delivery stops) in the congressional district involved (or, in the case of a committee of a candidate for election for the office of Senator, in the State involved).”.

(c) PRINCIPAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE DEFINED.—Section 3626(e)(2) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(D) the term ‘principal campaign committee’ has the meaning given such term in section 301(5) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

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

□ 2230

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The amendment I am offering is a straightforward effort to take a positive step toward improving our campaigns. This proposal would reduce the cost of campaigns for all candidates for Congress, those that are incumbent, those that are challengers. It will create a better balance between incumbents and challengers and it will encourage real debate and discussion of these issues that are very important to our voters. This is a proposal to level the playing field, for incumbents and challengers.

With more and more millionaires entering politics, the change in the postal rate will give those who are not wealthy the opportunity to get out their message by two mailings to each household in their district. What this means is that you will get the postage

at half the price it is now for candidates but at the price that is already authorized in law for national party committees and State party committees. This simply changes the law to include candidates for Congress, that includes the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives.

Under the current rules of the House, Mr. Chairman, we prohibit mass mailings under the frank in the 60-day period before a primary or a general election. This limit reduces one advantage enjoyed by incumbents under the current system. The Shays-Meehan bill would expand this prohibition by eliminating mass mailings under the congressional frank for the 6 months before an election. The limiting advantages for incumbents can be very appropriate reform, but I believe we should also seek to level the playing field for all candidates and thus improve the quality of the political dialogue. That is the goal essentially of this amendment. I think that the fact that we already can do that through the State and national committees, this is simply clearing out the intermediaries and the middle people and getting it directly to the challengers and to the incumbents. The difference is they would deliver the mail at 6.9 cents for what is generally a mailer versus the 13.2 cents that is already paid. So it would help everybody. That, I think, is in the interest of the public to have a decent political debate in this country.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I think this is a very well-intentioned amendment, but I have problems with it from several perspectives.

First of all the estimate of cost made by the Postal Service based on eight candidates per district, primary and general, is \$130 million. That is a very large sum, one that I think would bring this bill under criticism from many who support Shays-Meehan but do not support public financing. This would be perceived to be a backdoor way of providing public financing to candidates.

Now, there are those who would advocate some sort of proposal like this if it were tied to the concept of spending limits. But this bill has avoided getting into that thicket because the controversy would weigh down the basic benefits of passing the Shays-Meehan law which many of us think does not go far enough but many also believe is about all we can accomplish with this very even balance we have achieved here on a bipartisan basis in this Con-

gress. Since there is no spending limit and there would be no way of inducing people, therefore, into agreeing to limit their public spending, we would have to raise issues with this amendment that frankly would cause us to come down on the side of a “no” vote.

The problem with this is that it is perceived as a way of giving challengers funding. And while there may be people in the country and certainly in this body who would like to help challengers, most of us want to deal with people on an equal basis and therefore provide equal benefits to people running as incumbents and as outsiders. Shays-Meehan has done a major thing to restore some balance by setting the date at 6 months prior to an election. I know the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) voluntarily does not mail at all in the last year of the two-year cycle, but I do think that the effort made in this bill moves in the right direction, to move the franking privilege away from being a benefit to incumbent candidates.

I worry that the combination of opposition that might result both because it is too much reform, public financing and because it takes on the incumbent with money that would go to his challenger, creates a situation in which regrettably we would lose votes for this bill from both ends of the political spectrum and perhaps endanger the enactment of Shays-Meehan which we all believe is a major improvement, maybe not perfection but certainly the best we can do in this very evenly balanced proposal. I would have to on that basis regrettably indicate opposition.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise, too, in very reluctant opposition and I say reluctant because the author of this bill the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is not only one of the brightest individuals in the House, he has been a true reformer, offering multiple bills and multiple amendments, really an academic expert in this issue of campaign finance reform. But I do come from the other ideological perspective.

I encouraged the authors of Shays-Meehan early on when it was in a different form not to go the route of public financing, not to go the route of broadcaster financing and we have put together this coalition amazingly well of people who had great heartburn with those two provisions. This would effectively take us there, albeit in a small way, but it would take us there to public financing. Frankly I am on this train with the understanding we were not going to go to this destination. So I certainly want to speak to that. But I very much commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for all that he continues to do because he is truly trying his best to go in our direction.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, to say this is public financing is not really accurate. Sure, money is involved in postage. This is the postal administration that has several billion, I believe, in profits now. They deliver these at both the nonprofit rate and the higher rate. It does not really make any cost change in adding people to the route they run. It simply gives now what is given to State parties to the candidates.

The original Shays-Meehan bill and McCain-Feingold reform plans had a proposal like this in them. Now, they probably took it out for some reason. But I cannot imagine except incumbents would not like this because that would give their challenger a chance. I think we ought to get a little broader and not just be protecting incumbency, we ought to let the challengers have the same type of opportunity we have; because, let us face it, incumbents generally, unless you are running against a millionaire, can have a lot in their bank accounts. I do not happen to. So do hundreds of others in here. But a few of our Members, as we know, have million-dollar campaign funds, and that scares off the competition. This would at least give the competition a chance to get the message out twice, to the households in the district at the nonprofit rate.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just conclude by saying I personally believe public financing is the way of the future. I think we have neglected it in the presidential system and need to reinvigorate public support for it. But I am more concerned tonight that we not impede progress on Shays-Meehan, that we not upset the balance that has been achieved in this version of this bill. It is the best we can accomplish under the circumstances. I would not want to endanger its enactment because we went too far in the direction that some of our colleagues that support this bill cannot go. I do not want to inflame some of our colleagues on the other end of the spectrum who are concerned about advantaging their challengers.

I realize we have not made perfection, but I think we have come a lot further than any would have anticipated. We are on the verge of success, enacting something we can all be proud of. I hope the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) can accept our reluctant opposition to his amendment, and I hope he can support Shays-Meehan as a major step in the right direction. Hopefully in subsequent Congresses we can readdress some of these same kinds of issues and perhaps reach common ground on going further.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman from California knows that I have been a sponsor and coauthor of Shays-Meehan. I think there are a lot of good things in it. But these are simple, little things that can make a difference for candidates that are new to the political game and give them a chance to get their message over. I would hope the gentleman is not throwing the red herring of public finance out to this body to simply protect the incumbents' present superiority to most of the challengers, unless you have the increasing millionaires. I would hope we could rise above that and give the challenger two mailings to households in all our districts. You have to pay for them. You pay for them at half the rate you do now unless you go through the party committee at the State level and the national level, and then you are going to get the rate right now which you can already do. If you are calling that public financing, fine, but it makes no sense, because the public financing we are talking about is what is given Presidents of the United States, candidates for the presidency, and, that is, to have the money that is fungible throughout your campaign with no limit on when it is. This is one limit, getting the two mailers to the houses in your district.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON). Is there a designee for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON)?

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) as modified by the order of the House of July 20, 1998. Is there a designee for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH)?

It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 35 offered by Mr. SHADEGG to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. EXPEDITED COURT REVIEW OF CERTAIN ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 309 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if a candidate (or the candidate's authorized committee) believes that a violation described in paragraph (2) has been committed with respect to an election during the 90-day period preceding the date of the election, the candidate or committee may institute a civil action on behalf of the Commission for relief against the alleged violator in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as an action instituted by the Commission under subsection (a)(6), except that the court involved shall issue a decision regarding the action as soon as practicable after the action is instituted and to the greatest extent possible issue the decision prior to the date of the election involved.

“(2) A violation described in this paragraph is a violation of this Act or of chapter 95 or chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 relating to—

“(A) whether a construction is in excess of an applicable limit or is otherwise prohibited under this act; or

“(B) whether an expenditure is an independent expenditure under section 301(17).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have an amendment which seeks to solve a problem in existing law. That problem is that under the way the FEC laws are currently written, if a campaign law violation occurs in the last 90 days before an election is held, there is essentially no remedy. That is, that violation goes by and cannot be remedied. The reason for that is that under current law, the only existing remedy is to go to the Federal Election Commission in Washington, D.C., file a complaint and under the FEC guidelines no action, absolutely no action is to be taken on that complaint for a period of 90 days.

What that means is that during the last 90 days of a campaign, there simply is no remedy for many of the violations which occurred. Indeed there is no remedy whatsoever. The FEC cannot get to it before the election. Oftentimes such complaints are rendered moot by the election and, therefore, there is a gaping hole in existing law. What my amendment would do is to solve this. It solves this problem by simply saying that for any violation of the FEC provisions which occurs in the last 90 days before the election, a candidate involved in that campaign would be able to pursue a remedy in Federal District Court in their district. And it requires that the Federal District Court give that candidate expedited review of their complaint.

What that means is that when an egregious violation of law occurs during this key last 90 days of the campaign, the candidate would have an option to go to Federal District Court, file a pleading, request a remedy, ask the court to give them a remedy, and say, yes, this is a violation and provide an answer to the problem. It is, I think, an eminently fair provision. It would bias neither side, but it would solve the problem in the way the current Federal Election Code is written.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment. It is good sense. It would provide the court with the authority to grant injunctive relief if necessary, and it requires the court to both act on an expedited basis and if possible to resolve the complaint before the election. I think it has tremendous merit. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time normally in opposition but not to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This is another good example where the gentleman offering the amendment is in a constructive way enhancing what we are trying to accomplish with good reform. Certainly the reformers here in support of Shays-Meehan accept the amendment and commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) for bringing this idea to us and actually putting it into a form that will certainly strengthen the Federal Election Commission and the laws and rules that govern we as candidates here in the House and in the Senate. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

□ 2245

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding the amendment has been accepted?

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has been accepted, but we will have a voice vote at the pleasure of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the expression of support from both this side and the other side. I think it is an improvement in the current law that will benefit the system and help to clean up elections in America.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 36.

Is there a designee present for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY)?

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAW TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAW to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. REQUIRING MAJORITY OF AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTIONS ACCEPTED BY HOUSE CANDIDATES TO COME FROM IN-STATE RESIDENTS.

Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1)(I) With respect to each reporting period or an election, the total of contributions accepted by a candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress from in-State individual residents shall be at least 50 percent of the total of contributions accepted from all sources.

"(2) As used in this subsection, the term 'in-State individual resident' means an individual who resides in the State in which the congressional district involved is located."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we are here tonight at a quarter of eleven. Unfortunately, it is so late the offices are closed; the staff have gone home; there is only a handful of Members here on the floor tonight. I was tempted to call a point of order to bring the Members back in because I think this is really pitiful that Members are not here to listen to what we are talking about here tonight.

But what we are talking about is campaign finance reform, and my amendment would be the most simple and, I think, productive type of campaign reform that we could possibly have, and that is just simply to say this, and it is so simplistic:

Half of the campaign money that my colleagues receive has to come from their home State. I am not talking about colleagues' home districts. Much in the Calvert amendment, much was to do with the question of poor districts. I understand that, and I can well understand that. My district is 91 miles long and only 3 miles wide, but I think that it is not too much to say if we want to be able to take campaign finance away from K Street and back to Main Street with our own districts that we should be able to do so.

We have found here, as incumbents and long-term incumbents such as me, we have found that it is so easy to raise money here in Washington that we are tempted to do so instead of going home and raising money in our own State, campaign in our own districts and our own States. And I think that if we are really going to be talking about campaign finance reform, me and all the incumbents who have found it so easy over the years to raise money here in Washington should be able to be required to say, hey, money is the mother milk of politics today. We should be able to require ourselves and anyone else running for office in a Federal election to be able to go home to their home State and raise half of their money.

This is not too much to ask. I think it is a very, very reasonable amendment. I cannot see how anybody could possibly oppose it. And if someone could come up here and say to me that I have got a good reason to say this is bad, this should not be, I would yield them the time.

I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) who is standing there and all the gentlemen over there who are going to jump up and talk about a poison pill, if they can tell me how this is bad, I would yield them the time.

Does anybody want me to yield time because they can criticize the amendment? Or do they want to criticize it because it is a poison pill?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my argument against it, and then after I use the rest of the gentleman's time, I will ask for the time in opposition.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is going to criticize the amendment and come out and say this amendment is bad, and we go back a long time, but I do not think the gentleman would do that.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I would stay on the merits of the argument, if the gentleman would continue to yield.

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very, very difficult concept to administer, and let me give my colleagues some examples as to how difficult it would be.

If a Member is from Kansas City, Missouri, this places a much higher value on funds they would raise in St. Louis than in Kansas City, Kansas. In other words, if Members are one of those people on the borders of the State—

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman.

That cannot possibly be on the merits. If Members are from Kansas City, then they have got to decide which side of the border they are from, and then they should decide where they are running from, where their support should come from, who the people are that they are representing and bring this back closer to the people.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I was beginning to point out in my colloquy with my friend from Florida the unworkability of this amendment but also the fact that it is an artificial barrier. We ought to be focusing on the region that the individual comes from, for example, and why would not people who come from Kansas City, Missouri, have the same interests that people two miles away in the other State have on issues of importance to the region, to its economy, to its employers, to its workers?

This sets an artificial standard. For example, Members may have hundreds of bus drivers who want to support them in their district and in their State, but their home office where their PAC is located may be States away. This would mean that those people would, in effect, not be counted as people from their State. The same would be true of a corporate PAC that is home based at corporate headquarters hundreds of miles, thousands of miles away from where many of its workers are located in a plant in their district. They would not be counted as part of the in-State or in-district contributor base.

The marketplace of political debate should determine whether it is appropriate or not to raise money from any given place or individual. This can be an issue in a campaign. If Members are surviving only on the basis of Washington money or out-of-State money, it is a legitimate issue to be brought up. But to establish this standard is an artificial one, particularly difficult for Members who come from poor and small States, areas where it is hard to raise money and yet they have many legitimate issues they want to bring to the attention of their voters.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND).

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for bringing up the issue, and I think the issue that he is talking about is important and pertinent for States like Florida or California or New York.

But I come from Rhode Island. Rhode Island has a total of a million people in the State, only two congressional districts. I can travel 20 minutes from the center of my district and be in the State of Connecticut, travel about a half hour and be into Massachusetts.

For us in small States like Rhode Island this is an extremely difficult kind of amendment that would be imposed upon us. Not that the people in Rhode Island should not deserve representation and contribute to campaigns, to those people they want to have represent them, but for many people in Rhode Island and other small States like Delaware it becomes virtually impossible to raise that kind of money for a congressional campaign.

Secondly, for people that may be low income or minority in my State or other small States, they often connect with other people from other States that happen to be of the same ethnic background or same political direction, and it becomes very important for them to do that.

This bill, if every State were the size of the State of Florida, I could understand the gentleman's point. If everybody were centered in the middle of a large State, I could understand his point. But for a very small State it becomes almost impossible.

The second point that the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) made which is critical:

People within labor or business or advocacy groups that happen to be located in my State but their home or major office is someplace else, in Washington, New York, California or Texas, the funds that they use to support candidates in Rhode Island go to those Washington, Texas or California offices, then come back to us. They would not fall into the category within the confines of the gentleman's amendment, again hurting small States and low-income areas.

So I can sympathize with the intent of trying to keep the money within the area that Members represent, and when there is 30 seats, or 26 seats, or 52 seats in the Congress from one State, that is possible. But when there is only one or two seats, like Rhode Island, South Dakota, North Dakota, Delaware, it becomes very impossible.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say this is an important effort in Shays-Meehan to stop the explosion of soft money and sham issue ads. It does not deal with many of the other issues that have been brought up in other campaign finance reform bills. It is a carefully crafted and balanced proposal, and many people who support it do not agree with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and therefore, regrettably for him, would oppose the overall bill were this amendment to be adopted.

So I hate to say it, but it is, in fact, the proverbial poison pill. It would cause the coalition to shatter and end up destroying what chance we have in this late hour in this Congress to take some fundamental steps forward, not perhaps addressing all of the issues that all the Members would like to have before us but making a real difference in the electoral process and in the restoration of confidence in the American political system.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would briefly say in rebuttal to the gentleman I think what we are talking is trying to bring balance back to the American political system, and to stand there and argue that PACs may have some problem with this particular amendment is not a very good argument.

What we are talking about, Mr. Chairman, is trying to bring the political system back to the people that we represent. Now to bring it back to just their congressional district creates a problem, and we understand that problem because there are some districts that are extremely poor. But to say that we cannot bring it back to a State, I do not think that we have any States that are that poor that they cannot support the people that they send up here to represent them.

We think this is terribly important, Mr. Chairman, and I think that for us to turn our backs on the people that we represent and say that we are going to vote against this particular amendment, which just simply says to take back the political system back to the States, back to the people who have sent us here, it is very important and vital for us to remember where we came from and remember the people that sent us here.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman designate which amendment? Is it amendment number 38?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of the RECORD, this would be the original amendment listed as 39. I will not be officially offering it this evening. It has to do with the constitutional amendment to overturn Buckley versus Valeo, which I think is the real answer to these questions. But we will be moving on to Amendment 39.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman wish to offer Amendment No. 38?

Ms. KAPTUR. Not at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 39 offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KAPTUR to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE _____—ETHICS IN FOREIGN LOBBYING

SEC. _____01. PROHIBITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES BY MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES OR SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUNDS SPONSORED BY FOREIGN-CONTROLLED CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“PROHIBITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES BY MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES SPONSORED BY FOREIGN-CONTROLLED CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

“SEC. 323. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(1) no multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund of a foreign-controlled corporation may make any contribution or expenditure with respect to an election for Federal office; and

“(2) no multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund of a trade organization, membership organization, cooperative, or corporation without capital stock may make any contribution or expenditure with respect to an election for Federal office if 50 percent or more of the operating fund of the trade organization, membership organization, cooperative, or corporation without capital stock is supplied by foreign-controlled corporations or foreign nationals.

“(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED.—The Commission shall—

“(1) require each multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund of a corporation to include in the statement of organization of the multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund a statement (to be updated annually and at any time when the percentage goes above or below 50 percent) of the percentage of ownership interest in the corporation that is controlled by persons other than citizens or nationals of the United States;

“(2) require each trade association, membership organization, cooperative, or corporation without capital stock to include in its statement of organization of the multicandidate political committee or separate segregated fund (and update annually) the percentage of its operating fund that is derived from foreign-owned corporations and foreign nationals; and

“(3) take such action as may be necessary to enforce subsection (a).

“(c) LIST OF ENTITIES FILING REPORTS.—The Commission shall maintain a list of the identity of the multicandidate political committees or separate segregated funds that file reports under subsection (b), including a statement of the amounts and percentage reported by such multicandidate political committees or separate segregated funds.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

“(1) the term ‘foreign-owned corporation’ means a corporation at least 50 percent of the ownership interest of which is controlled by persons other than citizens or nationals of the United States;

“(2) the term ‘multicandidate political committee’ has the meaning given that term in section 315(a)(4);

“(3) the term ‘separate segregated fund’ means a separate segregated fund referred to in section 316(b)(2)(C); and

“(4) the term ‘foreign national’ has the meaning given that term in section 319.”

SEC. _____02. PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN ELECTION-RELATED ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN NATIONALS.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) A foreign national shall not direct, dictate, control, or directly or indirectly participate in the decisionmaking process of any person, such as a corporation, labor organization, or political committee, with regard to such person’s Federal or non-Federal election-related activities, such as decisions

concerning the making of contributions or expenditures in connection with elections for any local, State, or Federal office or decisions concerning the administration of a political committee.”

SEC. _____03. ESTABLISHMENT OF A CLEARINGHOUSE OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES INFORMATION WITHIN THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be established within the Federal Election Commission a clearinghouse of public information regarding the political activities of foreign principals and agents of foreign principals. The information comprising this clearinghouse shall include only the following:

(1) All registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(2) All registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), during the preceding 5-year period.

(3) The listings of public hearings, hearing witnesses, and witness affiliations printed in the Congressional Record during the preceding 5-year period.

(4) Public information disclosed pursuant to the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives regarding honoraria, the receipt of gifts, travel, and earned and unearned income.

(5) All reports filed pursuant to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(6) All public information filed with the Federal Election Commission pursuant to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF OTHER INFORMATION PROHIBITED.—The disclosure by the clearinghouse, or any officer or employee thereof, of any information other than that set forth in subsection (a) is prohibited, except as otherwise provided by law.

(c) DIRECTOR OF CLEARINGHOUSE.—(1) The clearinghouse shall have a Director, who shall administer and manage the responsibilities and all activities of the clearinghouse.

(2) The Director shall be appointed by the Federal Election Commission.

(3) The Director shall serve a single term of a period of time determined by the Commission, but not to exceed 5 years.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to conduct the activities of the clearinghouse.

SEC. _____04. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Director of the clearinghouse established under section _____03—

(1) to develop a filing, coding, and cross-indexing system to carry out the purposes of this Act (which shall include an index of all persons identified in the reports, registrations, and other information comprising the clearinghouse);

(2) notwithstanding any other provision of law, to make copies of registrations, reports, and other information comprising the clearinghouse available for public inspection and copying, beginning not later than 30 days after the information is first available to the public, and to permit copying of any such registration, report, or other information by hand or by copying machine or, at the request of any person, to furnish a copy of any such registration, report, or other information upon payment of the cost of making and

furnishing such copy, except that no information contained in such registration or report and no such other information shall be sold or used by any person for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for any profit-making purpose;

(3) to compile and summarize, for each calendar quarter, the information contained in such registrations, reports, and other information comprising the clearinghouse in a manner which facilitates the disclosure of political activities, including, but not limited to, information on—

(A) political activities pertaining to issues before the Congress and issues before the executive branch; and

(B) the political activities of individuals, organizations, foreign principals, and agents of foreign principals who share an economic, business, or other common interest;

(4) to make the information compiled and summarized under paragraph (3) available to the public within 30 days after the close of each calendar quarter, and to publish such information in the Federal Register at the earliest practicable opportunity;

(5) not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and at any time thereafter, to prescribe, in consultation with the Comptroller General, such rules, regulations, and forms, in conformity with the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of section 03 and this section in the most effective and efficient manner; and

(6) at the request of any Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, to prepare and submit to such Member a study or report relating to the political activities of any person and consisting only of the information in the registrations, reports, and other information comprising the clearinghouse.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—
 (1) the terms “foreign principal” and “agent of a foreign principal” have the meanings given those terms in section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611);

(2) the term “issue before the Congress” means the total of all matters, both substantive and procedural, relating to—

(A) any pending or proposed bill, resolution, report, nomination, treaty, hearing, investigation, or other similar matter in either the Senate or the House of Representatives or any committee or office of the Congress; or

(B) any pending action by a Member, officer, or employee of the Congress to affect, or attempt to affect, any action or proposed action by any officer or employee of the executive branch; and

(3) the term “issue before the executive branch” means the total of all matters, both substantive and procedural, relating to any pending action by any executive agency, or by any officer or employee of the executive branch, concerning—

(A) any pending or proposed rule, rule of practice, adjudication, regulation, determination, hearing, investigation, contract, grant, license, negotiation, or the appointment of officers and employees, other than appointments in the competitive service; or
 (B) any issue before the Congress.

SEC. 05. PENALTIES FOR DISCLOSURE.

Any person who discloses information in violation of section 03(b), and any person who sells or uses information for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for any profit-making purpose in violation of section 04(a)(2), shall be imprisoned for a period of not more than 1 year, or fined in the

amount provided in title 18, United States Code, or both.

SEC. 06. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED.

(a) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Section 2(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 612(b)), is amended in the first sentence by striking out “, within thirty days” and all that follows through “preceding six months’ period” and inserting in lieu thereof “on January 31, April 30, July 31, and October 31 of each year, file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth regarding the three-month periods ending the previous December 31, March 31, June 30, and September 30, respectively, or if a lesser period, the period since the initial filing.”

(b) EXEMPTION FOR LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—Section 3(g) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 613(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “A person may be exempt under this subsection only upon filing with the Attorney General a request for such exemption.”

(c) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 8 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 618), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“(1) Any person who is determined, after notice and opportunity for an administrative hearing—

“(A) to have failed to file a registration statement under section 2(a) or a supplement thereto under section 2(b),

“(B) to have omitted a material fact required to be stated therein, or

“(C) to have made a false statement with respect to such a material fact, shall be required to pay a civil penalty in an amount not less than \$2,000 or more than \$5,000 for each violation committed. In determining the amount of the penalty, the Attorney General shall give due consideration to the nature and duration of the violation.

“(2)(A) In conducting investigations and hearings under paragraph (1), administrative law judges may, if necessary, compel by subpoena the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence at any designated place or hearing.

“(B) In the case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena lawfully issued under this paragraph and, upon application by the Attorney General, an appropriate district court of the United States may issue an order requiring compliance with such subpoena and any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.”

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, could I claim the 5 minutes in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has claimed the time in opposition and will be recognized later for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

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

Mr. Chairman, historically, Congress has been very clear about disallowing foreign contributions to U.S. cam-

paigns at every level, and if we look, however, at the foreign lobbying activities that have grown, especially in this past quarter century, and the organization of multinational corporations that have in many ways outgrown existing law, it is clear that an amendment like this is needed and, as originally proposed, my amendment sought to both clarify the definition as well as the disclosure by foreign-controlled political action contributions to U.S. election campaigns.

□ 2300

But I am going to offer a modified version of this after considerable consultation with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and others on the other side of the aisle and this one.

But it is certainly true to say that U.S. law has been abundantly clear about who can contribute to U.S. campaigns: citizens of this country as individuals and citizens through political action committees expressly organized for that purpose. But corporations cannot contribute directly, nor can trade unions outside of a formally recognized political action committee.

But because of a loophole dating back to 1934, while foreign nationals and foreign citizens cannot directly or indirectly contribute to U.S. elections, foreign-controlled corporations and trade associations, including those based in the United States, can contribute.

The Federal Election Campaign Act, section 441(e) says, and I quote,

A foreign national shall not directly or through any other person make a contribution or expressly or implicitly promise to make a contribution in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office or for any person to solicit, accept, or receive any such contribution from a foreign national.

The Federal Elections Act defines a foreign principal as a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party; a person outside the United States who is not a citizen; or a partnership, association, corporation, or organization, or other combination of persons organized under the laws of or having its principal base of business in a foreign country.

The loophole in all of that is that foreign-owned corporations and trade associations which are organized under U.S. law and have their principal place of business in the United States are not classified as foreign principals and are, therefore, allowed to operate PACs, even though their control and ownership are foreign in nature.

The principal law governing the disclosure of lobbying by these entities, the Foreign Agents Registration Act, when the GAO studied in 1990 what had

been happening, it is that, in fact, disclosure of those activities are very thin.

The GAO found that the lack of timeliness of the filing of reports required under the Foreign Agents Registration Act contributes to the failure to fulfill the Act's goal of providing the public with sufficient information on foreign agents and their activities in this country, including political activities.

As modified, my amendment will not disallow contributions as I had hoped to do in a bill that I had filed earlier, because, frankly, there was opposition to doing that. But it does take the one section of our proposal that will allow us to at least collect the information that we need to understand the impact and the extent of these involvements.

As presently constituted, my amendment would establish within the Federal Election Commission a clearinghouse on that of public information regarding the political activities of foreign principals or their agents.

Currently, public information on these activities is collected by the government in scattered ways. But this information would be brought together in one place and provide the public and Congress a better idea of what is actually going on in regard to foreign lobbying and giving activity.

No one will be required to provide any information that is not already collected but in several disparate places. Nor would anyone be required to provide duplicative information to a new agency.

The responsibility for furnishing the data to the FEC would rest with the agency itself. The clearinghouse will only collect public information already compiled and will provide a comprehensive picture of what political activities are taking place by these foreign interests.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute in the form at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Ms. KAPTUR to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. ESTABLISHMENT OF A CLEARINGHOUSE OF INFORMATION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be established within the Federal Election Commission a clearinghouse of public information regarding the political activities of foreign principals and agents of foreign principals.

The information comprising this clearinghouse shall include only the following:

(1) All registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(2) All registrations and reports filed pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), during the preceding 5-year period.

(3) The listings of public hearings, hearing witnesses, and witness affiliations printed in the Congressional Record during the preceding 5-year period.

(4) Public information disclosed pursuant to the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives regarding honoraria, the receipt of gifts, travel, and earned and unearned income.

(5) All reports filed pursuant to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(6) All public information filed with the Federal Election Commission pursuant to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) during the preceding 5-year period.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF OTHER INFORMATION PROHIBITED.—The disclosure by the clearinghouse, or any officer or employee thereof, of any information other than that set forth in subsection (a) is prohibited, except as otherwise provided by law.

(c) DIRECTOR OF CLEARINGHOUSE.—

(1) DUTIES.—The clearinghouse shall have a Director, who shall administer and manage the responsibilities and all activities of the clearinghouse. In carrying out such duties, the Director shall—

(A) develop a filing, coding, and cross-indexing system to carry out the purposes of this section (which shall include an index of all persons identified in the reports, registrations, and other information comprising the clearinghouse);

(B) notwithstanding any other provision of law, make copies of registrations, reports, and other information comprising the clearinghouse available for public inspection and copying, beginning not later than 30 days after the information is first available to the public, and permit copying of any such registration, report, or other information by hand or by copying machine or, at the request of any person, furnish a copy of any such registration, report, or other information upon payment of the cost of making and furnishing such copy, except that no information contained in such registration or report and no such other information shall be sold or used by any person for the purpose of soliciting contributions or for any profit-making purpose; and

(C) not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and at any time thereafter, to prescribe, in consultation with the Comptroller General, such rules, regulations, and forms, in conformity with the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section in the most effective and efficient manner.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Director shall be appointed by the Federal Election Commission.

(3) TERM OF SERVICE.—The Director shall serve a single term of a period of time determined by the Commission, but not to exceed 5 years.

(d) PENALTIES FOR DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—Any person who discloses information in violation of subsection (b), and any person who sells or uses information for the purpose

of soliciting contributions or for any profit-making purpose in violation of subsection (c)(1)(B), shall be imprisoned for a period of not more than 1 year, or fined in the amount provided in title 18, United States Code, or both.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to conduct the activities of the clearinghouse.

(f) Foreign Principal: Foreign principal shall have the same meaning given the term "foreign national" in this section (2 U.S.C. 441e), as that term was defined on July 31, 1998. For purpose of this section, the term "agent of a foreign principal" shall not include any person organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and that has its principal place of business within the United States.

Ms. KAPTUR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modification be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to state that, first, this is a fairly comprehensive amendment, but we are not sure whether or not it is in conflict with the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR).

So what I am going to be suggesting to this Chamber is that we have a vote. I will be voting "no" tonight. I will be suggesting that we go over in depth line by line the gentlewoman's amendment to see if it is an amendment that, when we have an actual rollcall vote, it will be one that we can accept or not. Because the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) is not here tonight, I am uncomfortable in suggesting that it meets the conflict that he had.

The bottom line is that his amendment said that any American citizen had a right to contribute. That was implicit, and that was whether or not they worked for an American company or a foreign company.

Our concern is that a company like, for instance, Chrysler, that now has significant ownership by German interests, that the employee still be allowed to organize a political action committee, still be allowed to contribute, still be allowed to fight for things they think are important for Chrysler and its workers just as the employees of Chrysler, to make sure that we have that same process that the workers have when they organize as well.

I am not passing judgment because we still just are not sure of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that in my home State of

New York nearly 349,000 American citizens work for American subsidiaries of companies headquartered abroad. These are hard-working Americans that are employed by American subsidiaries of companies; and they, I believe, need to have the right to contribute their own money to candidates through employer-based PACs. It is a political right that is granted to all American citizens at this time.

Because we are not certain at this time about whether or not this amendment will change the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR), I want to be certain that we have the right to vote on this tomorrow since the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) is not here.

I believe that the political rights of all Americans should not be determined by where they work. I think it should be determined because they are American citizens. They should not be disenfranchised from the political process.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has no time remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, evidently, I have misinterpreted the gentlewoman's amendment. I would like for her to describe what she thinks her amendment does, and I would respond to that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to explain what she feels her amendment does and does not do.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me and the gentlewoman from New York, because, in consultation with both of them, we substantially scaled back our original amendment. This particular amendment, as modified, that we are offering this evening would only take the clearinghouse section out of the original proposal to collect information from the lobbying disclosure.

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, when the gentlewoman says take it out she means she leaves the clearinghouse in and take out the other parts?

Ms. KAPTUR. That is correct. We lift that out and we table the remainder of the bill.

The gentleman was saying and the gentlewoman from New York was saying that Chrysler Corporation employees could not contribute or people should not be allowed to contribute. We agree that U.S. citizens should be allowed to contribute. This amendment, as modified, has nothing to do with that. All it provides is for disclosure as we do with U.S. contributions

that are currently flowing into campaigns.

We are saying that we want to create a clearinghouse at the FEC for all these donations. We will do that by recording existing information from the Lobbying Disclosure Act, from the Foreign Agents Administration.

Mr. SHAYS. If I can reclaim my time, if I can say to the gentlewoman, as the amendment is described, I am comfortable and I think other Members are. I do think it will be healthy to have a vote on this tomorrow. I am not going to oppose it if there is all yeses. I still ask for a rollcall vote. I think it is important for us to sit down with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and others and make sure that we are clear as to our recommended vote to our colleagues when they vote on the floor.

□ 2310

So I am not going to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. I would suggest we get to a vote, but I will ask for a rollcall vote.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and gentlewoman for working with us, and we look forward to having the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) with us very soon here in resolving this.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, we will have a vote on the floor here tomorrow and by then it will be resolved.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS). Is there a designee for Mr. SMITH?

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in

the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 is as follows:

Amendment No. 47 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS):

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9003) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) PROHIBITING CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE LIMITS.—

“(1) VIOLATION OF LIMITS DESCRIBED.—If a candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President who receives amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund under chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or the agent of such a candidate, seeks to avoid the spending limits applicable to the candidate under such chapter or under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 by soliciting, receiving, transferring, or directing funds from any source other than such Fund for the direct or indirect benefit of such candidate's campaign, such candidate or agent shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000, or imprisoned for a term of not more than 3 years, or both.

“(2) CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE LIMITS DEFINED.—If two or more persons conspire to violate paragraph (1), and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000, or imprisoned for a term of not more than 3 years, or both.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment because I think after the debate that I had concerning legal aliens, there was some question that came up, and I thought I should attempt to amend, offer an amendment tonight. It sort of rectifies a problem that was raised by the gentleman from Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

During the debate a couple of weeks ago, this amendment that I sponsored and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) sponsored, both of them passed overwhelmingly. But there was something that was in both his amendment and mine that concerned me a bit. My amendment banned all political contributions from Federal, State or local elections from

noncitizens, which included resident aliens.

But I realized, Mr. Chairman, during the debate that the gentleman from Samoa had a very valid point about resident aliens who are serving in the military. Such permanent residents may be drafted, as they were in Vietnam and other military actions.

So what I am trying to do tonight is to say okay, if one is serving in the military, I think one should be able to participate.

So frankly, this amendment seeks to rectify the situation with resident aliens who serve in the U.S. military, which includes the reserves.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, does this make them permanent in their status if they served and then leave the service, or do they lose their right to vote after they have left military service?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if they are in the service for 3 years, they automatically become U.S. citizens.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, so in other words, at that point the issue goes away.

Mr. STEARNS. No, Mr. Chairman, but if during that period for 1 or 2 years they are serving in the military, we are saying we will allow them to contribute.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, as I remember the gentleman's comments from that earlier debate, he was also talking about people who were taxpayers, as many legal residents are, who are not citizens.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not remember what I said about taxpayers, other than that I felt that non-U.S. citizens should not be participating, but I think after talking to the gentleman from Samoa, I think if they served in the military or are presently serving in the military, then I think that one should have a chance to vote on this.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I certainly do not oppose this. I think it makes a bad proposal less bad, but I understand that the gentleman has the votes on his side, so I certainly will not oppose it. In fact, I encourage him to offer it.

But I do think that when we begin to think about those things that cause us to recognize the contributions of legal residents, we should not just stop with military service; we should think of all of the things they do, including contributing in many other ways, as well as being taxpayers.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the amendment is pretty simple and it will pass overwhelmingly. I think my good

friend from Samoa had made a good point, so I am here really to recognize his point and to try to bridge the gap with the two amendments that passed, and I think that is pretty much my argument tonight.

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, really it is a point of clarification, and I would like to yield to the gentleman.

Regarding those that have served in the military, am I to understand that not only those that are presently serving in the military and those that have served 3 years and are out of the military, what about those people who have served a year-and-a-half, 2 years, and perhaps have not reached the 3-year period of time?

Is the gentleman saying that anyone who has served, that is a resident, could contribute to a campaign?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if they are serving in the military.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, presently serving?

Mr. STEARNS. Presently serving, yes.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, so that if they have served in Vietnam, in Desert Storm, if they have done that, but they are now out of the military, they are not eligible?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's effort to try to make some amends, but it would seem to me that whether one is serving presently or one has served in Vietnam and one has provided that service to this country, the motivation for the gentleman's amendment would be indeed to provide some kind of an allowance for someone to contribute to a campaign by way of serving in the military, and I would think if anyone served 5 years ago, 10 years ago or 20 years ago, they would be eligible for the same merits that the gentleman is giving to the people who are presently serving in the military.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, of course, if they served 3 years, then they automatically become U.S. citizens. So we are trying to bridge here a little bit of support.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand what the gentleman is saying, but if someone had served only a year-and-a-half,

who was injured and was discharged from the military because of injury or something else and does not qualify for that 3-year citizenship that the gentleman is talking about, and therefore, in that case, may be still not an American citizen, but have served valiantly for this country, perhaps even given part of their body for this country, would now be eligible to contribute to a campaign.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can certainly offer an amendment to change what we have passed here on the House floor, but I think this amendment goes a long way and probably will receive a majority of support.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment that would allow for someone who has served in the military, been discharged, to be eligible for this benefit of contributing to a campaign?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, probably not, just because I am just going to keep this amendment as it stands, but I think certainly the gentleman could offer his own amendment.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague makes a very valid point. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. Clearly, a member of the Armed Forces or the Armed Forces Reserves should have the right to contribute to a Federal election. Yet I would remind the gentleman that all legal permanent residents have the right to contribute in Federal campaigns, according to the United States Supreme Court.

With this amendment, it seems to me the gentleman is making a value judgment that legal permanent residents who served in the Armed Forces are worthy of first amendment protection because they laid down their lives for this country. But how about those legal permanent residents who are doctors? They save American lives every day. Or how about the legal permanent residents who are the parents of those young men and women who have lost their lives fighting for our country? Should they not also be given the full protection of the first amendment?

I do not object to the gentleman's amendment, but I do want to point out the arbitrary nature of this particular exclusion. This amendment is only necessary because the gentleman, rightly, perceives the inequities of a flat-out ban. The problem is, I could think of

many worthy exemptions and exceptions.

There are so many ways that legal permanent residents prove their allegiance to this government and to the United States. Serving in the Armed Forces is only one example. But I certainly would accept the gentleman's amendment, but I think it is important to point out the injustice of just picking out one small group.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield to gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman I just have a question of how the gentleman would manage this, if the author would so indulge. One is a legal resident of the United States, one is here, the law says one is here.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, a permanent legal alien, not a U.S. citizen.

□ 2320

Mr. FARR of California. The gentleman is going to check all of this? They are legally here. We do not go around every day trying to check whether someone is here legally. I mean, if they are here legally, they are here legally; right?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the gentleman's argument.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the argument is how does the gentleman intend to enforce this amendment he is making? How do we enforce it? How do we check from campaign contributions? How do we go back to check whether the people are permanent residents, served in the Armed Forces? I mean, just look at the mountain of incredible research that we are going to have to do on everyone.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I do not think it will be hard to do that, because we have Social Security numbers and we could tell quickly and easily who was in the service.

Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Weygand), he wants to go back to the old argument that some wish to allow legal permanent aliens to contribute, has already been decided. We had a vote; 350 Members voted to do that. And now we have had two other votes, my vote and the vote on the Fossella amendment. In three cases now we have decided that legal permanent aliens should not contribute.

So my point is that I think it is easy to identify. And I think this is a step to try and really help the gentleman's cause by saying instead of ruling out all of them, let the people who are actually serving in the military less than 3 years have an opportunity to do so.

And I am surprised that the other side objects to giving the military people an opportunity to contribute.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment No. 48 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 48 offered by Mr. STEARNS to the amendment in the nature a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. PERMITTING PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441e) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, an individual who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act) and who is a member of the Armed Forces (including a reserve component of the Armed Forces) shall not be subject to the prohibition under this section."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment and the next one are generally just a little bit more clarification. This one goes to the fact that in presidential campaigns, oftentimes the folks who are running for office intentionally, per-

haps not realizing it or perhaps they do, intentionally violate campaign spending limits.

So what I try to do in this amendment is to impose criminal penalties. My amendment would immediately close the current loop that I believe has been exploited under the law, which is the Federal Election Campaign Act. There are strict limitations and restrictions on presidential candidates who voluntarily accept, decide to receive public financing for their campaigns. The fundamental tenet of this law is that presidential candidates are eligible to receive funding if they comply with expenditure limits and other restrictions imposed by law.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment attempts to strengthen the law by ensuring that the presidential and vice presidential candidates do not try to evade the limits and restriction under the law by intentionally trying to circumvent these rules.

Of course, the reason, Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment is that I think myself and others were greatly troubled by the evidence that the Federal Elections Campaign Act was intentionally violated. I think this came out in the hearings in the Senate Committee on Government Affairs when they investigated campaign finance abuses in 1997.

The committee underlined the purpose of the law by reporting, quote "Under FECA, a presidential candidate who accepts Federal matching funds cannot exceed the applicable expenditure limits for the campaign." The intent of this, of course, in providing limited Federal funding is to remove the candidate from the fund-raising process and to prevent the raising of large private contributions.

The deal the taxpayers make with the candidate is that in exchange for their funding, the candidate will fore-swear outside money and therefore make it less likely that the election will be influenced or appear to be influenced by big money.

Now the Senate Committee on Government Affairs found a great deal in their report. And, of course, the White House was cited several times. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to report what the committee said.

During the 1996 election cycle, the White House was very close to the DNC and they tried to micromanage it. Harold Ickes, then Deputy Chief of Staff to the President, simply seized the reins of financial power and went about exerting direct control over the DNC's finance division.

Now, this is the type of thing we are trying to stop. I will not go through and read a lot of the testimony in there, because I am not here to point fingers at one side or the other. I am just trying to convince my colleagues of the need to put in place the penalties in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think in short, though, most of us would agree that there were some evidence of collusion here. The purpose of our amendment here is to prevent this. The committee concluded that, "In the matter before us, the clear purpose of the law was circumvented." I mean, that is what they said. That is why I believe we need to protect the Federal Election Campaign Act.

We cannot allow the limits and restrictions in the law to be circumvented while candidates receiving public financing abuse the system in order to gain advantage over their opponent.

So in a sense what we tried to do is do the following: By putting in place that if a candidate or agent seeks to avoid the limits and restrictions by soliciting, receiving, transferring, or directing funds from any source other than the presidential election campaign fund for the direct or indirect benefit of such candidate's campaign, then the candidate, Mr. Chairman, or the agent shall be fined not more than \$1 million or imprisoned for a term of not more than 3 years, or both.

So in essence, Mr. Chairman, what I have done is put in a penalty. I think that we have had the history of this, so I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take the time reserved for anyone opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MEEHAN. No, but I would ask to take the time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this would ban any presidential or vice presidential candidate who receives public funding from raising soft money. While we support the gentleman's position, this amendment is really unnecessary in the context of the Shays-Meehan bill.

Not only does the Shays-Meehan bill ban soft money in Federal elections, but the Shays-Meehan bill expressly prohibits Federal candidates, office holders, and agents of Federal candidates and office holders from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring or spending soft money on behalf of any other Federal candidates or office holders.

So, the Shays-Meehan bill takes care of exactly what the problems were in the last presidential election on both sides and both parties.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, he had an amendment pass just now. We are going to vote tomorrow. And this amendment I think we are going to agree to. And so certainly the gentleman from Florida, my friend from Florida is getting his amendments passed. Does this mean the gentleman is going to support and join the majority of Members here and support us in passing the Shays-Meehan bill that has such strong bipartisan support? Which, by the way, I have to say in all of the years we have been working on campaign finance reform, my colleague cannot look at any evening and have witnessed any more broad-based, incredible success and support for our legislation than this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the gentleman has decided to join us in our efforts.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, there are a lot more amendments to come. Also, several amendments I voted for today were defeated. I think the Goodlatte amendment is a good example.

So I think this campaign finance bill is still in doubt. I think there are lots of areas that need to be improved, and frankly we have other substitutes and other bills that are going to be offered that I think we should look at.

I think it is premature to talk about that. I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that I think what he has to worry about is the executive branch micromanaging either the DNC, or either party.

□ 2330

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what we on this side and both sides who are fighting for campaign finance reform, what we have to worry about is making sure we get as many votes as we can. I am delighted that we are going to accept a couple of your amendments, but I just want to illustrate the point that ultimately you are not going to support our bill, which is unfortunate. But I will point out, this evening we had several historic votes, broad bipartisan support to defeat poison pill amendments.

I am encouraged, I think my colleagues who are here are encouraged with the tremendous support. We look forward to dealing tomorrow with the remaining amendments and voting yes on those amendments that we are accepting and voting no on those amendments which would destroy the unique and historic bipartisan coalition that we have in support of our legislation.

I look forward to getting through the amendments this evening. We are moving along slowly but surely. I am delighted at how well things are going this evening.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Judging from the information given by my colleague, I assume he is supporting my amendment. I think that the idea of putting penalties in place is important. I think the whole idea of the executive branch micromanaging any other area of the campaign financing operations is what we are trying to prevent. I would say to my colleague that I appreciate his support.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 49 offered by Mr. STEARNS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. ENFORCEMENT OF SPENDING LIMIT ON PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES WHO RECEIVE PUBLIC FINANCING.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9003) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) ILLEGAL SOLICITATION OF SOFT MONEY.—No candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President may receive amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund under this chapter or chapter 96 unless the candidate certifies that the candidate shall not solicit any funds for the purposes of influencing such election, including any funds used for an independent expenditure under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

This amendment is similar to the other one except we ask that candidates certify their intent. Let me just read a portion of this so we can clarify it:

No candidate for election to the office of President or Vice President may receive amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund unless the candidate certifies that the candidate shall not solicit any funds for the purpose of influencing such election, including any funds used for an independent expenditure, unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions and reporting requirements under the law.

The reason I offer this amendment, of course, is that, again, some of the testimony in the Senate hearing that brought forth the clear intent. And so we need to establish that a candidate for President and Vice President will certify that they are going to comply and that they have a full understanding so that they cannot use rigorous, specious logic to say they were not aware.

There was a lot of testimony that came out from Dick Morris, which I have here, and I will, Mr. Chairman, include Dick Morris's testimony as a part of the RECORD so I do not have to read the whole thing.

I just would like to summarize some of the things that he testified to that committee and that is why I think the certification is required.

The President reviewed and modified and approved all advertising copy, reviewed and adjusted and approved media time buys, reviewed and modified polling questions, received briefings on and analyzed polling results.

So the President had significant involvement with the DNC media consultants in the area of polling, advertising, speech writing, legislation strategy and general policy advice.

I think that is, frankly, what the Shays-Meehan bill is trying to prevent. I am hopeful that my colleagues will support this amendment and ask that the candidates who do run for President and Vice President will certify so that they have a full understanding before they go into this what their roles will be.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I think we can support this amendment, although I was a little concerned when you indicated you are going to read into the RECORD some of Dick Morris' words. It makes me a little nervous as to whether or not we really support the amendment.

Everything sounded great until we got to that. I get a little concerned about which statements from Dick Morris were going to be read into the RECORD, but, in any event, we generally support the amendment.

I think that the Shays-Meehan legislation addresses precisely the matter that you are concerned about. I do not know that it does address matters that Dick Morris may be concerned about, but in any event we are delighted to accept the amendment, notwithstanding the statements of Mr. Morris that have been submitted into the RECORD.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the reason I mentioned Dick Morris was just to give an example of what occurred, and I think the folks realize that he was the principal advisor to the President and basically they started running these ads that were constantly lauding the President all around the country and his record and running specific issue ads, and the problem was funding those ads.

So I am not categorically going after Mr. Morris or anybody but other than to say this is a clear example of what the committee on the Senate was talking about, which we need to prevent.

The problem of funding these ads got very difficult and where they got the money is where they started to get into the micromanaging. So putting this in the record is important to establish a reason why you support this amendment and why I support this amendment.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes some very good points. I have no idea why the President ever hired Dick Morris to begin with. After so many Republican campaigns, I have no idea why he did hire him. I think when the history books are written, the President will regret ever having hired him.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think Congress needs to strengthen the law by preventing the type of activity that Dick Morris mentioned in his testimony. This type of abuse should be prevented from ever happening again in presidential campaigns, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The infamous Dick Morris testified to the Committee that,

The President had significant involvement with the DNC media consultants in the areas

of polling, advertising, speech-writing, legislation strategy, and general policy advice. The President: (1) reviewed, modified and approved all advertising copy; (2) reviewed, adjusted and approved media time buys; (3) reviewed and modified polling questions; and (4) received briefings on the analyzed polling results.

A significant amount of the polling work the consultants performed for the President "related to substantive issues in connection with his job as President, but is (also) could be considered political." The President wanted to keep total control over the advertising campaign designed by Morris and the DNC media consultants.

The defenders of the President will argue that this is not a violation of the letter of the law under the Federal Election Campaign Act, but this intertwined coordination between the President, his political advisors, and DNC media consultants is certainly a violation of the spirit of the law.

Congress needs to strengthen the law by preventing this type of abuse from happening again during another presidential campaign. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago when we were discussing campaign finance abuses, I spent some time on the floor talking about a system that has been developed over time by both parties, where blame really needs to go, to both parties, and change really has to come from both parties.

So I listened with some interest tonight when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) was making his comments, because my recollection is there is, in addition to investigations going on around the Clinton-Gore campaign, there is currently an investigation going on around the Dole-Kemp campaign for their micromanagement of their money and coordination of their efforts in the campaign issues.

So I think what we need to do is to go back to the very place I started several weeks ago, which is we have a campaign system that has been built by both parties that does not work anymore, that has to be changed by people on both parties.

I applaud the fact that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is now interested in soft money and very interested in making sure that some people in the system do not abuse soft money.

Those of us that are part of the reform group want to make sure that no one in the system abuses soft money, and I would invite the gentleman from Florida to join us in supporting a ban on all soft money, and then we would not have worry about whose words have to be read into the RECORD. Then we would know that no one is going to engage in the kind of behavior that we all find offensive.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just add on that, there is still a lot of room left on this Shays-Meehan bandwagon, and we would love to have you joining with us in abolishing soft money, sham issue ads, giving the FEC the teeth that they need to enforce the election laws that are on the book.

□ 2340

We are very, very proud of the Members on both sides of the aisle that have demonstrated I think this evening on a number of votes wonderful support, Republicans, Democrats, conservatives, liberals. There is still plenty of room on this bandwagon as we roll to a majority vote by the Members of this body coming early next week. We would encourage the gentleman to join with us on those votes.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 50 offered by Mr. WHITFIELD to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title I the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 104. INCREASE IN CONTRIBUTION LIMIT FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES BY PERSONS OTHER THAN PACS.

Section 315(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "\$1,000" and inserting "\$3,000".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gen-

tleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. As we conclude the debate on this important legislation, I have been very pleased with the debate that has been a long and lengthy debate and I think we have covered about every aspect of campaign finance that one can cover. The advocates for campaign finance have talked a lot about special interests. They have talked a lot about sham ads. They have talked a lot about too much money. They have talked about inadequate disclosure. We have said many times, I guess, that special interest depends on who supports you and who does not; and sham ads if you do not like it, maybe it is a sham ad. So those are valid reasons that people have for supporting this legislation.

I have told some people, and I firmly believe this, that one of the unintended consequences of this act is to protect incumbents. The amendment that I am offering is to try to help alleviate the burden that is placed on people running for Congress the first time. I think all of us know that about 80 percent of the political action committee money goes to incumbents. One thing about the Shays-Meehan bill, it does not do anything about the way candidates raise their money or spend their money. It applies only to the way other groups out in the country spend their money and participate in the political system.

This is a very simple amendment in that it increases the amount that an individual can give a candidate from \$1,000 to \$3,000. Now, this contribution limit was set in 1974. When you consider inflation, it is worth in today's dollars \$325 instead of the \$1,000 that was in 1974. But I would ask that Members give some serious thought to this, because, as I said, 80 percent of political action committee money goes to incumbents. All of us know the first time that we ran, it is very difficult to raise the money. If we can increase the amount that an individual can contribute from \$1,000 to \$3,000, I think it will go a long way in making this a more equitable system, particularly for those very few candidates, one of which may be on the floor this evening, who do not accept political action committee money. This kind of evens the playing field, and that is really my purpose in introducing this amendment.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I may be uniquely qualified to address this amendment because, as the gentleman from Kentucky knows, he and I got here together in early 1995 and within just a few weeks, I had a bill on the floor called the Wamp Congress Act

of 1995. I think the gentleman from Kentucky was probably one of my co-sponsors, which actually did in fact increase the individual contribution limit. But over the last 4 years as I have worked this body on both sides of the aisle to try to build consensus around this issue of campaign reform, knowing that there were land mines throughout the entire process and knowing that this fundamental system has not been changed since Watergate because there are too many good ways to kill it, I looked for a consensus around a few principles, and that is what we have on the floor tonight represented in Shays-Meehan. That is why I reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment. Because there is an intellectual argument to be made for the fact that an individual contribution in 1974 is actually worth about \$3,000 today, but the fact is there is not much support in this body for raising individual contribution limits, and none of us can be king for a day. If I were king for a day, I would have my own bill here and it would be much different than what we have. But this process is a process of compromise and consensus. We are looking for a majority, especially a bipartisan majority, so that we can actually accomplish something that has not been accomplished in a generation because there are too many ways to chop the legs out from underneath this particular issue, because this one issue is the issue that is at the heart of whether or not we can stay in power as Members of Congress, and that is why the oldest trick in this business is to put something on the floor and promote it, that then everybody can say, "Well, I supported that but I didn't support this, therefore, I didn't support final passage" and we never get reform.

That is why I rise today even though I did support this principle early in my career here, knowing that there is no support here for that, and we cannot add it to this bill because frankly it is one of the things that will sink the boat.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because I cannot understand what is broken and needs fixing. This amendment suggests that there is not enough money in campaigns. This whole debate, this whole process started when we tried to put limits on what candidates running for a seat in Congress would spend in campaigns. They still have that comprehensive bill on the floor. That is the way this bill started out. Nowhere were we going to try to get more money into campaigns. And just to show you that only .1 percent of the American people, about 235 individuals gave contributions of \$1,000 or more in 1995 and 1996 to Federal candidates and to PACs and parties that

support candidates. Yet this group gave as much money for Federal elections, \$638 million, as the millions who gave under \$200.

This is not the part of the campaign finance system that is broken and needs fixing, to get more money into the system. In fact, this amendment, as well-intentioned as the author may be on it, is a poison pill. It is opposed by all of those groups that advocated for campaign finance reform, including League of Women Voters, Public Citizen, Common Cause, the U.S. PIRG and others.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, because it is not going to help get the Shays-Meehan bill passed, and it is not going to help the perception of the American public that we need to have more money and bigger contributions in campaigns.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, recognizing that the gentleman from Kentucky has the right to close, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to say that Meehan-Shays does three primary things: It bans soft money, the unlimited sums of money that go from individuals, corporations, labor unions and other interest groups; it deals with the sham issue ads and calls them what they should, campaign ads; and it also has FEC enforcement and disclosure.

It does not have a lot of things. We did not deal with issues that some Members would like us to deal with, in-state, out-of-state. It does not deal with motor voter and Voter Rights Act. There are a number of things we do not do. We do not deal maybe with the need to increase PAC contributions or individual contributions but this only limits and allows individual contributions to be increased, and I would oppose it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I want to quote Justice Thurgood Marshall whom I do not think anyone could say is a very conservative judge, but in *Buckley v. Valeo* he said, "One of the points on which all Members of the Court agree is that money is essential to effective communication in a political campaign."

□ 2350

And we do live in a world where it costs a lot of money to buy TV ads, to buy newspaper ads, to buy radio ads, and I guess I am not surprised that incumbents would not support this because it would be easier for opponents to raise money if they raised the amount that an individual can give.

And we talked about the groups that supported Shays-Meehan, and one of those groups is Public Campaign that has been running newspaper ads in my district against me for the last day or two and also in the Washington Post;

and, as I said earlier, I did not particularly like it, but I think they have a right to do that. That is an issue ad in my view. I think they have a right to do that, but they really pounded me because they said, "ED WHITFIELD is trying to triple the amount of money that an individual can give," and yet I find it quite ironic that one of their largest contributors is a guy named Mr. Solls, who is one of the wealthiest men in the world. He contributes heavily to them.

So I guess that sometimes it just depends upon who gives the money, but I think that we are doing a great disservice to our political system if we prevent individuals from giving up to \$3,000 to candidates that they have confidence in, that they believe in and they want to support, particularly when they know that challengers are not going to receive political action committee money.

So I would urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS.)

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 51 offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITFIELD to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Amend section 301(20)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201(b) of the substitute, to read as follows:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'express advocacy' means a communication that advocates the election or defeat of a candidate by containing a phrase such as 'vote for', 're-elect', 'support', 'cast your ballot for', '(name of candidate) for Congress', '(name of candidate) in 1997', 'vote against', 'defeat', 'reject'."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday,

July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply defines "express advocacy" using the exact terms that the Supreme Court has used repeatedly in defining express advocacy. This issue goes to the very core, the very heart, of what this debate is about because the Shays-Meehan bill expands the definition of "express advocacy". And when we expand the definition of "express advocacy," we automatically increase the opportunities for hard money to be spent and decrease the opportunities for individuals to spend money who do not have political action committees, who have not hired lawyers to file all the reports with the FEC, and I think it is going to be a chilling effect upon the participation and the political system.

Now Shays-Meehan expands the definition in a number of ways way beyond what the Supreme Court has said. One way that they do it is they say if an ad refers to one or more clearly-identified candidates in a paid advertisement that is broadcast by a radio broadcast station or a television broadcast station within 60 calendar days preceding the date of an election of the candidate, that that is express advocacy. And in essence what they are doing here at a time when people focus on political campaigns, as we get closer to the election, people focus on it, and that is when we have groups like the Sierra Club, the Right to Life, Pro-choice, labor unions; all these groups take out ads, and they talk about voting records of candidates as you get within 60 days of an election.

Under this bill, they will not be able to run those ads unless they had raised the money under the hard money rules. In other words, they would be totally caught up in the rules of the Federal Election Commission. They would have to meet all the requirements of the Federal Election Commission, have to meet all of the limits, all of the financial disclosures. And the courts have repeatedly said that that is a very chilling effect on the participation of people in the political process, and the courts have repeatedly said that the very core of our system is to allow participation, and this definition explicitly makes it more difficult to participate.

And the thing that I find the most troubling about it in this particular section is that when we get down to the end of the campaign, the only people that are going to be talking about these campaigns are the candidates themselves, the money that they spend for our ads. Then we are going to have

political action committees, that they can buy ads, and then we are going to have the news media doing editorials on who they support.

But the mass of people out there who belong to organizations, they are not going to have much say-so unless they want to go through all of this trouble, all of this burden of forming a political action committee, raising money, hiring lawyers, filing reports and so forth.

So I am very disappointed, I am extremely disappointed, in the way they expand the definition of "express advocacy," and my amendment simply brings it down to precisely what the Supreme Court has said: a bright line test so there is no question about what is and what is not express advocacy.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the words kill. It is the spirit that giveth life. The Scriptural reference applies to this part of the bill.

My good dear friend from Kentucky has given us the words, and he says that all that may be condemned are those ads which are so explicit in using words that they qualify in his definition as express advocacy. But what about the spirit that giveth life? What about ads that, in every other meaning, affect intent, purpose, are an express advocacy ad, but they are clever enough not to use the word "vote for" or "vote against?"

This kind of abuse has been documented so many times in this debate that it is unnecessary to go too much into detail, but I refer all of my colleagues to the examples that have been raised regarding such comments as President Bill Clinton has done these wonderful things, but we do not at the end say "Vote for President Bill Clinton." Senator Bob Dole has done these wonderful things, great American, but at the end we do not say "Vote for Bob Dole."

It is the most gravid interpretation of campaign advocacy to say that only those ads that actually use the word "vote for" or "vote against" are express advocacy.

Second point: The gentleman intentionally strikes from this bill the prohibition on using undisclosed money, money from whom no one knows the source for advertisements that mention the name of the candidate on radio and television in the last 60 days of a campaign.

What is wrong with disclosure? Our good friend and colleague argues that disclosure chills. Not at all. In other contexts those who have been advocating against the Shays-Meehan bill have said all we need is disclosure. Indeed that was the view of many of our colleagues.

The Supreme Court's interpretations of disclosure certainly have identified the concern about membership in NAACP, for example, at a time when that civil rights group was under a great degree of strain in our country but have never said that it is chilling for the American people to know what source of money puts an ad on 60 days before the election using the name of the candidate and hiding the identity of the donor.

□ 2400

Yet that would be struck by the proposal of our good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Supreme Court has actually opined in an area very close to this in the matter before us, in Massachusetts Committee For Life. In Massachusetts Committee For Life, the Supreme Court says that publication at issue there, quote, "cannot be regarded as a mere discussion of public issues that, by their nature, raise the names of certain politicians. Rather, it provides, in effect, an explicit directive for these named candidates. The fact that this message is marginally less direct than 'vote for Smith' does not change its essential nature." End quote.

The Supreme Court has told us it is the spirit that giveth life when the words can kill. We have heard this argument many times. At this point, it is appropriate, I think, to recognize the fundamental difference between people of goodwill.

I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Kentucky. He is sincere. He would not make the campaign finance reform that is needed, the campaign finance reform that is at the heart of Shays-Meehan, and that is that the American people know who is paying for ads that are campaign ads in every sense.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair tell me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I have been reading the gentleman's amendment, and I think that I can come up with a number of phrases that would apparently be permitted but which, under his amendment, would be very questionable.

Think of words like "Think Joe Smith" or "Joe Smith thinks about

our Nation's future every day" or "Joe Smith, the 1st District's Congressman" or on the crime theme, "Joe Smith voted yes on the crime bill," "Joe Smith was sponsor of the crime bill," "Joe Smith is tough on crime."

All of these would be passing muster under the amendment that the gentleman from Kentucky offers. I think that they all have a clear purpose and intent. But under this amendment, they would be permitted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, all that we ask is that we know who is paying for these ads, not that they be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I admire the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) for his persistence. This is the sixth, seventh time. Do we have to beat him again?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman's time is expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, we keep talking about disclosure. As I said before, when the labor unions ran ads against me last time on television, every ad said "Paid for by AFL-CIO." The Federal Communication Commission requires that on television that we know who pays for these ads.

It is interesting the public campaign group is running these ads all over the country right now. We do not really know who pays for those ads either, but they have a right to do it.

In closing, I would simply say the third expansion of express advocacy in this bill has already explicitly been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in FEC versus Maine Right To Life. The exact wording is in here, already been declared unconstitutional.

I just think it is a shame that we spend this much time on a bill that most people that have reviewed it, that have taken cases to the Supreme Court, say will be declared unconstitutional. Also, I think it shows very clearly that this really is an incumbent protection act. I would ask for the adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 52 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGLISH OF PENNSYLVANIA TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. PROHIBITING BUNDLING OF CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 315(a)(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) No person may make a contribution through an intermediary or conduit, except that a person may facilitate a contribution by providing—

"(A) advice to another person as to how the other person may make a contribution; and

"(B) addressed mailing material or similar items to another person for use by the other person in making a contribution."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer an amendment that speaks to an issue fundamental to campaign finance reform, one that would close a gaping loophole in the existing campaign laws through which a torrent of special interest cash has poured in every recent election.

My amendment is a basic reform of the current system and something that the Shays-Meehan substitute unfortunately does not address.

Bundling is the process by which special interest groups solicit funds from donors around the country and then deliver the money in large bundles. It is a way of avoiding limits on donations to campaigns.

The Center for Responsive Politics identified at least 32 bundles in excess of \$20,000 that went to House Members during the 1994 election cycle. The center surveying this practice wrote that bundling is "as predictable as the sunrise." This practice undermines the whole established structure of campaign finance.

My amendment simply states that intermediaries cannot engage in this practice. They can only provide advice to individuals about making a contribution.

In the past, opposition to bundling was close to a consensus issue among supporters of campaign finance reform. In the past, most campaign finance reform proposals have included some kind of antibundling language; indeed, earlier versions of Shays-Meehan included bundling restrictions.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, to close this terrible conduit for cash.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the amendment?

Ms. DELAURO. Yes, I am.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

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

I rise in strong opposition to the English amendment. Three years ago when campaign finance reformers started out to change the American election system, our goal was to try to increase the number of participants in the political process and to take elections out of the hands of the big-money special interests.

This amendment would, in fact, do just the opposite. It would rob Americans of an essential tool in leveling the political playing field. It effectively prevents bundling, which lets ordinary Americans with limited resources pool their funds together into a single contribution and put themselves on equal footing with the more well-heeled political interests. It also would allow corporate officers to host campaign functions for candidates and collect checks.

I give you an example of women in politics. Today, thanks to coordinated grassroots efforts, over 45,000 members of EMILY'S List, who on average have contributed less than \$100 per candidate, they had an opportunity to triple the number of women who serve in this body.

There is EMILY'S list on the Democratic side of the aisle. There is a group called Wish List on the Republican side of the aisle which, in fact, is looking at how we, in fact, change the face of the Congress and bring new people into the process and bring women, women of color into the process in this body. That has been accomplished by these groups.

The ability to pool political donations helps put average Americans on equal footing with the wealthiest of interests. This benefits everyone, regardless of what side of the political spectrum we may fall, self-employed men and women who sell Amway products, local environmentalists who participate in the League of Conservation Voters. I mentioned Wish List, the National Jewish Democratic Council, Council for a Livable World.

The English amendment cripples such organizations. It prevents ordinary voters from uniting together as significant political forces. What we want to do is to get more people in the process, not less people. The English amendment would cripple that process.

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman has the right to close.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I found it very interesting to hear the comments from the gentleman from Pennsylvania because I was very concerned when this came forward about what evil was trying to be remedied by this particular amendment.

What the gentleman had to say does not square with my personal experience and my understanding of this system of contributing to campaigns. Number one, these are small donors, small donations. EMILY'S List, for example, has 45,000 members from all 50 States, and they have made an average contribution of less than \$100 per time.

There is no ability to exceed campaign limits. All individual limits are counted in the aggregate. For any individual donor anywhere in the country, they cannot exceed the campaign limits put in place on any other donor. It simply is not true.

The other thing is that all of this money is fully disclosed twice, once when the donation is made to the bundling organization and secondly when the candidate receives it. So any individual who is interested in following this money can do to a much greater degree than any other campaign contributions that a candidate will get.

□ 0010

Again, I have to say, what is the evil that is to be remedied by this, unless, of course, that there are more women in Congress.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentlewoman from

Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

I think if we look at this amendment, it is obviously flawed in one sense, and that is that it only covers hard dollars. Triad Management is an organization that has gone out and organized all kinds of soft money bundling activities, including an entity called Citizens for the Republic Education Fund, which gave \$2 million in the final weeks of the 1996 campaign to Republican candidates in targeted races all across the country. One of them happened to be, by the way, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

I am wondering why this amendment is directed only at small donors, largely, who are contributing through processes we have just heard described as hard dollars, to the campaigns of candidates. We ought to be attacking soft dollars that are flowing in, bundled by organizations outside the political structure in theory, but in reality tied directly into the political parties, the kinds of campaign expenditures that have benefited many of the Members who now oppose this bill and oppose the soft money ban included in it.

Mr. Chairman, I would be much more respectful of this amendment if it were broadly based and took on all the problems of bundling. This one is targeted to kill this bill and perpetuate a soft money political system.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment truly does cripple organizations, organizations that mobilize thousands of men and women behind issues that they care about. It prevents average people from getting together as a political force. Again, this benefits all sides of the spectrum. We are not talking about narrowly defining this effort. Why we want to, instead of expanding the opportunity for people to participate, to narrow these efforts, and "do in," if you will, the ability in terms of full disclosure. What we need to do, as my colleagues have said, is we need to ban the soft money, and bring participation in the political process back home to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I was curious to listen to some of the arguments on the other side. They are

kind of fascinating to me, because, Mr. Chairman, I served as the first chief of staff for the first woman to ever serve in the Republican Conference in the Pennsylvania Senate. I do not think anyone on the floor of this House has a stronger record than I do of promoting women in high office, and I can tell my colleagues, my old boss got elected at the age of 28 to a State Senate seat half the size of a congressional seat, on a shoestring and without bundling.

It is ridiculous to argue that bundling somehow has something to do with few women being in Congress. Quite the contrary. Bundling favors incumbents, and women as challengers would benefit from the reduction in the practice of bundling.

In the past, the authors of this substitute have opposed the practice of bundling. Unfortunately, tonight they have chosen to support this widely acknowledged abuse by opposing this amendment, along with many other worthy amendments necessary to perfect this substitute and restore balance to this campaign finance reform proposal.

For those of my colleagues who in the past have supported legislation that included anti-bundling provisions, including the Farr legislation, including the earlier Shays-Meehan legislation, my colleagues are already on record opposing bundling. Do not flip-flop tonight.

Remember, instead, the statement of Common Cause, which, as of today was printed on their Web site, and I quote: "Bundling, thus, is harmful because it is a way around the contributory limits for both individuals and PACs. It allows individuals and PACs to get credit from candidates for delivering the kind of big money that the contributory limits are intended to deter."

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is fundamental reform and it is fundamental to perfecting this legislation. I urge any Member who is serious about campaign finance reform to support it. It is the right thing to do. I urge a "yes" vote on the English amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 442, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) to the amendment in the na-

ture of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEKAS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Add at the end of title V the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 510. DEPOSIT OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS IN TREASURY ACCOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), as amended by sections 101, 401, and 507, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS TO BE RETURNED TO DONORS

"SEC. 326. (a) TRANSFER TO COMMISSION.—
 "(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if a political committee intends to return any contribution or donation given to the political committee, the committee shall transfer the contribution or donation to the Commission if—

"(A) the contribution or donation is in an amount equal to or greater than \$500 (other than a contribution or donation returned within 60 days of receipt by the committee); or

"(B) the contribution or donation was made in violation of section 315, 316, 317, 319, or 320 (other than a contribution or donation returned within 30 days of receipt by the committee).

"(2) INFORMATION INCLUDED WITH TRANSFERRED CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION.—A political committee shall include with any contribution or donation transferred under paragraph (1)—

"(A) a request that the Commission return the contribution or donation to the person making the contribution or donation; and

"(B) information regarding the circumstances surrounding the making of the contribution or donation and any opinion of the political committee concerning whether the contribution or donation may have been made in violation of this Act.

"(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF ESCROW ACCOUNT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish a single interest-bearing escrow account for deposit of amounts transferred under paragraph (1).

"(B) DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—On receiving an amount from a political committee under paragraph (1), the Commission shall—

"(1) deposit the amount in the escrow account established under subparagraph (A); and

"(ii) notify the Attorney General and the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service of the receipt of the amount from the political committee.

"(C) USE OF INTEREST.—Interest earned on amounts in the escrow account established under subparagraph (A) shall be applied or used for the same purposes as the donation or contribution on which it is earned.

"(4) TREATMENT OF RETURNED CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION AS A COMPLAINT.—The transfer of any contribution or donation to the Commission under this section shall be treated as the filing of a complaint under section 309(a).

"(b) USE OF AMOUNTS PLACED IN ESCROW TO COVER FINES AND PENALTIES.—The Commission or the Attorney General may require any amount deposited in the escrow account under subsection (a)(3) to be applied toward the payment of any fine or penalty imposed under this Act or title 18, United States Code against the person making the contribution or donation.

"(c) RETURN OF CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION AFTER DEPOSIT IN ESCROW.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall return a contribution or donation deposited in the escrow account under subsection (a)(3) to the person making the contribution or donation if—

"(A) within 180 days after the date the contribution or donation is transferred, the Commission has not made a determination under section 309(a)(2) that the Commission has reason to believe that the making of the contribution or donation was made in violation of this Act; or

"(B)(i) the contribution or donation will not be used to cover fines, penalties, or costs pursuant to subsection (b); or

"(ii) if the contribution or donation will be used for those purposes, that the amounts require for those purposes have been withdrawn from the escrow account and subtracted from the returnable contribution or donation.

"(2) NO EFFECT ON STATUS OF INVESTIGATION.—The return of a contribution or donation by the Commission under this subsection shall not be construed as having an effect on the status of an investigation by the Commission or the Attorney General of the contribution or donation or the circumstances surrounding the contribution or donation, or on the ability of the Commission or the Attorney General to take future actions with respect to the contribution or donation."

(b) AMOUNTS USED TO DETERMINE AMOUNT OF PENALTY FOR VIOLATION.—Section 309(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) For purposes of determining the amount of a civil penalty imposed under this subsection for violations of section 326, the amount of the donation involved shall be treated as the amount of the contribution involved."

(c) DONATION DEFINED.—Section 301 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431), as amended by sections 201(b) and 307(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(22) DONATION.—The term 'donation' means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything else of value made by any person to a national committee of a political party or a Senatorial or Congressional Campaign Committee of a national political party for any purpose, but does not include a contribution (as defined in paragraph (8))."

(d) DISBURGEMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 309 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended by

adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) Any conciliation agreement, civil action, or criminal action entered into or instituted under this section may require a person to forfeit to the Treasury any contribution, donation, or expenditure that is the subject of the agreement or action for transfer to the Commission for deposit in accordance with section 326."

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply to contributions or donations refunded on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether the Federal Election Commission or Attorney General has issued regulations to carry out section 326 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by subsection (a)) by such date.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and with some representatives of the collaborators on the Democrat side in this venture. This is an amendment that simply states that when a political party, for instance, discovers all of a sudden that it has in its hands let us say \$100,000 which it knows has an illegal source, my amendment would compel that organization to turn that money over to the FEC for a transitional position in which the FEC would determine the source, the nature of the illegality, and to see whether or not the IRS or the Attorney General or some law enforcement agency should be brought into the picture before that money is returned to the donor, as is the practice now. This would go a long way in bolstering our confidence that some illegal foreign source or some drug dealer who contributes grand sums of monies to a political party does not get the benefit twice, first of getting favor from a political party to which he makes a donation, and then when it is declared illegal, he gets the money back; he sort of launders his own money, as it were.

What we would accomplish with my amendment would be to have a scrutiny placed upon that money before, and it may still be returned, before it be returned to the donor when it is found to be illegal. That is the simple text of my amendment.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the 5 minutes, since I do support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

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

We are concluding debate on all of the amendments that have come before us, and I think it is almost symbolic to have an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), and I appreciate him waiting so late to offer it, an amendment that I think we can support.

It makes logical sense that if money that was donated was not donated properly and may not be that individual's money, it should not be returned to that individual, it should be rushed to the FEC to determine whose money it is and if it properly should be returned, and so I compliment the gentleman on his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that would require the FEC to expend its resources on investigating potentially a minor violation at the expense of focusing some of its time on other resources.

I would just point out that I support the amendment, but I am a little concerned about the resources of the FEC, and I would hope that as we look down the road when we give the FEC more responsibility that requires them, for example, in this case to keep track of these contributions, I hope that in the future we look to try to give the FEC not only the teeth it needs, but the resources that they need in order to do their job and keep the laws that are on the books and enforce the laws that will be on the books.

□ 0020

So, I certainly support the gentleman's amendment and would like all of us to keep in mind the importance of fully funding the FEC in the future so that they can do not only their job on this amendment, but their job in other amendments and enforcing the laws that are on the books.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to offer any more debate, but we do need to do an amendment process to conform the text to the sections that are outlined in Shays-Meehan.

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

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment pursuant to form A, which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The Clerk will report the modification to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 53 offered by Mr. GEKAS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Strike the phrase "section 315, 316, 317, 319, or 320" and insert in lieu thereof the phrase

"section 315, 316, 317, 319, 320, or 325" in the one place where the former phrase appears in the amendment.

Mr. GEKAS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) to explain his modification.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do here is to offer an alteration to the amendment so it will conform to the Shays-Meehan substitute new ban on contributions by minors which is already in the text. And we are trying to fit it in so that it will make sense.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. I was yielding to give him a chance to explain if he wanted.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) are willing to accept the amendment. If that is the case, I will not ask for a recorded vote. I accept their acceptance, and they may accept the acceptance that I accept the acceptance.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, there is a lot of acceptance here. And we will accept the gentleman's support on the final version of Shays-Meehan when we vote on it Monday night. We will accept the gentleman's support.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SHAYS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified pursuant to form B, which is at the desk, which is another conforming amendment to the Shays-Meehan language.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report second modification to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 53 offered by Mr. GEKAS to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Strike the phrase "reason to believe" and replace it with the phrase "reason to investigate whether" in the one place where the former phrase appears in the amendment.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) if he wishes to explain any further.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do is to substitute the language that would give the Federal Elections Commission authority to investigate. To actually say "reason to investigate" whether or not something has happened, rather than what is now in the text, "reason to believe."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his explanation, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, with that we appear to accept everything, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider the amendment No. 54 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

It is now in order to consider the amendment No. 55 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Section 501 of the Shays substitute amendment to H.R. 2183, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. Section 501, entitled "Codification of Beck Decision," does nothing to correct the current injustices in our federal labor law relating to the unions' use of their members hard-earned paychecks for political and other purposes.

The Shays amendment is not a codification of the Supreme Court's 1988 Beck decision relating to the use of union dues. First, Section 501 provides absolutely no notice of rights to members of the union—it applies only to non-members. Second, Section 501 redefines the dues payments that may be objected to, by limiting such to "expenditures in connection with a Federal, State, or local election or in connection with efforts to influence legislation unrelated to collective bargaining." This definition not only infers that there may be other types of political expenditures to which work-

ers cannot object—but it also ignores Beck's holding that workers may object to any dues payments for any union activities not directly related to collective bargaining activities.

Mr. Chairman, if Congress is truly going to try to deal with the issue of organized labor taking dues money from rank-and-file members laboring under a union security agreement—taking it without their permission and spending it on causes and activities with which the workers disagree—then let us really deal with it. Mr. SHAYS' amendment is a fig leaf which falls woefully short of covering the problem.

The Shays amendment codifies a broken system that allows unions to raid workers' wallets, forces workers to resign from the union, requires workers to object—after the fact—to their money being removed from their paycheck, and then requires workers to wait for the union to rebate those funds, if they get around to doing so.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, I have held six hearings on this issue in the past four years. In each one, the Subcommittee has heard from worker after worker telling us about the one thing they wanted from their union—the basic respect of being asked for permission before the union spent their money for purposes unrelated to labor-management obligations. Yes, most of these employees were upset over finding out their head-earned dollars were being funneled into political causes or candidates they did not support. However, these employees supported their union and still overwhelmingly believe in the value of organized labor. A number of them were stewards in their union. All they want is to be able to give their consent before their union spends their money on activities which fall outside collective bargaining activities and which subvert their deeply held ideas and convictions.

As our six hearings demonstrated, individuals attempting to exercise their rights under current law often face incredible burdens, including harassment, coercion, and intimidation. The current system is badly broken and it is Congress' responsibility to fix it—not to legitimize it by adopting the Shays amendment. I urge members to join me in opposing Section 501's sugar-coated placebo and enact meaningful reform on behalf of union workers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment by Representative ROGER WICKER. Much like the standard bearers to long dead civilizations, Representative WICKER's amendment illustrates the same antiquated belief that there should be hurdles that citizens must clear in order to exercise their Constitutionally guaranteed right to vote. Land owners. Male. Caucasian. One by one the spirits of freedom and democracy have worked against other misguided attempts to disenfranchise certain American voters, and it is my hope that they will prevail here today.

There is an old saying that states, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I remember.

I remember the days when African Americans in Mississippi sat cowering in their homes on election day because they were too afraid to go to the polls.

I remember when men like Medgar Evers and Vernon Dahmer were murdered in cold blood because they realized the importance of voting and tried to impress their convictions onto other African Americans in Mississippi.

I remember the two youths wounded by shotgun blasts fired through the window of a home in Ruleville, Mississippi where they were planning ways to register blacks to vote.

I remember the dead bodies of three civil rights workers, who had been trying to register blacks to vote, being discovered on a farm near Philadelphia, Mississippi.

I remember James Meredith being wounded by a white sniper as he walked in a voter registration march from Memphis to Jackson.

I remember poll taxes and literacy tests.

Mr. Chairman, I remember voter intimidation and have fought long and hard against it. This debate belongs in 1960's not in 1998, and it is time to bury ideas like Representative WICKER's in the same grave with separate drinking fountains and making blacks sit at the back of the bus. This legislation is simply another attempt to appeal to mainstream sensibilities while ignoring the realistic and historically based fears of Black Americans.

Having both grown up in Mississippi, Representative WICKER and I obviously have had universally different experiences, but the things I remember make it impossible for me to support this amendment. It would be a slap in the face of the civil rights pioneers who risked their lives, were beaten and murdered in cold blood to protect both my right to vote and Representative WICKER's.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, may I be clear that all amendments have been dealt with under Shays-Meehan?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM HONORABLE JOHN A. BOEHNER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from JOHN A. BOEHNER, Member of Congress:

WASHINGTON, DC, July 28, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to L. Deschler, 3 *Deschler's Precedents of the United States House of Representatives* ch 11, §14.8 (1963), that I have been

served with an administrative subpoena issued by the Federal Election Commission.
Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HONORABLE JOHN A. BOEHNER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Barry Jackson, staff member of the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Member of Congress:

WASHINGTON, DC, July 28, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to L. Deschler, 3 *Deschler's Precedents of the United States House of Representatives* ch. 11 §14.8 (1963), that I have been served with an administrative subpoena issued by the Federal Election Commission.
Sincerely,

BARRY JACKSON.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. METCALF. 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 H.R. 4237.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT, COMMITTEE ORDER NO. 42, UNIFICATION OF THE MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCE ADOPTED ON JULY 30, 1998

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker. I submit a committee order from the Committee on House Oversight.

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §57 and 2 U.S.C. §59e, the Committee hereby orders that:

SEC. 1. Effective January 3, 1999 the amount available within the Members' Representational Allowance for franked mail with respect to a session of Congress shall not be limited by subsection (b) of Committee Order No. 41.

SEC. 2. The Committee on House Oversight shall have the authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ISTOOK (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, July 31 and August 3 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 6 p.m. On account of official business.

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. WEYGAND) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. COLLINS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. METCALF) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. BUYER.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. BRYANT.

Mr. OXLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEYGAND) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. KIND.

Mr. TURNER.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. ROEMER.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. SANDERS.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A Concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution. Expressing the sense of Congress concerning the human rights and humanitarian situation facing the women and girls of Afghanistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Friday, July 31, 1998, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10394. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting notification that it is estimated that the limitation on the Government National Mortgage Association's ("Ginnie Mae's") authority to make commitments for a fiscal year will be reached before the end of that fiscal year, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1721 nt.; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

10395. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Department's final rule—Authority to Approve Federal Home Loan Bank Bylaws [No. 98-32] (RIN: 3069-AA70) received July 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

10396. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Petroleum Refining Process Wastes; Land Disposal Restrictions for Newly Identified Wastes; And CERCLA Hazardous Substance Designation and Reportable Quantities [SWH-FRL 6122-7] (RIN: 2050-AD88) received July 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10397. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Identification of Additional Ozone Areas Attaining the 1-Hour Standard and to Which the 1-Hour Standard is No Longer Applicable [FRL-6126-8] received July 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10398. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Revision of Part 2 of the Commission's Rules Relating to the Marketing and Authorization of Radio Frequency Devices [ET Docket No. 94-45 RM-8125] received July 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10399. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Fowler, Indiana) [MM Docket No. 98-38 RM-9223] received July 23, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10400. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Israel [DTC 78-98] received July 29, 1998, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

10401. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Belgium [RSAT 3-98] received July 17, 1998, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

10402. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by nominees as chiefs of mission, ambassadors at large, or ministers, and their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

10403. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by nominees as chiefs of mission, ambassadors at large, or ministers, and their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

10404. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by nominees as chiefs of mission, ambassadors at large, or ministers, and their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

10405. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Helium Contracts [WO-130-1820-00-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AD24) received July 23, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10406. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Restrictions on Frequency of Limited Entry Permit Transfers; Sorting Catch by Species; Retention of Fish Tickets [Docket No. 971208294-8154-02; I.D. 103097B] (RIN: 0648-AJ20) received July 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10407. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Compensation for Collecting Resource Information [Docket No. 980501115-8160-02; I.D. 032498A] (RIN: 0648-AK86) received July 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10408. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trip Limit Changes [Docket No. 971229312-7312-01; I.D. 062698A] received July 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10409. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Patent Fees for Fiscal Year 1999 [Docket No. 980713170-8170-01] (RIN: 0651-AA96) received July 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10410. A letter from the Secretary, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting the Annual Audit Report of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps

for the fiscal year ending 31 December 1997, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(39) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10411. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments to the Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards for the Organic Pesticide Chemicals Manufacturing Industry—Pesticide Chemicals Point Source Category [FRL-6126-6], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10412. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Revisions to Part 1813 of the NASA FAR Supplement [48 CFR Parts 1801, 1812, 1813] received July 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

10413. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Provision of Drugs and Medicines to Certain Veterans in State Homes (RIN: 2900-AJ34) received July 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

10414. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Revenue Ruling 98-36] received July 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10415. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Reduction in Certain Deductions of Mutual Life Insurance Companies [Revenue Ruling 98-38] received July 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10416. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting the report providing an itemized accounting of all non-appropriated funds obligated or expended by the Authority for the quarter, pursuant to Public Law 105-100; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 513. Resolution Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3736) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes relating to H-1B nonimmigrants (Rept. 105-660). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2921. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct an inquiry into the impediments to the development of competition in the market for multichannel video programming distribution; with an amendment (Rept. 105-661, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2921. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than September 11, 1998.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 4353. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 to improve the competitiveness of American business and promote foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GINGRICH (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 4354. A bill to establish the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund on behalf of the families of Detective John Michael Gibson and Private First Class Jacob Joseph Chestnut of the United States Capitol Police; to the Committee on House Oversight, 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. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. HORN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GORDON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LOPGREN, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. LAMPSON)(all by request):

H.R. 4355. A bill to encourage the disclosure and exchange of information about computer processing problems and related matters in connection with the transition to the Year 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4356. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to assure that the full amount deposited in the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund is spent for the purposes for which the Fund was established; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4357. A bill to establish the Fort Presque Isle National Historic Site in Erie, Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 4358. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide for equitable duty treatment for certain wool used in making suits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEACH (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CASTLE, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 4359. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to broaden the range of discount window loans which may be used as collateral for Federal reserve notes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 4360. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a pilot program under which milk producers and cooperatives will be permitted to enter into forward price contracts with milk handlers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 4361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that an organization shall be exempt from income tax if it is created by a State to provide property and casualty insurance coverage for property for which such coverage is otherwise unavailable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 4362. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct Stand Down events and to establish a pilot program that will provide for an annual Stand Down event in each State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WATT of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 4363. A bill to provide for the restructuring of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mrs. KELLY):

H. Con. Res. 313. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to self-determination for the people of Kosovo, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 164: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 457: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 754: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 986: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1050: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1063: Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COOK, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 1126: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1173: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1283: Mr. ENSIGN.

H.R. 1321: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1382: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1401: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1525: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1712: Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 1995: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 2224: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 2275: Ms. NORTON and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 2504: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2701: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 2723: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 2733: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2849: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. YATES, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2921: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2955: Mr. JACKSON and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3001: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 3031: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. FORD, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3077: Mr. FROST, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3248: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 3251: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3320: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 3622: Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 3629: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 3632: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 3684: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 3688: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3774: Ms. STABENOW and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 3790: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SUNUNU, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. CAMP, Mr. EHRlich, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. COCKSEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. WILSON, Mr.

GEKAS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BUYER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KIM, Mr. THUNE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 3792: Mr. COLLINS and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3815: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 3831: Mr. SHERMAN and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3879: Mr. PAXON and Mr. THOMPSON.
H.R. 3956: Mr. HOYER and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3976: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 3995: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4031: Mr. COYNE and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 4037: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4053: Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 4121: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 4132: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 4175: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4188: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4196: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 4197: Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 4209: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 4220: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 4224: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4232: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. HEPLY, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 4235: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 4246: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. EWING.
H.R. 4283: Mr. LAMPSON and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4298: Mrs. FOWLER.
H.R. 4302: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4308: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 4309: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 4339: Mr. FROST and Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 4344: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. FORBES.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. LAMPSON.

H. Con. Res. 251: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H. Con. Res. 304: Mr. GILMAN.
H. Res. 171: Mr. RANGEL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

(Omitted from the Record of July 29, 1998)

H.R. 1515: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2801: Mr. STABENOW.
H.R. 3000: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 3396: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H. Res. 375: Mr. FAZIO of California.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3736

OFFERED BY: MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA
AMENDMENT NO. 2: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Workforce Improvement and Protection Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY INCREASE IN SKILLED FOREIGN WORKERS; TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN H-2B NONIMMIGRANTS.

Section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1)(A) to read as follows:
"(A) under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), subject to paragraph (5), may not exceed—
"(i) 95,000 in fiscal year 1998;
"(ii) 105,000 in fiscal year 1999;
"(iii) 115,000 in fiscal year 2000; and
"(iv) 65,000 in fiscal year 2001 and any subsequent fiscal year; or";

(2) by amending paragraph (1)(B) to read as follows:

"(B) under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) may not exceed—
"(i) 36,000 in fiscal year 1998;
"(ii) 26,000 in fiscal year 1999;
"(iii) 16,000 in fiscal year 2000; and
"(iv) 66,000 in fiscal year 2001 and any subsequent fiscal year.";

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking "years." and inserting "years, except that, with respect to each such nonimmigrant issued a visa or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 in excess of 65,000 (per fiscal year), the period of authorized admission as such a nonimmigrant may not exceed 4 years."; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:
"(5) The total number of aliens described in section 212(a)(5)(C) who may be issued visas or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status during any fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 1999) under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) may not exceed 5,000."

SEC. 3. PROTECTION AGAINST DISPLACEMENT OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)) is amended by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

"(E)(i) Except as provided in clause (iv), the employer has not laid off or otherwise displaced and will not lay off or otherwise displace, within the period beginning 6 months before and ending 90 days following the date of filing of the application or during the 90 days immediately preceding and following the date of filing of any visa petition supported by the application, any United States worker (as defined in paragraph (3)) (including a worker whose services are obtained by contract, employee leasing, temporary help agreement, or other similar means) who has substantially equivalent qualifications and experience in the specialty occupation, and in the area of employment, for which H-1B nonimmigrants are sought or in which they are employed.
"(ii) Except as provided in clause (iii), in the case of an employer that employs an H-1B nonimmigrant, the employer shall not place the nonimmigrant with another employer where—
"(I) the nonimmigrant performs his or her duties in whole or in part at one or more worksites owned, operated, or controlled by such other employer; and
"(II) there are indicia of an employment relationship between the nonimmigrant and such other employer.
"(iii) Clause (ii) shall not apply to an employer's placement of an H-1B nonimmigrant with another employer if the other employer has executed an attestation that it satisfies and will satisfy the conditions described in clause (i) during the period described in such clause.

"(iv) This subparagraph shall not apply to an application filed by an employer that is an institution of higher education (as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965), or a related or affiliated nonprofit entity, if the application relates solely to aliens who—
"(I) the employer seeks to employ—
"(aa) as a researcher on a project for which not less than 50 percent of the funding is provided, for a limited period of time, through a grant or contract with an entity other than the employer; or
"(bb) as a professor or instructor under a contract that expires after a limited period of time; and
"(II) have attained a master's or higher degree (or its equivalent) in a specialty the specific knowledge of which is required for the intended employment."

(b) DEFINITIONS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(n) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) For purposes of this subsection:
"(A) The term 'H-1B nonimmigrant' means an alien admitted or provided status as a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).
"(B) The term 'lay off or otherwise displace', with respect to an employee—
"(i) means to cause the employee's loss of employment, other than through a discharge for cause, a voluntary departure, or a voluntary retirement; and
"(ii) does not include any situation in which employment is relocated to a different geographic area and the employee is offered a chance to move to the new location, with wages and benefits that are not less than those at the old location, but elects not to move to the new location.
"(C) The term 'United States worker' means—
"(i) a citizen or national of the United States;
"(ii) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or
"(iii) an alien authorized to be employed by this Act or by the Attorney General."
(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)) is amended by striking "a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)" each place such term appears and inserting "an H-1B nonimmigrant".

Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)), as amended by section 3, is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F)(i) The employer, prior to filing the application, has taken, in good faith, timely and significant steps to recruit and retain sufficient United States workers in the specialty occupation for which H-1B nonimmigrants are sought. Such steps shall have included recruitment in the United States, using procedures that meet industry-wide standards and offering compensation that is at least as great as that required to be offered to H-1B nonimmigrants under subparagraph (A), and offering employment to any United States worker who applies and has the same qualifications as, or better qualifications than, any of the H-1B nonimmigrants sought.
"(ii) The conditions described in clause (i) shall not apply to an employer with respect

to an employer with respect to an application filed by an employer that is an institution of higher education (as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965), or a related or affiliated nonprofit entity, if the application relates solely to aliens who—
"(I) the employer seeks to employ—
"(aa) as a researcher on a project for which not less than 50 percent of the funding is provided, for a limited period of time, through a grant or contract with an entity other than the employer; or
"(bb) as a professor or instructor under a contract that expires after a limited period of time; and
"(II) have attained a master's or higher degree (or its equivalent) in a specialty the specific knowledge of which is required for the intended employment."

(b) DEFINITIONS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(n) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) For purposes of this subsection:
"(A) The term 'H-1B nonimmigrant' means an alien admitted or provided status as a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).
"(B) The term 'lay off or otherwise displace', with respect to an employee—
"(i) means to cause the employee's loss of employment, other than through a discharge for cause, a voluntary departure, or a voluntary retirement; and
"(ii) does not include any situation in which employment is relocated to a different geographic area and the employee is offered a chance to move to the new location, with wages and benefits that are not less than those at the old location, but elects not to move to the new location.
"(C) The term 'United States worker' means—
"(i) a citizen or national of the United States;
"(ii) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or
"(iii) an alien authorized to be employed by this Act or by the Attorney General."
(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)) is amended by striking "a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)" each place such term appears and inserting "an H-1B nonimmigrant".

Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)), as amended by section 3, is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F)(i) The employer, prior to filing the application, has taken, in good faith, timely and significant steps to recruit and retain sufficient United States workers in the specialty occupation for which H-1B nonimmigrants are sought. Such steps shall have included recruitment in the United States, using procedures that meet industry-wide standards and offering compensation that is at least as great as that required to be offered to H-1B nonimmigrants under subparagraph (A), and offering employment to any United States worker who applies and has the same qualifications as, or better qualifications than, any of the H-1B nonimmigrants sought.
"(ii) The conditions described in clause (i) shall not apply to an employer with respect

to an employer with respect to an application filed by an employer that is an institution of higher education (as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965), or a related or affiliated nonprofit entity, if the application relates solely to aliens who—
"(I) the employer seeks to employ—
"(aa) as a researcher on a project for which not less than 50 percent of the funding is provided, for a limited period of time, through a grant or contract with an entity other than the employer; or
"(bb) as a professor or instructor under a contract that expires after a limited period of time; and
"(II) have attained a master's or higher degree (or its equivalent) in a specialty the specific knowledge of which is required for the intended employment."

(b) DEFINITIONS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(n) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) For purposes of this subsection:
"(A) The term 'H-1B nonimmigrant' means an alien admitted or provided status as a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).
"(B) The term 'lay off or otherwise displace', with respect to an employee—
"(i) means to cause the employee's loss of employment, other than through a discharge for cause, a voluntary departure, or a voluntary retirement; and
"(ii) does not include any situation in which employment is relocated to a different geographic area and the employee is offered a chance to move to the new location, with wages and benefits that are not less than those at the old location, but elects not to move to the new location.
"(C) The term 'United States worker' means—
"(i) a citizen or national of the United States;
"(ii) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or
"(iii) an alien authorized to be employed by this Act or by the Attorney General."
(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)) is amended by striking "a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)" each place such term appears and inserting "an H-1B nonimmigrant".

SEC. 4. RECRUITMENT OF UNITED STATES WORKERS PRIOR TO SEEKING NON-IMMIGRANT WORKERS.

Section 212(n)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(1)), as amended by section 3, is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F)(i) The employer, prior to filing the application, has taken, in good faith, timely and significant steps to recruit and retain sufficient United States workers in the specialty occupation for which H-1B nonimmigrants are sought. Such steps shall have included recruitment in the United States, using procedures that meet industry-wide standards and offering compensation that is at least as great as that required to be offered to H-1B nonimmigrants under subparagraph (A), and offering employment to any United States worker who applies and has the same qualifications as, or better qualifications than, any of the H-1B nonimmigrants sought.
"(ii) The conditions described in clause (i) shall not apply to an employer with respect

to an employer with respect to an application filed by an employer that is an institution of higher education (as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965), or a related or affiliated nonprofit entity, if the application relates solely to aliens who—
"(I) the employer seeks to employ—
"(aa) as a researcher on a project for which not less than 50 percent of the funding is provided, for a limited period of time, through a grant or contract with an entity other than the employer; or
"(bb) as a professor or instructor under a contract that expires after a limited period of time; and
"(II) have attained a master's or higher degree (or its equivalent) in a specialty the specific knowledge of which is required for the intended employment."

to the employment of an H-1B nonimmigrant who is described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 203(b)(1)."

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS AND CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS FOR NON-H-1B-DEPENDENT EMPLOYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(n)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: "except that the Secretary may only file such a complaint respecting an H-1B-dependent employer (as defined in paragraph (3)), and only if there appears to be a violation of an attestation or a misrepresentation of a material fact in an application."; and

(2) by inserting after the second sentence the following: "Except as provided in subparagraph (F) (relating to spot investigations during probationary period), no investigation or hearing shall be conducted with respect to an employer except in response to a complaint filed under the previous sentence."

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 212(n)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)), as added by section 3, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (E), respectively;

(2) by inserting after "purposes of this subsection:" the following:

"(A) The term 'H-1B-dependent employer' means an employer that—

"(i) has fewer than 21 full-time equivalent employees who are employed in the United States; and

(ii) employs 4 or more H-1B nonimmigrants; or

"(iii) has at least 21 but not more than 150 full-time equivalent employees who are employed in the United States; and

(iv) employs H-1B nonimmigrants in a number that is equal to at least 20 percent of the number of such full-time equivalent employees; or

"(v) has at least 151 full-time equivalent employees who are employed in the United States; and

(vi) employs H-1B nonimmigrants in a number that is equal to at least 15 percent of the number of such full-time equivalent employees.

In applying this subparagraph, any group treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated as a single employer. Aliens employed under a petition for H-1B nonimmigrants shall be treated as employees, and counted as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) under this subparagraph."; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated) the following:

"(D) The term 'non-H-1B-dependent employer' means an employer that is not an H-1B-dependent employer."

SEC. 6. INCREASED ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(n)(2)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)(C)) is amended to read as follows:

"(C)(i) If the Secretary finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, a failure to meet a condition of paragraph (1)(B) or (1)(E), a substantial failure to meet a condition of paragraph (1)(C), (1)(D), or (1)(F), or a misrepresentation of material fact in an application—

"(I) the Secretary shall notify the Attorney General of such finding and may, in ad-

dition, impose such other administrative remedies (including civil monetary penalties in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 per violation) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

"(II) the Attorney General shall not approve petitions filed with respect to that employer under section 204 or 214(c) during a period of at least 1 year for aliens to be employed by the employer.

"(iii) If the Secretary finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, a willful failure to meet a condition of paragraph (1), a willful misrepresentation of material fact in an application, or a violation of clause (iv)—

"(I) the Secretary shall notify the Attorney General of such finding and may, in addition, impose such other administrative remedies (including civil monetary penalties in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 per violation) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

"(II) the Attorney General shall not approve petitions filed with respect to that employer under section 204 or 214(c) during a period of at least 1 year for aliens to be employed by the employer.

"(iii) If the Secretary finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, a willful failure to meet a condition of paragraph (1) or a willful misrepresentation of material fact in an application, in the course of which failure or misrepresentation the employer also has failed to meet a condition of paragraph (1)(E)—

"(I) the Secretary shall notify the Attorney General of such finding and may, in addition, impose such other administrative remedies (including civil monetary penalties in an amount not to exceed \$25,000 per violation) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

"(II) the Attorney General shall not approve petitions filed with respect to that employer under section 204 or 214(c) during a period of at least 2 years for aliens to be employed by the employer.

"(iv) It is a violation of this clause for an employer who has filed an application under this subsection to intimidate, threaten, restrain, coerce, blacklist, discharge, or in any other manner discriminate against an employee (which term, for purposes of this clause, includes a former employee and an applicant for employment) because the employee has disclosed information to the employer, or to any other person, that the employee reasonably believes evidences a violation of this subsection, or any rule or regulation pertaining to this subsection, or because the employee cooperates or seeks to cooperate in an investigation or other proceeding concerning the employer's compliance with the requirements of this subsection or any rule or regulation pertaining to this subsection."

(b) PLACEMENT OF H-1B NONIMMIGRANT WITH OTHER EMPLOYER.—Section 212(n)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(E) Under regulations of the Secretary, the previous provisions of this paragraph shall apply to a failure of an other employer to comply with an attestation described in paragraph (1)(E)(iii) in the same manner as they apply to a failure to comply with a condition described in paragraph (1)(E)(i)."

(c) SPOT INVESTIGATIONS DURING PROBATIONARY PERIOD.—Section 212(n)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)), as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(F) The Secretary may, on a case-by-case basis, subject an employer to random investigations for a period of up to 5 years, beginning on the date that the employer is found by the Secretary to have committed a willful failure to meet a condition of paragraph (1) or to have made a misrepresentation of material fact in an application. The preceding sentence shall apply to an employer regardless of whether the employer is an H-1B-dependent employer or a non-H-1B-dependent employer. The authority of the Secretary under this subparagraph shall not be construed to be subject to, or limited by, the requirements of subparagraph (A)."

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON IMPOSITION BY IMPORTING EMPLOYERS OF EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT PROVISIONS VIOLATING PUBLIC POLICY.

Section 212(n)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(n)(2)), as amended by section (6), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(G) If the Secretary finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that an employer who has submitted an application under paragraph (1) has requested or required an alien admitted or provided status as a nonimmigrant pursuant to the application, as a condition of the employment, to execute a contract containing a provision that would be considered void as against public policy in the State of intended employment—

"(i) the Secretary shall notify the Attorney General of such finding and may, in addition, impose such other administrative remedies (including civil monetary penalties in an amount not to exceed \$25,000 per violation) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

"(ii) the Attorney General shall not approve petitions filed by the employer under section 214(c) during a period of not more than 10 years for H-1B nonimmigrants to be employed by the employer."

SEC. 8. COLLECTION AND USE OF H-1B NONIMMIGRANT FEES FOR STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS AND JOB TRAINING OF UNITED STATES WORKERS.

(a) IMPOSITION OF FEE.—Section 214(c) (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9)(A) The Attorney General shall impose a fee on an employer (excluding an employer described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 212(p)(1)) as a condition for the approval of a petition filed on or after October 1, 1998, and before October 1, 2002, under paragraph (1) to grant an alien nonimmigrant status described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The amount of the fee shall be \$500 for each such nonimmigrant.

"(B) Fees collected under this paragraph shall be deposited in the Treasury in accordance with section 286(t).

"(C)(i) An employer may not require an alien who is the subject of the petition for which a fee is imposed under this paragraph to reimburse, or otherwise compensate, the employer for part or all of the cost of such fee.

"(ii) Section 274A(g)(2) shall apply to a violation of clause (i) in the same manner as it applies to a violation of section 274A(g)(1)."

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT; USE OF FEES.—Section 286 (8 U.S.C. 1356) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(t) H-1B NONIMMIGRANT PETITIONER ACCOUNT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a separate account which shall be known as the 'H-1B Nonimmigrant Petitioner Account'. Notwithstanding any other section of this title,

there shall be deposited as offsetting receipts into the account all fees collected under section 214(c)(9).

"(2) USE OF HALF OF FEES BY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION GRANTS.—Fifty percent of the amounts deposited into the H-1B Nonimmigrant Petitioner Account shall remain available until expended to the Secretary of Education for additional allotments to States under subpart 4 of chapter 8 of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 but only for the purpose of assisting States in providing grants to eligible students enrolled in a program of study leading to a degree in mathematics, computer science, or engineering.

"(3) USE OF HALF OF FEES BY SECRETARY OF LABOR FOR JOB TRAINING.—Fifty percent of amounts deposited into the deposits into such Account shall remain available until expended to the Secretary of Labor for demonstration programs described in section 104(d) of the Temporary Access to Skilled Workers and H-1B Nonimmigrant Program Improvement Act of 1998."

(c) CONFORMING MODIFICATION OF APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 415C(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070c-2(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(11) provides that any portion of the allotment to the State for each fiscal year that derives from funds made available under section 286(t)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be expended for grants described in paragraph (2)(A) to students enrolled in a program of study leading to a degree in mathematics, computer science, or engineering."

(d) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL SKILLS TRAINING FOR WORKERS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), in establishing demonstration programs under section 452(c) of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1732(c)), as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, or demonstration programs or projects under a successor Federal law, the Secretary of Labor shall establish demonstration programs or projects to provide technical skills training for workers, including both employed and unemployed workers.

(2) GRANTS.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary of Labor shall award grants to carry out the programs and projects described in paragraph (1) to—

(A)(i) private industry councils established under section 102 of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1512), as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) local boards that will carry out such programs or projects through one-stop delivery systems established under a successor Federal law; or

(B) regional consortia of councils or local boards described in subparagraph (A).

(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish programs and projects under paragraph (1), including awarding grants to carry out such programs and projects under paragraph (2), only with funds made available under section 286(t)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and not with funds made available under the Job Training Partnership Act or a successor Federal law.

SEC. 9. IMPROVING COUNT OF H-1B AND H-2B NONIMMIGRANTS.

(a) ENSURING ACCURATE COUNT.—The Attorney General shall take such steps as are necessary to maintain an accurate count of the number of aliens subject to the numerical limitations of section 214(g)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act who are issued visas or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status.

(b) REVISION OF PETITION FORMS.—The Attorney General shall take such steps as are necessary to revise the forms used for petitions for visas or nonimmigrant status under clause (i)(b) or (ii)(b) of section 101(a)(15)(H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to ensure that the forms provide the Attorney General with sufficient information to permit the Attorney General accurately to count the number of aliens subject to the numerical limitations of section 214(g)(1) of such Act who are issued visas or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status.

(c) REPORTS.—Beginning with fiscal year 1999, the Attorney General shall provide to the Congress not less than 4 times per year a report on—

(1) the numbers of individuals who were issued visas or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status during the preceding 3-month period under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

(2) the numbers of individuals who were issued visas or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status during the preceding 3-month period under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of such Act; and

(3) the countries of origin and occupations of, educational levels attained by, and total compensation (including the value of all wages, salary, bonuses, stock, stock options, and any other similar forms of remuneration) paid to, individuals issued visas or provided nonimmigrant status under such sections during such period.

SEC. 10. GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON AGE DISCRIMINATION IN THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FIELD.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study assessing age discrimination in the information technology field. The study shall consider the following:

(1) The prevalence of age discrimination in the information technology workplace.

(2) The extent to which there is a difference, based on age, in promotion and advancement; working hours; telecommuting; salary; and stock options, bonuses, or other benefits.

(3) The relationship between rates of advancement, promotion, and compensation to experience, skill level, education, and age.

(4) Differences in skill level on the basis of age.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2000, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States House of Representatives and the Senate a report containing the results of the study described in subsection (a). The report shall include any recommendations of the Comptroller General concerning age discrimination in the information technology field.

SEC. 11. GAO LABOR MARKET STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a labor market study. The study shall investigate and analyze the following:

(1) The overall shortage of available workers in the high-technology, rapid-growth industries.

(2) The multiplier effect growth of high-technology industry on low-technology employment.

(3) The relative achievement rates of United States and foreign students in secondary school in a variety of subjects, including math, science, computer science, English, and history.

(4) The relative performance, by subject area, of United States and foreign students in postsecondary and graduate schools as compared to secondary schools.

(5) The labor market need for workers with information technology skills and the extent of the deficit of such workers to fill high-technology jobs during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) Future training and education needs of companies in the high-technology sector.

(7) Future training and education needs of United States students to ensure that their skills at various levels match the needs of the high-technology and information technology sectors.

(8) An analysis of which particular skill sets are in demand.

(9) The needs of the high-technology sector for foreign workers with specific skills.

(10) The potential benefits of postsecondary educational institutions, employers, and the United States economy from the entry of skilled professionals in the fields of engineering and science.

(11) The effect on the high-technology labor market of the downsizing of the defense sector, the increase in productivity in the computer industry, and the deployment of workers dedicated to the Year 2000 Project.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2000, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States House of Representatives and the Senate a report containing the results of the study described in subsection (a).

SEC. 12. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to applications filed with the Secretary of Labor on or after 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the amendments made by section 2 shall apply to applications filed with such Secretary before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 4276

OFFERED BY: MR. CALLAHAN

AMENDMENT NO. 36: Page 52, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$29,000,000)".

Page 52, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$29,000,000)".

Page 53, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$29,000,000)".

Page 53, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$29,000,000)".

H.R. 4276

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 37: Page 101, line 21 insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 76, line 3 insert "(decreased by \$4,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ISSUES OF CONCERN TO YOUTH
TODAY

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD statements by high school students from my home state of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today. I am asking that you please insert their statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe that the views of these young persons will benefit my colleagues.

STATEMENT BY RACHEL SALYER REGARDING
SUBSTANCE ABUSE

RACHEL SALYER: My name is Rachel Salyer. I am a senior at the Bellows Free Academy in St. Albans.

I think there are so many issues surrounding the youth of today, things like success—we are pressured to succeed in life, whether that is monetarily, or just self. And the adults in the community don't seem to be helping very much. When adults, parents and other adults alike throughout Vermont and the nation characterize teenagers as all being troublemakers or all being people who drink or party, then they are sending a message to the youth of the community that they don't care about our future, because it is our future, and they are not going to be around for it, and it is our own fault, basically.

These stereotypes are wrong. Not all youth in Vermont are people who like to drink, people who like to do drugs, people who go to parties every weekend. That's why organizations such as Green Mountain Prevention Project are such an important part of Vermont youth, because they sponsor programs like the Green Mountain Teens, which is a group of teens who have gotten together, who try to make other teens aware that there are all these issues surrounding them, that parents and adults have this image of us, and we want to try and change it.

Basically, what the Green Mountain Teens do is, we are a peer-awareness and prevention group. We provide healthy alternatives to doing drugs or drinking and things like that. We have coffee houses, we have haunted houses, winter balls, dances, anything you can imagine, any other kind of healthy lifestyle habit, we promote that, in order to tell teens that there is something else out there. We are setting examples for teens by being teens, and telling them that there are other choices. And we are trying to show the adults in the community that we need their support also, that we recognize there is a problem, and that it needs to be changed.

Congressman SANDERS: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT BY JOSH LEMIEUX, MARK BOYLE, CARL HALBACH AND RICHARD GONZALES REGARDING SKATEBOARD COMMUNITY BUILDING

CARL HALBACH: First of all, thank you for inviting us here. The point we are trying to

prove today is, we have changed our community outlook and image from a negative to a positive outlook.

MARK BOYLE: A lot of groups here are talking about things they would like to do and things that they think need to be done, or processes they need to do. We would like to prove that works. We did a lot of community service and got help from a lot of community members in order to enhance what we enjoy. And this is one of those things that a lot of these groups out there need to think about doing, and this is how they need to do it, just like get a lot of help from the community and be able to follow the guidelines that the adult world uses, and not dwell on the fact that they need to let us do what we want to do, because we are going to do it anyway.

RICHARD GONZALES: Basically, I looked at the State of Vermont, and I seen that they don't recognize extreme sports as one of the big issues, as like physical activities, and, you know, we just took it upon ourselves to build our own park and raise money, and do stuff like that, try to help our city out.

JOSH LEMIEUX: Right now, we are building a new skate park. We just got done. It ran for like five years, and was getting too small. Right now, we are moving and expanding to a bigger skate park, and doing this by ourselves. And we have a grant from a couple of companies, and we are just raising money right now. We have the communities behind us, just trying to.

Carl, did you want to add something?

CARL HALBACH: Yes. Basically went around asking for donations, seeing who would like to help us. A lot of the times, we worked for the money, instead of having it handed to us. There is a sliding hill near our town. And we decided to go clean it up and put up all new fences and paint the buildings and take them down and rebuild them again, so they are in a much better condition, and made the sliding hill much more safe.

Congressman SANDERS: Are we talking about St. Albans?

CARL HALBACH: Yes.

Congressman SANDERS: Mark, did you want to add anything?

MARK BOYLE: We have done this all by ourselves. We have guidance of some outstanding citizens in our community, Miss Gridmore and Doctor Chip. I mean, they don't do work for us, but they help organize stuff, because not all community members are going to be totally accepting of a bunch of rag-tag kids coming and saying, can we do some work for money so we can do this, or can we have community support, and she helped us work through the right channels and we really appreciate it.

Congressman SANDERS: This is an excellent presentation.

STATEMENT BY JESS WALTERS, AND LINH NGUYEN, AND RYAN LAFEBVRE, AND GARY BAILEY REGARDING BURLINGTON'S OLD NORTH END

RYAN LAFEBVRE: Hello. My name is Ryan. I am here to represent Burlington's Old North End. We decided that one of the most important issues to us is how teens in the Old North End spend their out-of-school hours.

Each day, teens in the Old North End decide how they will spend at least five of their waking hours when not in school. For many of these, the hours harbor both risk and opportunity.

For many that are home alone, the out-of-school hours present serious risks for substance abuse, crime, violence and sexual activity, leading to unwanted pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS. Time spent alone is not the crucial contributor to higher risk; it is what young people do during that time, where they do it, and with whom, that leads to positive or negative consequences.

According to a 1990 survey, my community contains 29 percent of the Burlington's population, and has the highest percentage of people of color in the city. Over half of the households are female-headed, and over 60 percent of these families live below the poverty line.

Poverty is especially pronounced for the Old North End's children, 42 percent of whom lived in poverty in 1990. That percentage is higher today. The Old North End has 32.1 percent of its residents living below the poverty level, compared with 19.3 percent for the city as a whole.

Recently, a number of focus groups were held, where youth, senior citizens, and business people spoke out about concerns they have about the Old North End. The following issues and concerns were continually mentioned: Public drinking, drug dealing, continuing poverty, racial tensions, and potential gang violence.

We proposed a teen center that would directly address many of our community concerns, as well as issues many of you will be presenting later today. Jessica is now going to tell you why there is a need for our teen center in Burlington.

JESSICA WALTERS: Hello. My name is Jessica Walters.

Yes, there are other teen centers in Burlington, but there are many reasons why they do not meet our needs.

First, they all have limited teen hours. For instance, I have nowhere to go after school until 5:30, and most youth centers close at 9:00 at night. My friends usually hang out on the street until teen hours start or until they have to go home.

Due to things mentioned by Ryan, North Street isn't really a safe place for teens to hang out. Most of the teens that live in the Old North End go to Burlington High School, where there is no computer and Internet access available to us after school. Currently, there is nowhere to go to do research or study after school hours. The other youth centers don't have a place for us to do this.

The final issue is the adults' role. Other youth centers have too much supervision and not enough opportunity for independence and creativity. There are also a lot of little kids around.

Now Gary is going to tell you about what our teen center will be like.

GARY BAILEY: Hello. My name is Gary, and I would like to tell you about our teen center.

Our teen center will be run by youth, it will be for ages 13 through 19, and it will be

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

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

free of charge. We feel that it should be open for longer hours, like said she before, because other teen programs like the one we want to open will have to be open for younger children also, so we only have a section of the day that we can go there, so we are still out in the streets.

We feel that it should have a resource room run by adults, with a mini library, mentoring and tutoring facilities, a career college center, and information on social services. Also, a job board for a list for people to get jobs easily, and maybe once a week somebody in there helping them out, somebody like Becky Trudeau or something, where they won't have to go five different places to look for a job, they can just go there and have one place to look.

We feel that it should have a computer room, with Internet access. A lot of people work right after school, and they have to be there around 3:30, including us. And we don't have the time to go after school and work on the computers to get an essay done, so we feel that it should have computers where it will be available for us after work.

We think there should be recreational rooms, including a gym, a game room. Also special events, such as, once a month, a dance or some sort like that. We also think there should be a lounge so that we can relax and watch TV.

Congressman SANDERS: Good. Linh, do you want to begin?

LINH NGUYEN: My name is Linh Nguyen. We would like to ask for continued support in finding out how we should embark on this teen center and after school program. We strongly believe this would make the Old North End a better place for teens, and not only the teens, but the community as a whole. We would, as well, be a model to replicate in the rest of Vermont.

Congressman SANDERS: Thank you very much. Thank you all very much.

REMEMBERING THE FLOOD VICTIMS OF FORT COLLINS AND LARIMER COUNTY, COLORADO

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recall Monday, July 28, 1997 and to describe to the House, one year later, a natural disaster which occurred in Colorado on this date, when an intense storm produced record amounts of rainfall in Fort Collins and unincorporated Larimer County, Colorado. The storm devastated area residents as they watched their homes, schools, and churches roll into the immense current which swept through their city. However, the loss far more costly was that of human life. JoAnn Roth, Rose Marie Rodriguez, Sarah Payne, Estafana Guarneros, and Cindy Schulz died as they attempted to escape the storm. Although this event caused a multitude of pain and sorrow, it also enabled members of our community to reach out to one another as individuals struggled to put the pieces of their lives back in place. As a Member of Congress representing Colorado's Fourth District where citizens worked together to restore their way of life, I hereby commemorate the victory achieved through this widespread community

spirit and recall the names of those who perished.

As we reflect on the events of the past year, we recall the words of Luke 8:23-24, "... A windstorm swept down on the lake, and the boat was filling with water, and they were in danger. They went to him and woke him up, shouting, 'Master, Master, we are perishing!' And he woke up and rebuked the wind and the raging waves; they ceased, and there was a calm."

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4194) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, today I join with Congressman TIM ROEMER and Congressman DAVE CAMP to take a stand for common sense and fiscal responsibility when it comes to our budget.

When Congress first approved the International Space Station in 1984, the original price tag was \$8 billion. A recent General Accounting Office [GAO] report projects the station's total operating costs at \$95.6 billion. Congress keeps throwing taxpayer dollars into this money pit, and we have no tangible benefits to show for it.

Since its conception in 1984, the station has been redesigned three times. The latest model would accomplish only two of its eight original scientific missions. Furthermore, many of the remaining goals envisioned for the station could be accomplished aboard unmanned satellites or aboard the space shuttle for a small fraction of the cost.

Furthermore, the station's rising costs are a threat to other promising projects. Already, NASA has shifted \$200 million from other programs like space shuttle safety and space education grants to pay for station cost overruns. This year, NASA has requested the authority to shift an additional \$375 million. As the station experiences more cost overruns, the space station budget will literally consume the NASA budget at the expense of proven programs like probes within our solar system, the Space Shuttle, earth sciences, and aeronautics.

Every year we pour billions upon billions of dollars into NASA and the International Space Station at the expense of schoolchildren, the elderly and the infirm. We cannot afford the price of the space station when we have such pressing needs here on planet Earth. If we choose to look to the stars, we must first have our feet planted firmly on the ground.

THE LONG TERM CARE ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 1998

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the aging of the Baby Boom generation has been extensively discussed in Congress and among the American people, with particular attention to the impact on Social Security and Medicare.

What has not been widely discussed, however, is a related but very distinct trend: the rapid expansion of the group of Americans defined by the Bureau of the Census as "the oldest old"—those senior citizens aged 85 and above. Often lost during discussions of the Baby Boom generation is the fact that the fastest growing demographic age group in the United States is the "oldest old."

That is why I am introducing legislation, joined by my colleagues PHIL ENGLISH (PA), RON PAUL (TX), JOHN ENSIGN (NV), and CHRIS SHAYS (CT) to help Americans better prepare themselves and their families for their long term health care needs of the future. The tax breaks contained in this legislation will go a long way towards providing families with peace and security against the massive costs of professionally provided long term care, including nursing home care, home health care, and adult day care services.

I am pleased that this legislation has already secured the support of the 60 Plus Association and the Home Health Assembly of New Jersey. The Health Insurance Association of America (HIAA) has also endorsed the concept behind the bill.

Our Nation will soon be grappling with a long term care crisis unless Congress acts now to prevent it. From 1960 through 1994, the senior citizen population (age 85+) increased by 274 percent. And the number of Americans in the 85+ age cohort is expected to double in size by the year 2020, reaching 7 million. The number of senior citizens between the ages of 75 and 84 will reach nearly 15.5 million by 2020. The sixty four thousand dollar question is: how will we as a nation meet our parents' and grandparents' long-term care need?

This demographic change will put an enormous strain on our nation's fragmented system of long-term care. Already, our Medicaid program has demonstrated its financial shortcomings when providing long-term care services to increasing numbers of the frail elderly. The Medicaid program already spends over \$40 billion on long term care services for senior citizens. These expenditures are projected to double over the next 10 years.

A vital part of any comprehensive response to these trends must be the promotion of private long term care insurance (LTC) for Americans. Although the number of persons insured under LTC policies has nearly doubled between 1992 and 1996, this growth is from a very low base. The fact of the matter is that the overwhelming majority of Americans still do not have any private LTC insurance coverage at all. This needs to change, and soon.

Mr. Speaker, the Long Term Care Advancement Act of 1998 will assist Americans prepare for their future long term care needs. My

bill will allow penalty-free withdrawal from IRAs and 401 (k) plans when the funds are used to pay for 'qualified' LTC insurance premiums (as defined by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996).

In addition, a certain portion of the IRA/401 (k) withdrawals used for LTC will be excluded from taxable income. Depending on one's tax bracket, age, and type of policy purchased, the savings on a long term care insurance policy under my bill are considerable, and could range from 15 to 25 percent.

Lastly, the Long Term Care Advancement Act will provide a refundable \$500 tax credit for families caring for a dependent elderly spouse or parent in the home. This tax credit is important because most of the long term care provided in America is provided by families in the home, and these families desperately need and deserve tax relief.

By encouraging more Americans to plan for their future care needs I believe we can improve the medical, social, and financial well being of families, as well as provide substantial future savings to the Medicaid and Medicare programs. According to the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company, there is a 48% chance of any given individual of needing long term care in one's lifetime. And the costs of nursing home care for one year is approximately \$40,000. The potential for savings to American families, as well as the Medicaid and Medicare programs, by encouraging families to purchase LTC insurance is simply enormous.

I look forward to working on and discussing long term care issues with my colleagues during the remainder of the 105th Congress, and urge all of my colleagues to support this important initiative.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Capitol Police Officers John Gibson and Jacob Chestnut who gave their lives last week in a vicious attack by a deranged gunman.

My heart goes out to the families of these officers, both of whom spent 18 years in courageous and devoted service to their country as members of the Capitol Police. They gave their lives, not only protecting Members of Congress, but the thousands of Americans and foreign visitors to this great monument, the people's house of government.

Officers Gibson and Chestnut were both known as kind, personable men who were especially devoted to their families. They performed their jobs with a special kind of pride in playing a small part in the smooth and efficient conduct of the processes of government.

As we go about our business in the Capitol, we tend to take for granted the freedom and protection we enjoy because of the selfless contributions of our Capitol Police who are constantly on guard against the type of insane acts which took the lives of Officers Chestnut and Gibson and wounded an innocent civilian.

This horrible act reminds us once again of the debt we owe to those officers who do their jobs daily in protecting those who work here and those who visit. With few exceptions, problems, large and small, are prevented so we are left free and comfortable to perform our jobs in peace.

We owe these men and their families a great debt of gratitude for their sacrifice. They will not be forgotten and their contributions will be forever recognized by the Members of the House of Representatives.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to help express my thoughts to the families of slain Capitol police officers John Gibson and Jacob Chestnut. I say "help express" because there is no total way to thank these men for laying down their lives for others. I would defer to the words of my wife, Freda, for these remarks, in the joint letter she sent to the Gibson and Chestnut families.

To the families of Officer John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut:

My heart today is filled with a tremendous sense of debt and gratitude to your fathers and husbands and the sacrifice they have made. Scripture tells us in John 15:13, "Greater love has no one than this, that one lay down his life for his friend." Indeed, we consider each officer at the Capitol a friend. Daily we give thanks for their constant careful watch of the members of congress and the millions of visiting tourists. Last night as we welcomed my husband, Congressman Donald Manzullo, home we breathed a prayer of thanksgiving for his safe return. But also your families and great loss were uppermost in our thoughts. Our heartfelt thanks pour out to you. Our sorrow at your loss is overwhelming. Another scripture comes to mind, one that I believe the Lord said as he received your loved ones into this eternal kingdom, "Well done, good and faithful servants; you were faithful with a few things; enter into the joy of your master," Matthew 25:23.

With love and gratitude,

FREDA MANZULLO.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the two men who gave their last full measure of devotion in defense of the people's House, the U.S. Congress.

Capitol Police Officers John Gibson and J.J. Chestnut leave behind friends and family who will mourn their sacrifice for years to come. Today, a grateful Nation mourns with them.

Thousands of Americans are paying tribute as we speak, filing past their caskets in the Capitol Rotunda just a few hundred feet from where they died.

In the last few days, we've learned a great deal about Officers Gibson and Chestnut—their love of family and country, the many kindnesses they showed over the years to everyone on Capitol Hill, from committee chairmen to wandering tourists.

The focus on the lives of these two courageous men has been a poignant reminder of what America is really all about.

In death, Officers Gibson and Chestnut have been hailed as heroes, but they were quiet heroes each and every day of their lives. They symbolize what all of us strive to achieve.

J.J. Chestnut served his country in Vietnam, raised five children, loved gardening, and helped raise money in his neighborhood for college scholarships. He and his wife were often seen bicycling around their home in Fort Washington, MD.

John Gibson, from the great State of Massachusetts, suffered from the regional malady known as Red Sox Fever and shared his tragic affliction with all who would listen.

John was married to the niece of my good friend and colleague JOE MOAKLEY. A deeply religious man, John was devoted to his wife and their three teenage children and worked hard to give them a stable and loving home. In the Lake Ridge neighborhood of Woodbridge, VA, John was known for an easy smile, a generous laugh, and the best-kept lawn on the street.

In some ways, these were ordinary men leading ordinary lives. But when duty called, they acted in extraordinary fashion. They acted just the way all who knew them always expected they would.

Every one of us in this chamber owes them a special debt of gratitude. They served the Congress faithfully. They served the country faithfully. They swore an oath to protect and serve, and they died as they lived—holding true to those vows.

There is nothing we can say or do to diminish the loss felt by those who loved these men and knew them best. But at one time or another, we have all lost friends, we have all lost brothers, we have all lost fathers, and so we share their loss as well.

And today, we pause to remember not just what we have lost, but what Officers Gibson and Chestnut gave to each and every one of us: a lesson of bravery and courage under fire and a reminder of the greatest love of all—that of laying your life down for others.

That's what these quiet heroes did. I'm grateful for the opportunity for us to come together as a Nation, here in the temple of democracy they gave their lives to defend, to offer them a final salute.

My heart goes out to their families and all those who feel their loss most of all.

Finally, I hope this tragic incident makes us look inside as a Nation to recognize the real meaning of Heroism—the selfless work that goes on each and every day by those who take an oath to protect us.

I would ask that we look around us today and take a moment to appreciate the men and women of our law enforcement community who serve with courage and devotion.

They are police officers and firefighters, soldiers and sailors, secret service and FBI agents. And, as we know too well, they are also mothers and fathers, husbands, sons, and daughters. Some serve in uniform, some do not, but each and every one carries the same badge of honor, and we should never, never, take them for granted.

Because of the sacrifice of Officers Gibson and Chestnut, I know I never will.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, Officers Jacob J. Chestnut and John M. Gibson are American heroes. They gave their lives protecting us, our staffs, and visitors to the United States Capitol. This tragedy reminds us that the members of the Capitol Police and other police officers across the country put their lives on the line for us every day.

We honor Officers Chestnut and Gibson for their bravery and sacrifice. We lost two good men and fine police officers. No words can adequately express our feelings on this sad occasion. Our hearts go out to their families and to their fellow officers.

This tragedy highlights a dilemma as old as democracy itself: the balance between security and openness. We have made a decision—the correct decision, I believe—to maintain public accessibility to the Capitol. The people's business must be open to the public gaze. Every year people from our districts, some traveling literally thousands of miles, visit the Capitol to share their views and urge us to support or oppose this or that bill. They come to partake of the history that walks these halls. They come simply to see us in the flesh, look us in the eye, and take the measure of the men and women whom they have elected to make our laws. Their right to do so is enshrined in the very concept of democracy. Nowhere is it more appropriate to exercise that right than here in the people's house.

At the same time, we can not escape the reality of the world in which we live. There are some individuals who would take advantage of that openness to enter this building and do violence to those engaged in the people's business. Their actions defile this temple of democracy. That is why it is necessary to have a Capitol Police force. Its members not only protect us as individuals, they defend the accessibility of this building, accessibility which is so important to our democracy.

On Friday, July 24, 1998, two of those officers made the ultimate sacrifice. Their bravery and devotion to duty enshrine the names of Jacob Chestnut and John Gibson among the heroes of our nation. We bow our heads in sorrow and gratitude. We pledge to honor their memories by keeping our nation's Capitol open, accessible, and safe for everyone who desires to enter this building, the people's house.

AN EXPRESSION OF CONGRATULATIONS TO COLONIA COUNTRY CLUB ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the officers and members of Colonia Country Club on the occasion of their Club's 100th anniversary.

Colonia, the name of both the Club and the section of Woodbridge, New Jersey in which it is located, is a derivation of the word, colony, a term defined by Webster as "a body of people living in a new territory." Colonia is a most appropriate designation for the community—originally Houtenville—that was the site of many Revolutionary War events. Immediately adjacent to Colonia Country Club is the highway on which George Washington traveled on his way to his first inauguration. That roadway was also a main north-south artery during the Civil War and was later named The Lincoln Highway. In Colonia, the highway is also bound, on its east side, by the nation's major east coast rail line.

It was in 1898 that a group of area residents agreed to form a golf and country club, using an Inn constructed just prior to the Civil War as its clubhouse. Designed to serve as a gathering place for sport and social occasions, their new "home-away from home" was to be called Colonia Country Club. Part of their agreement called for the purchase of a horse-drawn lawnmower to trim what would become a nine-hole golf course.

The century that followed will be remembered by the citizens of America and, indeed the world, as one filled with joys and achievements unparalleled in recorded history and with toils and tragedies that would test human endurance. A microcosm of that world, Colonia Country Club rose from a small gathering of neighbors to become a proud and prominent member of its region's social fraternity, the site of a modern clubhouse and one of its region's most challenging 18-hole golf courses. In the process, those that charted the course of its progress proved they had the grit and determination to withstand depressions and years of mid-century decline. Colonia Country Club, like many venerable, sturdy American institutions both large and small, stands today as a model of a modern Americana. It is a story of people overcoming difficulty and proving their endurance as they share prosperity and camaraderie—and it offers its one hundred year history as evidence of that achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, my neighbors in the 7th Congressional District of New Jersey and my colleagues to join me in offering our congratulations to Colonia Country Club as it celebrates its 100th anniversary.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. BILL LUTHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice today to the much-deserved tributes being paid to U.S. Capitol Police Officers Jacob Joseph Chestnut and John Michael Gibson. This is a sad day for Congress and our nation. Just a few short steps from here two American heroes lay in honor in the rotunda of the United States Capitol. This past Friday these men gave the last full measure of devotion to their country. Their honored sacrifice no doubt saved numerous lives and served as a stark reminder of the reality of the violent world in which we live. This tragedy also reminds us of the price that must sometimes be paid for the great privilege of having our democratic form of government.

So today it is appropriate that all of us pause for a moment to thank officers Chestnut and Gibson for what they did last week. Their sacrifice will never be forgotten. And we should also extend our thanks to all of the members of the Capitol Police force and all other law enforcement officers throughout our nation. They have an incredibly difficult mission—providing security while serving as goodwill ambassadors for their communities. They do a terrific job day in and day out and frankly we don't do enough to show our appreciation for all of their hard work.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that this seems like a different place today than it did when I left here on Friday. The tragic events of last week seem to have pulled us together. Democrats and Republicans, Members and staff, as well as so many people of our country have all joined hands in coming to terms with what happened here. If there is a silver lining in these tragic circumstances perhaps it is that we all may gain a little more appreciation for the people we work with on a daily basis and for the wonderful country we are proud to call our own. The differences we have pale in comparison to the bonds we share as Americans. A tragedy like this reminds us of this simple truth and affords us the opportunity for a renewed perspective as we face the challenges ahead.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the ultimate sacrifice made by Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob J.J. Chestnut while conducting their duty protecting the Capitol. I admire the tremendous sacrifice made by these individuals and my thoughts are with their families as they cope with the departure of their loved ones. Like countless others, I did not personally observe the tragedy. But like them, I have been shaken by the

event and moved by the warm reception all have provided in memory of the fallen men.

No one can bring back these brave officers who gave their lives to protect us. But I stand today to recognize the risks that our law enforcement personnel face each day. I express the gratitude that I have for the dedication of these people, who each day leave the security of their homes and families to protect and serve those in need all across America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was recorded as voting in favor of agreeing to the conference report on H.R. 629, the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact.

As should be obvious from my vote against the rule providing for consideration of the conference report, I had intended to vote against the conference report itself.

I am in complete agreement with my colleagues from Texas and elsewhere who have fought against the imposition of what could become the nation's major depository for low-level radioactive waste on the largely poor and minority community of Sierra Blanca, Texas.

I understand and share the concerns of Sierra Blanca and other minority communities. The siting of a disproportionate number of New York City's waste transfer and waste processing facilities in the Hunts Point area of my South Bronx congressional district, and the related particulate-spewing diesel truck traffic, have led to disproportionate levels of asthma and other respiratory illnesses among my Hunts Point constituents, especially the children. Without attention to environmental justice, the more disenfranchised a community is, the likelier it is to find itself the depository for more powerful people's waste.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LOUIS STOKES

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following for the RECORD:

I want to add my voice to the tributes offered by the Congressional colleagues of the Honorable LOUIS STOKES. When I first came to Washington, nearly six years ago, as the Assistant Secretary of Community Planning and Development at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, LOUIS STOKES was Mr. Chairman. He was the Chairman of the Subcommittee that controlled the purse strings for all the creative ideas that a new Administration wanted to implement—an unprecedented increase in funding for the homeless, funding for partnerships between the Federal Government and not for profit organizations to

build and rehabilitate affordable housing, a new economic development grant program. And he agreed with those initiatives and helped restore the Department as the agency that is dedicated to assisting the most vulnerable among us and to revitalizing our cities and towns.

Now as ranking member of that same Subcommittee, he continues to help this Administration and me as Secretary of the Department. He has been with me every step of the way as we have "reinvented" HUD and I counted on his advice and counsel. Now that we are beginning to see the results of that re-invention, he has fought to give the Department the resources it needs to create jobs and economic opportunity to meet the challenges of the global economy and the demands of American cities. He has fought steadfastly to expand and preserve housing opportunities for renters in public and assisted housing, for homebuyers, and for the homeless. He has fought unabashedly to end the scourge of housing discrimination. He has taken on all these battles even in the face of terribly tight budget strictures.

Perhaps it was growing up in public housing, but, whatever the reason, Congressman STOKES sought to serve on the two appropriations subcommittees that reach those most in need—VA, HUD and Independent Agencies and the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, & Related Agencies. And serve those in need, he has. He is a man who cares deeply about the programs of this Department and the people they impact.

So I want to pay tribute to him and to say how deeply I appreciate his long, hard work. I will miss him and the people who rely upon HUD's programs will miss him.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, upon my return from my home district of Guam yesterday, I had the privilege to pay respects to slain Officers Jacob J. Chestnut and John Gibson. As Members of Congress join the nation in mourning the passing of these two gentlemen who paid the supreme sacrifice for our safety and protection, I could not help but reflect upon my constituents from Guam, people who, like me, have to overcome the rigors of traveling several thousand miles in order to experience, to participate, or maybe even just to catch a glimpse of their government at work.

As with everyone, the highlight of my constituents' Washington, D.C. trip is a visit to Members' offices and a tour of the Capitol. Times like these remind us of the valuable service provided by police officers stationed at different posts within the Capitol complex ensuring the safety of constituents who travel the many miles in order to visit members who represent them in this body.

Speaking not only for myself but for the people of Guam, I wish to express apprecia-

tion to the Capitol Hill Police Force who, by the loss of Officers Gibson and Chestnut, demonstrated their willingness to lay down their lives for the safety and protection of Members of Congress and our constituents. As quoted from the Book of John, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." John Gibson and J.J. Chestnut gave their lives so that others may live.

Roman Benavente, a retired Capitol Police officer—a native son of Guam who has chosen to reside in the State of Maryland, has called together members of the Guam Society of America to honor the slain officers in a Memorial Mass to be celebrated this Friday at St. Ignatius Catholic Church in Oxon Hill, Maryland. I hope that my colleagues would be able to join Guam residents in the area for this memorial service.

The sacrifice of Officers Gibson and Chestnut will never be forgotten. On behalf of the people of Guam, I extend sincerest thanks to Officer Chestnut and Officer Gibson for their sacrifice. To the families and loved ones of these two American heroes, we offer our most heartfelt sympathies.

FUNDING FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, this year, to my disappointment, the House of Representatives voted to continue funding the International Space Station. The amendment I introduced with Representative CAMP to cancel the space station program would have ended the single largest wasteful government program in history.

Today, I am proud and pleased to have introduced my amendment to the VA-HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999 that was supported by 109 Representatives. I strongly believe that my amendment reflects the best interests of the United States, the taxpayers and certainly of NASA and the American space program.

Like most of my colleagues, I am a strong supporter of the American space program. However, I find it sad to see that productive and more worthwhile space programs are being shut down so that larger and larger amounts of NASA funding are claimed by a space station program that has already cost almost \$20 billion with no hardware in space to show for it.

In 1993, upon NASA's final redesign of the space station, we were told that the program would cost no more than \$17.4 billion and that our partnership with the Russian Government would save American taxpayers around \$2 billion. This was still a huge increase over the Reagan Administration's initial plan to build the station for \$8 billion and complete it by 1994. Now NASA has accepted the findings of the Cost Assessment and Validation Task Force, also known as the independent Chabrow committee, which concluded the program will cost \$24 billion and an additional

\$130 million to \$250 million for each month that the station assembly is delayed. And it will be delayed—probably by at least two years.

Also, Mr. Speaker, GAO now tells us that the program will cost more than \$100 billion. This does not include additional costs associated with Russia's potential withdrawal from the partnership or the costs of upgrading the station's defense system to protect it against meteorites and orbital debris. Nor does the \$100 billion pricetag include disassembly costs, which GAO says could be "prohibitively expensive" and could exceed \$5 billion. These "unforeseen" funding contingencies are indeed shocking and clearly jeopardize the future and integrity of the entire U.S. space program.

The magnitude of these dramatic cost overruns and assembly delays are unacceptable and sure to result in the cannibalization of the so-called "smaller, better, faster, cheaper" space missions. If we do not move to cancel the space station now, then these smaller, but important, missions will most likely never share the tremendous success of projects like the Hubble Space Telescope and the Mars Sojourner Pathfinder. This is a shame, and a disappointment to the entire scientific community.

While the Russians remain competent in repeating missions that have been flown for three decades, they have been unable to fund development of reliable new technologies or to deliver critical component parts such as the Service Module. Everything that worked on Mir involves 20-year-old technologies. A year ago, when a fundamentally new space docking procedure was attempted, the result was a collision that punched a hole in the space station, crippling it and almost killing the crew. Other new Russian space vehicles such as the Mars probe and its plutonium batteries have also failed. This does not bode well for the space station.

The Russians have repeatedly promised to develop a series of new and improved space vehicles to help assemble the space station. However, over the past several years, Russia's work on the components has fallen far behind schedule, causing significant delays and cost overruns which have spilled over into NASA's share of the work. Russia's Finance Ministry has repeatedly misled NASA and the American people, and we should not tolerate this continued foot-dragging. As I have said over the past six years, NASA's dependence on Russian participation in the space station will cripple other, more worthwhile U.S. space programs, and this will most likely continue to result in more assembly delays and cost overruns.

When the Administration approved the space station redesign in 1993, NASA promised the taxpayers that no more than \$2.1 billion would be spent each year for the program. At that time, it was estimated that Russia's inclusion as a partner would reduce costs by \$1.6 billion. Nevertheless, NASA has told us that the cap should be broken, despite Russia's repeated promises that the money and the critical hardware components like the Service Module would be delivered.

Far too many questions remain unanswered. NASA has yet to determine or release

any cost figures for the program reflecting the likely scenario that Russia will drop out of the partnership, but continues to offer robust assurances that it will save money. While I support efforts to engage our former adversaries, and sharing our knowledge of important scientific issues, I do not believe it is prudent to perpetuate a back-door foreign aid project that makes Russia look more like an international welfare recipient than the major partner in the single largest construction project in the history of mankind.

While space station cost overruns to date are currently estimated at \$800 million, NASA has cut mission control, shuttle safety, and more deserving programs such as Mission to Planet Earth and space education grants. Already \$227 million has been diverted from space station science and \$200 million has been shifted from the space shuttle payload and utilization operations. This year, NASA has asked for the authority to shift an additional \$375 million.

Like our efforts aboard Mir, NASA has cannibalized the station's scientific research missions simply because all the funds are being consumed on construction. NASA has transferred a whopping \$462 million from its science funding to space station development in fiscal years 1996 through 1998. Case in point: NASA dropped the centrifuge, a critical research component, and now depends on negotiations with the Japanese Government to provide it.

Throwing more money at the space station is adding fuel to the fire. We should not continue to approve NASA's repeated request for supplemental funding. Rather, we should hold NASA and the Russian Government's feet to the fire. The American taxpayers deserve accountability and demand that the integrity of our space program be maintained. We should therefore end this program before it kills NASA and its mission.

Mr. Speaker, for several years, we have known the solution to the many problems associated with the space station. In fact, the House almost got it right in 1993, when my amendment to terminate space station funding lost by a single vote. I suggest that we allow NASA the time and resources to improve its management structure, redefine its mission first, rather than move ahead with a mammoth, multi-billion dollar program whose costs will assuredly go over and beyond all reasonable budgetary expectations. All of the station's problems can be solved by simply canceling this wasteful, over-budget boondoggle, returning \$80 billion to the American taxpayers, and saving the life and health of the rest of the U.S. space program. I will continue to fight this program and strongly encourage my colleagues to closely monitor this program as cost overruns and schedule delays will most assuredly continue to cheat the scientific community of funding that could be better spent on more worthwhile space research endeavors.

TRIBUTE FOR MAJOR GENERAL
CLAUDE W. REINKE

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge a brave soldier, strong leader, caring father and a very good friend. Major General Claude W. Reinke is the retiring Commanding General of the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, which is located in my District. I have grown very fond of General Reinke and would like to commend his leadership at the base.

General Reinke is a Texan by birth but has always been ready to move anywhere the Marines needed to send him, including a tour in Vietnam. The position of Commander General to a base like Pendleton is often like being the mayor of a city, as both require outstanding managerial skills. General Reinke has gone above and beyond the call of duty as Commander. His leadership has had a positive impact on both the Marines and the entire community.

Part of what makes General Reinke so special is how much he cares for his troops. Very few Commanding officers are more sensitive to the needs of their troops than Claude Reinke. General Reinke has become a champion for quality of life for our troops by emphasizing the need for improved base housing and training facilities for members of the Corps.

General Reinke has been decorated with the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V," Meritorious Service Medal and the Combat Action Ribbon. He is a proud husband and father of five. I might also add that he plays a very good game of golf! If he reacts to the challenges of work like he reacts to the challenges on the golf course, I think the men and women of Camp Pendleton have been in very able hands!

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish Claude my best and commend him on a job extremely well done.

A TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING HOUSE
BANKING COMMITTEE STAFF
ROBERT AUERBACH AND
STEFANIE MULLIN

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to two dedicated members of the House Banking Committee Minority staff who are leaving the Committee this week to pursue endeavors in higher education. The efforts of Robert Auerbach, the Democratic staff economist, and Stefanie Mullin, the Democratic press secretary, will be greatly missed by all members of the Committee.

Bob Auerbach is a first-rate financial economist with a keen understanding of money and banking, the payments system, and the Federal Reserve System. He has served the

members of the House Banking Committee well in more than 10 years and two separate tours of duty on Capitol Hill. During this time, he has worked on a number of initiatives from the deregulation of interest rates to the promotion of openness at the Federal Reserve Board. I have personally worked with Bob on a number of issues pertaining to monetary policy and have found his knowledge, insight, and guidance to be invaluable.

Bob is leaving Capitol Hill for the ivory tower of academia. Starting this fall, he will be a Professor at the LBJ School of Public Policy at the University of Texas where he will be teaching courses on money and banking. He also has plans to write a book. Though I will miss Bob's wise counsel here in Washington, I know that our loss is most definitely the University of Texas' and his students' gain.

As press secretary for the Democrats, Stefanie Mullin has the often thankless job of reminding the world that there is another perspective on the Banking Committee. For the past five years, she has accomplished this with grace and dignity, always making sure that the views of the minority were heard by the world outside the Rayburn Building. Stefanie is also leaving us to return to school, but as a student. She will be attending Columbia University in a masters program in the prestigious School of Journalism. I wish her luck, and look forward to the day when I meet her again as a member of the news media.

COMMEMORATING "HEARTS AND STARS"

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize James M. McNeely's recent bronze sculpture "Hearts and Stars" that depicts the anguish, pain, honor and heroism displayed by young men and women while engaged in war.

Born and raised in St. Paul, Minnesota, James M. McNeely, was drafted into the United States Army in May of 1969. He served as an infantryman with the 196th Light Infantry Brigade, American Division, in I Corps, CCU Law, Vietnam. Serving courageously, McNeely rose to the rank of Sergeant and was awarded the Purple Heart and 3 Army Commendation Medals. After being discharged, he joined the Ramsey County Sheriffs Department in June of 1972. He has worked in Detention, patrol division and is currently working in the court security unit.

Jim McNeely is a self taught artist and member of the Vietnam Veterans Art Group. In the past, Jim's sculptures have recaptured the experiences of war and its effects upon humanity. In 1985, the 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Snelling, Minnesota commissioned McNeely to sculpt a bronze battle memorial of the Mexican American War to commemorate its bicentennial birthday. Currently, this celebrated bronze sculpture is on display at the Fort Snelling Museum in St. Paul, Minnesota.

His latest work, "Hearts and Stars" reminds us all that we must remember the suffering

and agony endured by young men and women while engaged in war. The sculpture is a bronze sculpture of a soldier carrying another soldier on his back. The figures stand astride a creek bed with the silhouette of North and South Vietnam. A branch lays across the creek symbolizing the split between the North and South. On the front of the oak pedestal is a 10 inch bronze medallion of a bamboo grove and dragon with the words inscribed "Republic of South Vietnam 1965-1975." The stone is polished and crafted from rough cut limestone. After being on display at the St. Paul City Hall/Ramsey County Courthouse the sculpture is going to the National Vietnam Veterans Art Museum in Chicago on August 11th. Vice President ALBERT GORE and seven United States Senators who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam War will be attending the event. This ceremony will open McNeely's work and bring to life the experience and memories of Vietnam that might educate and guide the understanding of our history and the American experience. "Hearts and Stars" is a honorable and captivating tribute to those young men and women who have courageously served in the Armed Forces.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 315, 319 and 320 last week. Let the RECORD state that I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 315 and 320 and "yes" on 319.

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN LINDER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, today the American people are feeling the pressure of rising health care costs paired with dwindling health care choices. They have called on us to do something that will make their lives better, to put health care decisions back in their hands.

Given that mandate, we have two choices. We can choose to task the government and lawyers with improving our health options. Or, we can choose to task the marketplace with offering us more health choices. My constituents have tasked me to do the latter.

For those who believe in the benevolence of lawyers, for those who believe in the wisdom of bureaucrats, the Dingell substitute is available to you today.

But for those who believe that the individual makes better choices about his family's health care than a government official does, you will share my excitement about the Patient Protection Act introduced by Speaker GINGRICH and Mr. HASTER.

The Patient Protection Act protects the patient in three key ways. First, this legislation

protects the patient's choice of doctors. For those patients in HMO's, the bill provides that they have a point-of-service option—so that patients can visit doctors outside of their HMO network. For those patients not in HMO's, the bill expands their access to Medical Savings Accounts—accounts that offer complete freedom of doctor and treatment. For all patients, the bill—for the first time—allows a woman to choose an OB/GYN as her primary care physician and allows a parent to choose a pediatrician as his child's primary care physician. These new choices assure patients that they will be able to choose the best doctor for their health care needs.

Second, the Patient Protection Act protects the individual's access to the care to which he is entitled. The bill moves the decision about access to care away from the insurance company and back to the patient and the doctor. For example, when a patient reasonably believes he or she is having a medical emergency, he or she should be able to seek care at a local emergency room and that care should be paid for by his or her insurance plan. Under the Patient Protection Act, the patient now has that freedom without being second-guessed by the insurance company. The Act also prohibits "gag rules"—insurance company restrictions on what information a doctor can give a patient. With the prohibition, we restore the complete disclosure—the complete freedom of communication—that is so essential to the doctor patient relationship.

Finally, the Patient Protection Act protects the individual from arbitrary decisions from the insurance company to deny care. We are all aware of the too familiar pattern of a patient calling his or her insurance company to request care and having the untrained, non-medical reviewer deny the care without even reviewing the patient's medical history. The Patient Protection Act ends that practice forever. Under this bill, if the patient and her doctor believe that a certain medical procedure is indicated—but the insurance company declines to cover the expense—the patient has the right to an immediate appeal to a panel of doctors—not bureaucrats—who will decide whether the medical care is necessary. This new right of appeal will ensure that only medical professionals will make decisions about a patient's need for health care.

We have heard so much in this debate about the patient's right to sue. I'm so tired of that red herring. Patients sue their doctors and sue their insurance companies every day. While I abhor the litigious nature of our society today, I certainly support the patient's right to be made whole when malpractice of breach of contract or any other misconduct occurs.

In all my years, however, I've never met a patient who really believes that the legal process makes them whole. When you lose some of your hearing, or part of your sight, or any of your abilities, money is no substitute. Unfortunately, after the harm has occurred, money is all that society has left to offer. After the harm has occurred, it's too late to be made whole.

This is why the Patient Protection Act focuses on preventing the harm from occurring. Why spend two years to win a lawsuit for your injury when you can spend 1 hour on an appeal to your doctor that will prevent the injury

all together. Our bill is about patients and doctors and healing. We provide access to the doctors, assure choice for patient, and believe that gives us the best chance at healing.

My constituents and I thank all of my colleagues for the many months of hard work that went into this bill. With the very first patient that is healed by a doctor rather than frustrated by an insurance company, we can all be certain that we have succeeded in our efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1998, I was away from the House on official business during Monday's rollcall vote No. 340, on agreeing to the resolution honoring the memory of Detective John Gibson and Private First Class Jacob Chestnut of the United States Capitol Police. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "yes."

As the official designee of the House Minority Leader, I was present in Albuquerque, New Mexico on July 27 along with three of my Congressional colleagues representing the Speaker of the House, the Senate Majority Leader, and the Senate Minority Leader to join the President of the United States as participants in "The Great Social Security Debate #3." May I note for the record that immediately prior to the commencement of this debate President Clinton asked all in attendance, in person and via television, to observe a moment of silence in memory of the two heroic officers.

I join with my colleagues in the House to express my deepest condolences to the families of Detective John Gibson and Private First Class Jacob Chestnut who sacrificed their lives for our nation. For their acts of courage, this country is forever grateful; their memory will never be forgotten.

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I spoke with Congressman HARRIS FAWELL, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, on the occasion of the passage of H.R. 4250, the Patient Protection Act. I told Chairman FAWELL that instead of a 200 page bill full of mandates and Federal interference, I proposed a two-page clarification of the ERISA preemption that would get the Federal government out of the way of states to address these problems. I told him that the problem was with ERISA preemption. I asked Chairman FAWELL if he could assure me that the bill does not do anything to strengthen or broaden the ERISA preemption.

Chairman FAWELL assured me that H.R. 4250, the Patient Protection Act, does not amend the ERISA preemption clause. Therefore, it makes it neither broader nor narrower. We have left this to the courts to continue to develop.

Seeking further clarification, I told Chairman FAWELL that I appreciated his putting language in the committee report at the request of members of the Texas delegation to ensure that the Patient Protection Act neither broadens nor changes the current scope of the ERISA preemption as it is being developed in the courts. Again, Chairman FAWELL assured me that was the case.

I explained to Chairman FAWELL that the United States Supreme Court, in the last three years in cases like *Travelers*, *Dillingham*, and *DeBuono*, have narrowed the previously broadly interpreted scope of the ERISA preemption and clarified that ERISA does not preempt traditional state law areas of regulation such as "quality standards in health care." Federal Circuit courts of appeal have likewise been holding more recently that ERISA does not and should not preempt patient quality of care cases against HMOs like the 3rd Circuit held in the *Dukes* case. Five different Federal judges in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, all Republican, have also held that quality of care cases are not preempted by ERISA. Again, Chairman FAWELL assured me it would not.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans in Texas last year passed state patient protection legislation that is more comprehensive than the Patient Protection Act. Such protections include the right to sue HMOs for affecting the quality of health care treatment decisions. Aetna has gone to court in Houston to assert that Texas legislation is preempted by ERISA. I am glad that Chairman FAWELL could assure me that the Patient Protection Act would not affect the decision of the court in that case.

RECOGNIZING THE SACRIFICE AND SERVICE OF THE FIREFIGHTERS FROM AROUND THE NATION TO THE STATE AND PEOPLE OF FLORIDA

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as co-chairman of the Congressional Fire Service Institute I rise today to echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues in expressing my thanks and appreciation for all the firefighters who have worked so hard in battling the wildland fires in Florida.

The magnitude of the fires and the destruction they have caused is almost incomprehensible. In the last two months more than 500,000 acres in 67 counties have been burned by 200 separate fires. At least 367 homes and more than 33 businesses have been destroyed. Estimates are that it may take over 100 years for some of the burned acreage to return to normal. In short, Mr. Speaker, it has been a devastating disaster.

Thankfully, no lives have been lost. However, 95 people, mostly firefighters, have been

injured. Many of the firefighters who are on the front lines are not even from Florida. Approximately 7000 first responders from 46 states have volunteered their time, effort and talent to help the people of Florida. From Maryland alone, over 200 firefighters left their homes and loved ones to battle fires that were threatening land they did not own and to protect people they have never met.

For anyone not familiar with the fire service it may sound amazing that firefighters from across the country would drop everything to help the people of Florida. However, it does not surprise me at all. In fire companies across the country firefighters do just that, day in and day out. They do not do it for money and they do not do it for fame. They do it because, Mr. Speaker, they are committed to bettering their community and serving their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in acknowledging their service, I would like to include in the RECORD a complete listing of all the Maryland firefighters who volunteered to battle the Florida wildfires.

Anne Arundel County: John Devine, William Evans, Tom Frankow, David Owen; Baltimore County: Adam Bosely, Bob Bury, Andy Caladerge, Matt Fox, Charles Janney, Dawn Kaszek, Robert Lepin, William McCabe, Richard Muth, Randy Perky, Ron Sheldon, Claude Melcher; Calvert County: Ted Allen, Mike Cox, Joe Deltacame, John Gott, Gary Harrison, Rob Helms, Jean Miller, Seth Randalma, Rob Schultbur, Walter Taylor, Donnell Wallace, Kevin Whittington; Caroline County: Richard Baker, Steven Chaall, Donald Hill, Wayne Winchester, Heath Wroten; Carroll County: Robert Schoenber; Cecil County: Kevin Bell, Jim Bennett, Shawn Buckanian, Robert Caffrey, Adam Dommenic, Josh Eller, Mike Fifona, John Graham, Mike Lipka Jr., Mike Lipka Sr., Ron Miller, Aaron Neely, Tom Scott, John Smith, John Upp; Charles County: Tim Allen, Michael Carroll, Paul Donaldson, Trevor Forrester, Christi Grey, Brian Harrison, Jimmy Herbert, Wayne Higdon, Justin Hutchinson, Scott Hutchinson, Dick Irby, Jimmy Jackson, David Jenkins, Tom Jenkins, Tom Kellom, Chris Maddox, Tim Massey, Chris Mattingly, Brent O'Neil, Billy Pirner, Duane Rice Jr., Tony Rose, Billie Stevens, Chris Thompson; Dorchester County: Thomas Coghlan, Brad Dickerson; Frederick County: Paul Cullen, Claude Droneberg, Paul Hackey, Mike Hayter, Jeremy Hutton, Chris Seneel, Brandyn Thomas; Harford County: Chris Rach; Howard County: Jeff Hoasis, Tom Norman, Robert Freeman, David Moynihan, George Pearman; Kent County: Randy Barr, Matt Burge, Chris Carter, Bobby Helmer, Jimmy Kirby, Antonio Leonardi; Maryland Department of Natural Resources: Kenneth Jolly; MEMA: Warren Campbell; Montgomery County: Jeff Bennett, Mark Brown, Paul Brubaker, Jay Bureau, John Collins, Seth Condon, Tim Dowd, Wayne Drapean, Bill Dunn, Jack Ferguson, Sarah Fields, Pam Foltz, Robert Golian, Mark Hopkins, Ken Knopp, Larry Lease, Drew Lermond, Bill Lucas, Mike McAdam, William McLaghtin, Peggy Miller, Joseph Mills, Rick Morrisey, Jim Roy, Barry Smith, Rick Tatum, Justin Thorew, Gina Young; Prince George's County: Ernie Alsop, Robert Bramhall, William Corrigan, Bill Edwards, Patrick Feehley, Shannon Foster, Scott Glazer, William Hinton, Abree Johnson,

Gary Kirchbaum, Thomas Maddox, Angela Moore, Chris Ranson, Floyd Richerson, Larry Robey, Fred Sheckles, Jack Spencer, Ed Torrence, Michael Warhurst, Shannon Welch; Queen Anne County: Eric Arcane, Robbie Dixon, Sarah Holloman, Greg Johnston, Andy Robertson, David Steel; Somerset County: David Barnett, Brian Barnette, Grover Chatham, Chris Holland, Steve Mitchell, Scott Sturgis; St. Mary's County: Kevin Bannagan, Gerard Campbell, Andy Cather, Jim Foster, Boots Garner, George Gatton, Steve Gobson, Billy Hill, Bill Houle, Michael Huseman, Billy Long, C.J. Mattingly, George McKay, LeRoy Owen, and Francis Raley.

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASTERWORKS CHORALE

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 25th Anniversary concert season of the Masterworks Chorale in Belleville, Illinois and its founder and director, Dr. A. Dennis Sparger.

Masterworks Chorale began under the sponsorship of Belleville Area College as the BAC Community Chorus. In 1982, the chorus left the college and officially incorporated under the name Masterworks Chorale, Inc. The 65 members of the adult chorus must audition for their place in the group. The chorus has been awarded the first place gold medalion at the Great American Choral Festival competition, made the European Tour twice, sung with the St. Louis Symphony under the direction of Leonard Slatkin, and has been a major force in the arts in our community.

Dr. Sparger recently retired from the music faculty at Belleville Area College, where he served for 32 years. Under his baton, the Chorale has performed more than fifty major choral-orchestral works in the past 25 years. In addition to founding the Chorale, Dr. Sparger also founded the Masterworks Children's Chorus and was their director until 1990. In 1986, he was appointed music director and conductor of the Bach Society of St. Louis.

A native of Chicago, Dr. Sparger began musical studies at the age of eight and began conducting at sixteen. He earned both his bachelor's and master's degrees from Eastern Illinois University. In 1981, he was awarded a Doctor of Musical Arts degrees in conducting from the University of Illinois, where he studied under Harold Decker. According to Dr. Sparger, Harold Decker is responsible for teaching about 75 doctoral candidates during his career. These students have taken position at major universities and with symphonies around the nation. Dr. Sparger is the only one who chose to make his career at a community college. All of this makes Dr. Sparger's selection for the Harold A. Decker Choral Award, presented to him by the American Choral Directors Association of Illinois earlier this year, even more meaningful.

Masterworks Chorale is a member of the Arts and Education Council of Greater St.

Louis and a member of Chorus America, the association of professional vocal ensembles. This special 25th anniversary concert is partially supported by a grant from the Illinois Arts Council.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dennis Sparger and Masterworks Chorale for 25 years of wonderful music.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LOUIS STOKES

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT C. SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, while I rejoice in the opportunity to sing the praises of my friend and mentor, the Honorable LOU STOKES, the Dean of the Ohio Delegation, I am saddened by the realization that he will be retiring from this body at the end of this Congress. His departure from Congress will constitute a great personal loss to me and a great loss to the nation.

LOU STOKES' Congressional contributions were legendary to me long before I came to the Congress. His successes toward developing health programs for underserved and disadvantaged populations were well known to me and to health care workers throughout the country. During my 15 years in the Virginia legislature, I was active in developing programs to prevent infant mortality. LOU STOKES was our champion in the Congress on this issue then, and since I came to the Congress has continued to be our champion on the issue.

I serve with Representative STOKES on the Congressional Black Caucus' Health Braintrust. Year after year, he has provided absolutely stellar leadership as Chairman of the Braintrust by focusing the attention of the Congress and the nation on efforts to improve the health care status of disadvantaged populations. Not only will he leave a legacy of legislative accomplishments such as the Minority and Disadvantaged Health Care Improvement Act, but his annual Spring and Fall Health Braintrust programs will leave a record, that will be difficult for us to maintain, of pulling together the sharpest minds and most accomplished people to focus on pressing health concerns.

Mr. Speaker, in all of his endeavors, LOU STOKES has shown himself to be the consummate professional, a distinguished legislator, and an outstanding human being. I will miss you, LOU. I thank you for all you done for me, for this Congress and for this nation. God bless you Representative LOUIS STOKES, and Godspeed on your future endeavors.

HONORING THE NORTH CAROLINA COOPERATIVE BRIGHT IDEAS PROGRAM

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, as a former Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of North Carolina, I closely follow matters related to the quality of public education in my district and state. Nothing gives me more pleasure than acknowledging a joint public-private initiative at the local level that is having a positive impact on the quality of classroom instruction.

In North Carolina, our community-minded electric cooperatives have a grant program for teachers called Bright Ideas. It was established in 1994 while I was Superintendent to improve classroom instruction by encouraging innovative teaching techniques. Bright Ideas has been a great success. Bright Ideas awards up to \$2,000 to teachers K-12 with no restrictions on subject matter. This year they received almost 2,000 applications and made more than 400 grants.

North Carolina's electric cooperatives, which provide power to 22 percent of my state's population and operate in 93 out of the 100 counties, made an early decision to consider any school's application regardless of its power supplier.

In 1994, North Carolina's electric cooperatives authorized \$225,000 a year for a state-wide Bright Ideas Program, which would have put the program over the \$1,000,000 mark by the 1998-99 school year. However, through generous additional funding in their respective areas, the cooperatives were able to reach \$1 million a full year ahead of schedule. I congratulate them for their achievement.

Chuck Terrill, Executive Vice President and CEO of the North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation, says that the program will break \$1.5 million by the end of the 1998-99 school year, making the title of "Bright Ideas Classroom" a badge of honor in our schools.

In my district I have many cooperatives and thousands of cooperative members whom I count as friends. I salute these fine corporate citizens for their extraordinary contributions; more than \$1 million benefiting more than 400,000 students and still counting.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, today we continue to mourn the loss of two of the finest men this Capitol has known. John 15:13 states that, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Had John Gibson and J.J. Chestnut not put themselves in harm's way, the lives of many would have been lost in last week's tragic event. These two men of courage laid

down their lives so that their friends, coworkers and tourists visiting from around the world would be safe. We are truly blessed to have men and women of such noble character and bravery serving on the Capitol Police force.

As thousands of visitors came together yesterday to walk through the Capitol Rotunda to pay their respects to these men of courage, I realized that we are only able to safely visit this building which is a symbol of freedom because of the service of the many members of law enforcement we have here in Washington. We must never take for granted those who serve to protect and preserve the freedoms that we enjoy here in the United States Capitol, and across this nation.

My prayers go out to the families of these two heroes who died that we might live. The memory of their actions will not be soon forgotten.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT CLINTON, VICE PRESIDENT GORE AND THE OHIO CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit this open letter on behalf of many associations and federations from the state of Ohio:

We respectfully and urgently request you to reject efforts to accept the United Nations treaty signed in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and further revised in Kyoto, Japan that deals with greenhouse gas emissions.

Acceptance of this treaty would bind the U.S. to restrict fossil fuels (coal, natural gas and petroleum) use which together provide 80% of America's energy, while exempting 2.5 billion people in foreign countries from these reductions. These reductions will greatly force up the price of coal, natural gas, gasoline and electricity. Ohioans' cost for each of these necessities could rise by roughly 50% by 2010.

The result will be anti-family; as families are forced to pay much more for the basic necessity of electricity, anti-farm; as the cost of farming and supplies soar, anti-jobs; as 56,000 Ohio-based jobs are lost, many going to the exempted foreign countries. All of this will devastate Americans and Ohioans in particular. Economic estimates suggest by the year 2010, Ohioans will pay \$350 more for every man, woman and child in our state. This means we will together annually pay \$3.8 billion more to heat our homes, run a business, or care for our loved ones. This will be especially harsh and unfair to Ohio seniors, the poor and others.

Global warming warrants thoughtful study but it does not make sense to strangle 80% of America's energy foundation while over half the world's population is exempted from this treaty's reach. Ohioans deserve better than this.

Please don't force Ohio families, seniors, those on the edge of poverty, our farmers and businesses to be saddled with this United Nations treaty.

Joel Hastings, Director of Local Affairs, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus—192,000 members; Kelly McGivern, Director of Environment and Health Care Policy, Ohio Chamber of Com-

merce, Columbus—5,000 members; John C. Mahaney, Jr., President, Ohio Council of Retail Merchants, Columbus—3,000+ members; Alon Apel, Director of Government Affairs, Ohio Pharmacists Association, Dublin—4,000 members; Tom King, Executive Vice President, Ohio Trucking Association, Columbus—1,000 members; Sherry Weisgarber, Managing Director, Ohio Aggregates Association, Columbus—197 members; Ruth Ann Wilson, Executive Secretary, Ohio Assoc. of Meat Processors, Delaware—500 members; Gary A. Murdock, President, Ohio Valley Automotive Aftermarket Association, Hilliard—1,000 members; Roger P. Jones, President, Ohio Ready Mixed, Concrete Association, Columbus—210 members companies; Michael H. Cochran, Executive Director, Ohio Twp Assoc., Columbus—8,600 members; Holly Saelens, Director—Public Policy Services, The Ohio Manufacturers' Association, Columbus; Sheila Adams, President/CEO, Urban League of Greater Cincinnati, Cincinnati—700 members; Bernard Shoemaker, President (Master), Ohio State Grange, Columbus—17,000 members; Bryan Bucklew, Director-Governmental Affairs, Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce, Dayton—3,350 members; C. Clark Street, Executive Vice President, Ohio Contractors Association, Columbus—585 members; James H. Lee, Executive Director, Ohio Forestry Association, Columbus; Susie Calhoun, Executive Director, Ohio Soybean Council, Columbus—1,500 members; Jack Heavenridge, Executive Vice President, Ohio Poultry Association, Columbus—200 members

David M. Kelly, General Manager, Ohio Potato Growers Association; Tim Williams, Executive Vice President, Ohio Manufactured Housing Association, Dublin—500 members; David L. Kahler, Executive Vice President/CEO, Ohio Equipment Distributors Association, Dublin, 121 members/2,420 employees; Michael L. Wagner, Executive Director, Ohio Corn Growers Association, Marion—1,800 members; Jim Silvania, Executive Director, Ohio Association Security & Investigative Services, Columbus—33,000 members; John R. Langhirt, President, Mid-Ohio Electric Co., Columbus; Carmine J. Torio, Executive Vice President, Home Builders Association of Great Akron, 750 member Companies, 10,000 employees; Robert D. Horne, President, United Steel Workers of America, Local 5L—Akron, 175 members; Daniel L. Neff, Executive Director, Ohio Mid-Eastern Governments Association, Cambridge, serves a 10 county area; Judy R. Bastian, President, Ohio Glass Association, Cleveland—250 members; Roger Tedrick, Secretary/Treasurer, Ohio Dairy Farmers Federation, Gahanna—1,000 members; Robert T. Lambert, Executive Vice President, Ohio Auto and Truck Recyclers Association, Columbus; Donald L. Buckley, President/Secretary, Midwest Dairy Foods Association, Inc., Columbus—52 companies; Amira F. Gohara, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Medical College of Ohio at Toledo, Toledo—3,400 members; Peggy J. Smith, Executive Director, Ohio Chemical Council, Columbus—100 members; Patricia R. Cooksey, President, True Blue Patriots, Cincinnati—10,000 mem-

bers; Thomas L. Hart, Executive Director, The Building Industry Association of Central Ohio, Columbus—1,226 members; Richard Greenwalt, Camp Secretary, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War—McClellan Camp, No. 91—Alliance;

Joseph Divito, Financial Secretary & Treasurer, Iron Workers Local Union No. 172, Columbus—723 members; Sue Yang, Program Coordinator, International Community Empowerment Project A.S.I.A., Inc., Akron—50 families served; Rochelle Peoples, Director of Volunteers, Habitat for Humanity of Greater Akron, Akron—100 volunteer members; Carole Richards, President, Creative Education Institute, Chagrin Falls—50 people served; Mike P. Reilly, President-Elect, Cincinnati Master Plumbers Assoc., Cincinnati—80 contractors; W. Paul Kilway, Jr., M.D., Summit County Medical Society, Akron, 460 members; David L. Kahler, Executive Vice President/CEO, Ohio-Michigan Equipment Dealer Association, Dublin, 865 members/14,272 employees; Edward Tumulty, Regional Director, Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute, Central Region Columbus; Russell K. Tippett, Dean, School of Natural Resources, Hocking College, Nelsonville; Randy Smith, Financial Secretary, Glass, Molders, Pottery, Plastic and Allied Workers Local 7A, Tiffin—573 members; Margaret F. Planton, Mayor, City of Chillicothe, 270 employees; Bill Hueckel, President, Central Ohio Flower Growers, Delaware—100 members; Hal Mullins, President, Central Ohio Chapter, Air Conditioning Contractors of America, Columbus—106 member companies; James Tann, President, Brick Institute of America, Mid East Region, North Canton; Ronald L. Kolbash, President, Ohio Mining & Reclamation Association, Columbus, 121 member companies; Richard C. Hannon, Jr., Chairman of Legislative Committee, Board Member, Carroll County Chamber of Commerce, Carrollton—150 members; John Nave, Director, Associated Risk Managers of Ohio, Powell; Jim Frost, Secretary/Treasurer, Akron/Medina County Labor Council AFL-CIO, Akron—18,000 members.

PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to explain why I cannot vote for the Patient Protection Act (H.R. 4250). However, I would first like to express my support for two of the bill's provisions, relating to Medical Savings Accounts and relating to the proposed national health ID.

Earlier this week I introduced legislation, the Patient Privacy Act (H.R. 4281), to repeal those sections of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 that authorized the creation of a national medical ID. I believe that the increasing trend toward allowing the federal government to track Americans through national ID cards and numbers

represents one of the most serious threats to liberty we are facing. The scheme to create a national medical ID to enter each person's medical history into a national data base not only threatens civil liberties but it undermines the physician-patient relationship, the cornerstone of good medical practice. Oftentimes, effective treatment depends on a patient's ability to place absolute trust in his or her doctor, a trust that would be severely eroded if the patient knew that any and all information given their doctor could be placed in a data base accessible by anyone who knows the patient's "unique personal identifier."

While I was not here in 1996 when the medical ID was authorized, it is my understanding that this provision was part of a large bill rushed through Congress without much debate. I am glad that Congress has decided to at least take a second look at this proposal and its ramifications. I am quite confident that, after Congress hears from the millions of Americans who object to a national ID, my colleagues will do the right thing and pass legislation forbidding the federal government from instituting a "uniform standard health identifier."

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that Congress is addressing the subject of health care in America, for the American health care system does need reform. Too many Americans lack access to quality health care while millions more find their access to medical care blocked by a "gatekeeper," an employee of an insurance company or a Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) who has the authority to overrule the treatment decisions of physicians!

An OB/GYN with more than 30 years experience, I find it outrageous that any insurance company bureaucrat could presume to stand between a doctor and a patient. However, in order to properly fix the problem, we must understand its roots. The problems with American health care coverage are rooted in the American tax system, which provides incentives for employers to offer first-dollar insurance benefits to their employees, while providing no incentives for individuals to attempt to control their own health care costs. Because "he who pays the piper calls the tune," it is inevitable that those paying the bill would eventually seize control over personal health care choices as a means of controlling costs.

Because this problem was created by distortions in the health care market that took control of the health care dollar away from the consumer, the best solution to this problem is to put control of the health care dollar back into the hands of the consumer. We also need to rethink the whole idea of first-dollar insurance coverage for every medical expense, no matter how inexpensive. Americans would be more satisfied with the health care system if they could pay for their routine expenses with their own funds, relying on insurance for catastrophic events, such as cancer.

An excellent way of moving toward a health care system where the consumer is in charge is through Medical Savings Accounts (MSA's). I enthusiastically endorse those provisions of this bill that expand access to MSA's. It may be no exaggeration to say that MSA's are vital to preserving the private practice of medicine.

MSA's provide consumers the freedom to find high-quality health care at a reasonable

cost. MSA's allow consumers to benefit when they economize in choosing health care so they will be more likely to make informed health care decisions such as seeking preventive care and, when possible, negotiate with their providers for the lowest possible costs. Most importantly, MSA's are the best means available to preserve the patient's right to choose their doctor and the treatment that best meets their needs, free from interference by an insurance company or an HMO.

Mr. Speaker, all those concerned with empowering patients should endorse H.R. 4250's provisions lifting all caps on how many Americans may purchase an MSA and repealing federal regulations that discourage Americans from using MSA's. For example, a provision in the tax code limits the monthly contribution to the MSA to one-twentieth of the MSA's yearly amount. Thus, MSA holders have a small portion of their yearly contribution accessible to them in the early months of the year. The Patient Protection Act allows individuals to make the full contribution to their MSA at any time of the year, so someone who establishes an MSA in January does not have to worry if they get sick in February.

This legislation also allows both employers and employees to contribute to an employee's MSA. It lifts the arbitrary caps on how one can obtain MSA's and expands the limits on the MSA deductible. Also it provides that possession of an MSA satisfies all mandated benefits laws as long as individuals have the freedom to purchase those benefits with their MSA.

However, as much as I support H.R. 4250's expansion of MSA's, I equally object to those portions of the bill placing new federal standards on employer offered health care plans. Proponents of these standards claim that they will not raise cost by more than a small percentage point. However, even an increase of a small percentage point could force many marginal small businesses to stop offering health care for their employees, thus causing millions of Americans to lose their health insurance. This will then lead to a new round of government intervention. Unlike Medical Savings Accounts which remove the HMO bureaucracy currently standing between physicians and patients, the so-called patient protections portions of this bill add a new layer of government-imposed bureaucracy. For example, H.R. 4250 guarantees each patient the right to external and internal review of insurance company's decisions. However, this does not empower patients to make their own decisions. If both external and internal review turn down a patient's request for treatment, the average patient will have no choice but to accept the insurance companies decision. Furthermore, anyone who has ever tried to navigate through a government-controlled "appeals process" has reason to be skeptical of the claims that the review process will be completed in less than three days. Imposing new levels of bureaucracy on HMO's is a poor substitute for returning to the American people the ability to decide for themselves, in consultation with their care giver, what treatments are best for them. Medical Savings Accounts are the best patient protection.

Perhaps the biggest danger these regulations pose is ratification of the principle that guaranteeing a patients' access to physicians

is the proper role for the government, thus opening the door for further federal control of the patient-physician relationship. I ask my physician-colleagues who support this regulation, once we have accepted the notion that federal government can ensure patients have access to our services, what defense can we offer when the government places new regulations and conditions on that access?

I am also concerned that this bill further tramples upon state autonomy by further preempting their ability to regulate HMO's and health care plans. Under the 10th amendment, states should be able to set standards for organizations such as HMO's without interference from the federal government. I am disappointed that we did not get an opportunity to debate Mr. BRADY's amendment that would have preserved the authority of states in this area.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, while the Patient Protection Act takes some good steps toward placing patients back in control of the health care system, it also furthers the federal role in overseeing the health system. It is my belief that the unintended, but inevitable, consequence of this bill, will require Congress to return to the issue of health care reform in a few years. I hope Congress gets it right next time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday morning July 29, 1998 I was in my district attending to official business and as a result missed two roll call votes.

Had I been present, the following is how I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 343 (the "Rule" on H.R. 629) "Aye."

Rollcall No. 344 (final passage of H.R. 629) "Aye."

INTRODUCTION OF THE JACOB JOSEPH CHESTNUT-JOHN MICHAEL GIBSON CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER ACT OF 1998

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Jacob Joseph Chestnut-John Michael Gibson United States Capitol Visitor Center Act of 1998 (Chestnut-Gibson Act). I feel a special obligation to do so because I represent the District of Columbia in which the Capitol is located. I also introduce the bill because the residents of the District have a special relationship with the Capitol Police. In 1992, when there was a large spike in crime in the District, Congress passed the United States Capitol Police Jurisdiction Act, a bill I introduced authorizing the Capitol Police to

patrol parts of the Capitol Hill residential community closest to the Capitol where various facilities of the Capitol are located. Capitol Police officers were not only willing; they were enthusiastic to use their excellent training and professionalism for the benefit of residents and the many tourists and visitors whose safety might be compromised by having to travel through high-crime areas in order to get to the Capitol.

My bill authorizes the Architect of the Capitol "to plan, construct, equip, administer, and maintain a Capitol Visitor Center under the East Plaza of the Capitol" grounds. The primary purpose of the bill is to increase public safety and security. A second purpose is to provide a place to welcome visitors who are seeking tours, taking into account their health and comfort. To guard against excessive costs and to obtain quick action, the bill requires the Architect to consider existing and alternative plans for a visitor center and to submit "a report containing the plans and designs" within 120 days.

I have supported a Capitol Visitor Center since it was first extensively discussed in 1991. During this decade of high deficits, the reluctance of Congress to appropriate funds for such a center has perhaps been understandable, until last Friday. No one knows whether Officer Chestnut or Detective Gibson or, for that matter, any other officer or individual would have been spared had a visitor center been in place. What we do know is that our nineteenth century Capitol was not built with anything like today's security hazards in mind. According to the Capitol Police and the United States Capitol Police Board, a visitor center would provide significant distance between the Capitol and visitors, and for a host of reasons they have documented, would make the Capitol more secure.

Our foremost obligation is to protect all who visit or work here and to spare no legitimate consideration in protecting the United States Capitol. The Capitol is a temple of democracy and is the most important symbol of the open society in which we live. It is more so than the White House, in part because the President's workplace is also a residence and cannot be entirely open. However, the Capitol symbolizes our free and open society not only because it is accessible but also because of what transpires here. It is here that the people come to petition their government, to lobby and to persuade us, and ultimately to discharge us if we stray too far from their democratic demands. Thus, we neither have nor would we want the option to make the Capitol more difficult to access. After last Friday's tragedy, we have an obligation to demonstrate that security is not inconsistent with democracy.

There is a second reason why this bill is necessary. Visitors are safe when they come to the Capitol, but the conditions they encounter do not ensure their health, convenience, and cordiality, nor afford them the welcome to which they are entitled. Members address constituents seated on stone steps outdoors. In the blistering heat and merciless cold of Washington, visitors wait in line outdoors to tour the Capitol. During this summer, the hottest on record in the United States, it has not been uncommon for tourists to faint during

lengthy waits on line and then be rushed inside to be treated by our physicians. Even if the Capitol had not incurred a terrible tragedy, we would be in need of a more civil way to welcome the people we represent.

I will seek cosponsors for this bill at once. I have not waited to do so because I believe a bill requiring plans for a visitor center is necessary to provide the assurance of safety and comfort the public has a right to demand. We must do more than try to recover from the shock of the invasion of the Capitol by a gunman. We must do more than mourn the irreplaceable loss of two fine men. We must do what we can and we must do it now.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 29, 1998, I was unavoidably detained while conducting official business and missed rollcall vote No. 344. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

SHAME ON THE GOVERNMENT OF GRENADA

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it was 15 years ago that American soldiers liberated the small island of Grenada from the authoritarian government that, under the direction of Cuban dictator Fidel Castro, had overtaken that nation.

During the time the Castro regime manipulated the government of the island in an attempt to expand communism in the Americas, the people of Grenada lost all semblance of civil liberties and human rights that was then returned to them.

Unfortunately, it seems that the present Grenadian government has forgotten the repression brought upon their country by the Castro regime and it has invited the dictator to visit the island this week.

The visit comes as the nations members of the Caribbean Economic Community (CARICOM) continue to flirt with the Cuban tyrant, who desperately wants to enter the organization to obtain economic benefits that will strengthen his oppressive regime.

How sad that after 19 American soldiers died to liberate Grenada, that island's government now receives, with open arms, the dictator who orchestrated the repression of that island's citizens.

Shame on the government of Grenada!

TRIBUTE TO PEGGY CALDWELL BEESON

HON. FRANK RIGGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Peggy Caldwell Beeson, who passed away this month. I, along with many other Northern Californians, cherished the friendship of Peggy who, with her husband Phillip, contributed greatly to our community.

Peggy had a special talent for sharing her visions with others and making them want to be a part of her ideas. This talent for consensus building and motivating others allowed her to accomplish things that most people would never attempt.

Over the years, Peggy was involved with a number of community action committees, including the Parent Teacher Association, the Lake Elephants Club, and the Konocti Lioness Club. She also served as Executive Director for Californians for a Drug Free Youth, President of the Conejo Republican Action Committee, and Director of the Riviera Yacht and Golf Club.

Peggy and Phillip raised four daughters: Karen, Lindsay, Cynthia, and Heidi. She also is survived by 13 grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

Peggy Beeson's dedication to community and family should be held as a model for others. I have personally seen the results of Peggy's efforts and was impressed time and again with her hard work and determination. Her vision, innovation and accomplishments will benefit the people of Lake County for a long time.

CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT GAUGA COUNTY FAIR

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the people of Geauga County on the 175th anniversary of the Great Geauga County Fair. This special gathering has always been a time for people and families throughout Ohio to come together. It's also a wonderful way to celebrate community and the values we hold dear.

The Great Geauga County Fair brings to mind homemade pies, baking contests, 4-H club activities, the annual petting zoo, music, and pony rides for children. The Fair is also about celebrating the locally produced maple syrup, used in nearly every home throughout the region. Finally, the Fair provides a special moment for the community to honor area veterans and their service to Ohio and the nation.

The history of the Great Geauga County Fair is as rich as the Fair itself. In 1823, a group of pioneers, some of whom were among the first settlers in Ohio's Western Reserve, formed one of our state's first trade societies—called the Geauga County Agricultural

and Manufacturing Society. The society was formed to promote the region's growing farming and manufacturing industries. To display and share the bounty from their farms, society members organized an annual county-wide fair. While the early Fairs alternated between the towns of Burton and Chardon, the Fair has been held in Burton at the County Fairgrounds since the mid-1800s.

This year's Fair also celebrates another birthday. Known as the oldest and only all-volunteer band in the Buckeye State, the Great Geauga County Fair Band turns 60 this year. To most people who go to the Fair today, the Band is a major presence. In a fitting tribute to this milestone, the band this year will play with three of the original "charter" band members.

Labor Day is always a bittersweet time. For kids, the holiday means back to school; for parents, it means a welcome day off to enjoy the good weather. Labor Day also means Fairtime—the "grand finale" to summertime in Geauga County. Without doubt, the Fair is one of our region's most important annual community events—for families and all residents of northeast Ohio. In fact, the "Great" in the Fair's name was officially added early this century to signify the Fair's senior standing as the "Great Granddaddy" of Ohio's county fairs.

The Great Geauga County Fair's motto says it all, "Something for Everyone Since 1823." On the 175th anniversary of the Great Geauga County Fair, I'm proud to represent the people of Geauga County, and proud to be a part of this community.

THE ORPHAN FOUNDATION: MAKING A DIFFERENCE IN THE LIVES OF YOUTH

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in the Tuesday, July 21, 1998 copy of the Washington Post, there is a front page story about how difficult it is to survive in society when you're an orphan and you turn 18. I would like to insert this article in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, without objection. According to this article, in many states, when orphans turn 18 years of age, they are dropped from the state's child protection system. This means they have to pay their own rent, buy their own groceries and manage their own budget. Without parents to teach these orphans the importance of fiscal responsibility, and to provide for their needs when they do run out of money, it should not be a surprise that 4 out of 10 of the nation's homeless are orphans.

There is one statement in the Post article that sticks out in my mind. That statement reads, " * * * there is little public attention focused on how to keep foster children from migrating from their bureaucratic family to the streets." I agree that the public could be better informed about the problems many orphans face, but I wish the article had listed a group I work with called the Orphan Foundation of America as part of the solution. OFA has

worked hard over the last two decades to provide financial assistance and counseling to orphans, help which has made a tangible difference in the lives of many.

Founded in 1981, the Orphan Foundation has awarded over \$500,000 in scholarships to orphans in 44 states through its OLIVER Project, with the help of generous private and corporate donors such as: American Airlines; Gateway Computers; Kraft Foods, Inc.; General Electric; Prudential Securities; AT&T; J.C. Penney Company; Bristol Myers-Squibb Company; Jones, Day, Reavis and Pogue; Lockheed Martin; Fannie Mae; Lucent Technologies, Northrop Grumman; Time Warner, Inc.; The Limited, Inc.; Williams & Jensen; ESOP; and Kerr-McGee Corporation. OFA also teaches orphans how to successfully manage their money and other basic life skills they will need to know to survive in an unforgiving world, and does this through volunteers in their communities.

Most of all, OFA and its tireless director, Eileen McCaffrey, provide orphans with something they receive all too little—an ear to talk to when they need encouragement, and a little love and understanding. Most of the staff is all volunteer, a true sign of their dedication. I have had the pleasure of meeting and talking with several orphans whose lives have been impacted by OFA, and these youth are quick to point to the organization as one big reason why they have a job and a good education, as opposed to being locked up in jail, or being forced to sleep in their car.

The Orphan Foundation receives no state or federal funding, and yet it has managed to improve the lives of orphans across America. To learn more about OFA, you can visit their web page at www.orphan.org. The Orphan Foundation of America is a great cause well worth assisting, and a testimony of the power of Americans who care.

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1998]

AT 18, IT'S SINK OR SWIM—FOR EX-FOSTER CHILDREN TRANSITION IS DIFFICULT

(By Barbara Vobejda)

CINCINNATI—Seventeen-year-old Carrie Lucas has spent the past two years in the embrace of the state. Her mother was mentally ill, her father in jail, and Ohio's child protection officials considered it their business to place Carrie in a safe foster home.

Now she's about to be dropped. At the toll of her 18th birthday next spring, Carrie will be released from the state's child protection system. The federal and state bureaucracies that fashioned themselves into a substitute family will declare themselves done. And like 20,000 other young people across the country each year, Carrie will be left to pay her own rent, fill her own refrigerator, manage her own budget. In essence, she will be expected to become her own parent.

"It's sort of scary to think I have to do this on my own," Carrie said. "I don't want to think about it too much."

If ever there was proof that, for many children, the foster care system does not offer a stable, surrogate family, it comes at the point they turn 18. The day the money stops, the care stops too.

While a minority of teenagers stay on for some time with their foster families, most grow up knowing exactly when their funding will end. They accept that they will be forced to leave on or near that birthday, knowing they'll be replaced by a younger

child, who comes with money attached. If the foster families had wanted to make a permanent commitment to one child, experts say, they would have adopted. Most don't.

"We can't dump them fast enough at 18," said Robin Nixon, director of youth services at the Child Welfare League of America, referring to the federal-state system that has responsibility for more than 500,000 children, most of them abused or neglected by their parents. "But kids in the average community are 25 and 26 years old before they're expected to live alone."

It is this large but mostly forgotten population of America's disadvantaged that social researchers now believe makes up a significant component of the nation's homeless population: One study found four of 10 of the nation's homeless are former foster children. Experts on homelessness say it is predictable—that young people isolated from their families often suffering from emotional problems, many of them former runaways, would end up in an emergency shelter. While some of these teenagers can go to grandparents or siblings for help, most are on their own.

The most recent study on the fate of foster children, conducted by University of Wisconsin researcher Mark Courtney, found that 12 to 18 months after they left foster care, just half were employed, one-third were receiving public assistance, one-fifth of the girls had given birth and more than one-quarter of the boys had been incarcerated.

Most of the teenagers had less than \$250 in savings when they went out on their own.

Yet while other subgroups among the disenfranchised—the mentally ill, victims of domestic violence, welfare workers—have their vocal advocates in policy debates, there is little public attention focused on how to keep foster children from migrating from their bureaucratic family to the streets.

For Carrie Lucas, the journey to independence has already begun. It is both tangible and psychological. She is a 17-year-old constantly aware of a clock ticking. Nine more months of financial help. That's it. One minute she's sure she can handle it. The next, she's in a panic about what lies ahead.

The state will keep paying an agency more than \$1,000 a month to help her until her 18th birthday. But after that, she can make no mistakes. Blow her rent money on a car, she may be sleeping in that car. Anger her landlord, she could be looking for a place to sleep. The same mistakes other kids make, but nobody to bail her out.

A month ago, she moved into a tiny attic apartment by herself. It is stifling, with no air conditioner, and the stairway leading up smells of cat urine. But she chose it because she loved the bathtub—an antique with claw feet and flowers painted on the side.

Carrie had trouble sleeping when she first moved in, frightened of the nighttime sounds echoing around her old building. But now she's more relaxed, cuddled on the living room carpet beside her worn, thrift store couch, or in her narrow bedroom, surrounded by stuffed toys.

When Carrie was 4, her grandmother took her in because Carrie's mother would stay away from home for long periods of time, leaving Carrie and her three siblings to care for themselves. Carrie grew up cooking for herself, washing her own clothes.

"I think my mother is mentally insane," Carrie said. "She was never reliable, always working, or out with whomever."

But Carrie's grandmother died of cancer two years ago, and the child protection system took over. Carrie moved in with a foster

mother, a woman in her late sixties who had raised 10 children of her own. "Her message was, 'I'm here for you,'" Carrie said, "but there was distance between us."

Under the state's policy, her foster mother received more than \$400 a month to keep Carrie, but that ended when Carrie asked to move out. She had heard of a program that would help her move into her own apartment, and her foster care money would go toward rent and utilities. So she left her foster mother's home and moved into her apartment. And since then, neither has picked up the phone to stay in touch.

In fact, Carrie says she's lucky. She lives in one of the few places around the country—Hamilton County, Ohio—where the child protection system places people as young as 16 in apartments to prepare them to live on their own. The program pays rent and sets up a savings account with a \$60 weekly stipend—until she's 18.

Carrie likes living by herself. But already, her days play out with the rhythms of an adult, not a girl of 17.

This summer, she gets herself up at 6 each morning, eats a bowl of cereal and leaves her apartment by 7, catching a bus to work as an intern at a downtown bank, where she spends her days checking account numbers and ATM receipts. At 5 p.m., she heads home and fixes her own dinner. She is in bed by 9 p.m. On the weekends, she works a second job at a restaurant.

For now, she has \$594 in savings, and in the fall, she'll return to finish her senior year in high school. The county and the judge overseeing her case could extend her funding long enough to help her get her high school diploma. But even if that happens, she'll be cut loose in less than a year.

She worries most about how she will pay her \$240 monthly rent, or if she'll be able to afford college.

"I pray I can go to college," she said. "I'm going to try everything in my power to get a scholarship."

Some of the half-million children in the child protection system are allowed to stay with their biological families. But for those who are taken out of their homes, a combination of federal and state funds provides payments—averaging \$431 a month for 16-year-olds—to foster families. The government may pay much more for group homes or residential treatment facilities, where many foster teens reside.

In 1986, after researchers began to notice the link between foster care and homelessness, Congress reacted by establishing an "independent living program" for states to help prepare foster children for life after 18. States can extend the program to older teens, which is common for those with disabilities.

While states have established these programs, many are cursory—occasional weekend seminars on housekeeping and budgeting, for example. And Courtney's study in Wisconsin found that one out of four teenagers had received no help in preparing for independence before they left the system.

In a handful of jurisdictions, however, welfare offices have gone to great lengths to ease this passage.

Los Angeles County, where about 800 young people leave foster care each year, has pulled together a package of subsidized housing, job training and some entry-level employment to help those moving out of the system.

And in Hamilton County, Ohio, where Carrie lives, dozens of teenagers, some as young as 16, are living in apartments as a transition to independence.

"Independent living without housing experience is like driver's education without the car," said Mark Kroner, who runs an independent living program for Lighthouse Youth Services, a nonprofit agency contracted by Hamilton County to put young people in apartments.

"You learn to budget food money when you go a day without food. You learn to budget utilities when you come home to a dark apartment," he said.

When young people come into his program, having been referred by county social workers or juvenile judges, they are matched with an adult on Kroner's staff who helps them find an apartment, shops with them for furniture and helps them move. The social worker stops by weekly, and the agency becomes the newest surrogate family.

But this family is dedicated to a daunting goal: sending a child, often one with emotional difficulties, out into the world.

It is not uncommon for Kroner to get a call saying one of his teenagers has been arrested. He has had kids knocking on a landlord's door asking for money just a week after moving in. Some have been kicked out of the program for failing to follow the rules.

Despite the problems, studies have found that placing kids in their own apartments is probably the most effective way to help them become independent.

One of Kroner's newest "clients," as the former foster children are called, is 16-year-old Ricky Bryant, who has dropped out of high school.

He lives in a second-floor, two-room apartment, where he sleeps on the living room floor. The dishes are carefully soaking in soapy water, and the refrigerator is virtually empty.

In just over a month of living on his own, it has become clear to Ricky that some things are beyond him: "My laundry. I cannot afford to do it. And keeping groceries in my house," he said. "I buy it and it's gone."

He says this on a Wednesday, five days until he gets his paycheck from Wendy's where he works nights. He has cereal in the cupboard, but no milk to pour on it. A loaf of bread, but nothing to put between the slices. He has, literally, one penny in cash.

When Kroner hears this, he gives Ricky a dollar and tells him to take the bus to the agency office and someone there will give him an advance on his weekly \$60 stipend.

"I was afraid to ask," Ricky said. "I don't want to aggravate nobody."

Ricky landed here after years in the child welfare system, where he lived in 12 to 15 places, he estimates.

"My mom is the type who is a bar hopper," he said. "She was never home. She left us kids wherever." He was often home alone when he was just 7 and 8 years old. When his mother brought home a new boyfriend, and Ricky saw him abusing her, he left to live with his dad.

But that didn't work out either, "because I was a 'hood rat.'" And child protection workers moved Ricky to his first foster home. That began a long and sad list of fighting, running away, ending up in juvenile detention, until he was finally allowed this spring to return to his father.

That was the home Ricky had wished for all the years he was in foster care, he said. But three months later, in May, his father died of pulmonary disease.

Once again, a caseworker was ready to put him with a foster family, but Ricky wanted no more.

"I've never had a mother-father type deal in my life, so I wouldn't be ready for it," he said.

The next step for Ricky was his own apartment.

Last week, he sat huddled over a spiral notebook, the kind most kids his age would use for geography or math. He is no longer in any math classes, but the notebook is perfect for managing his money.

He budgets \$144 for two weeks of groceries, \$6 for "hygiene," \$50 for "recreation," \$20 for miscellaneous and \$20 to pay back a debt. But when he totals up his expenses, he compares it with the paycheck he expects to get and realizes he's \$3 short. He decides he will take it out of groceries.

He has written all this out carefully, underscoring the totals in pink highlighter.

Ricky has two years before his safety net is folded up.

He hopes he'll get a high school equivalency degree and a better job. In the meantime, he is learning to navigate the adult world. He lost his electricity in the middle of the night recently when he plugged in an old air conditioner he had found in the basement. But when he called the power company and heard they weren't going to send over any help right away, he told them he was blind. That got them over.

But for every victory, he discovers another trap. He is out of money because he blew a bundle on a Fourth of July cookout. He and his friends bought food and cases of soda pop and cigarettes, and that sent him way over budget.

"It was the first night of really enjoying myself," he said. It was Independence Day.

Struggling in the Adult World

Children leaving foster care at age 18, when federal and state funding ends, face a difficult future. Many suffer from emotional problems and are without financial help from relatives, making them vulnerable to homelessness and other problems. One study found that nearly four in 10 of the homeless population are former foster children.

12 to 8 months after leaving foster care system:

AVERAGE WEEKLY WAGE

\$210 for males

\$157 for females

PHYSICAL INJURY

26% of the males had been beaten or otherwise seriously injured.

15% of the females had been beaten.

10% of the females had been raped.

INCARCERATION

27% of the males had been incarcerated.

10% of the females had been incarcerated.

OTHER

33% were receiving some public assistance.

19% of the females had given birth to children.

37% had not finished high school.

50% were unemployed.

MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT

Before leaving foster care: 47 percent were receiving some kind of counseling or medication for mental health problems.

After leaving foster care: 21 percent were receiving treatment, although there was no reduction in mental problems.

IN TRIBUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM DELAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the RECORD further tributes to the police officers who died protecting the United States Capitol last Friday.

SUSAN HIRSCHMAN, CHIEF OF STAFF TO THE MAJORITY WHIP

John Gibson made the ultimate sacrifice last Friday defending us. John's professional skills saved each of us. We will always remember John's sacrifice. But we will also remember the many other contributions John made to our lives. John's official duty was protecting Tom, the role that ultimately cost him his life. However, I will also remember that John had a quiet way of helping each of us do our job better. For example, as the person who spent more time with Tom than any of us, he was usually the first person to see when things weren't working right. Often, as I walked into the office passing his desk at the back door, he would look at me and simply say "Have you talked with the boss yet?"—gently letting me know that something was on Tom's mind. As we have gathered over the past few days to discuss how much we will miss John, I was not surprised that he had a similar way of helping each and every person in the office. John was a friend to each of us and he made our entire team work more effectively.

MONICA VEGAS KLADAKIS, MAJORITY WHIP STAFF

I got to know John Gibson better during the Republican Convention in 1996. I remember squeezing into a cab with him and a bunch of other staff people as we drove from place to place, and I thought, "He must really hate this." I had thought he was reserved and maybe even a little distant, but after that week I not only realized that he had a lot of patience to deal with all of us raucous staff people, I also discovered what a great sense of humor he had, how kind he was, and how much fun he was to be with.

And now he has saved my life. I feel an overwhelming sense of gratitude toward him, from a depth which I don't know if I've ever reached before. We can never thank him properly for what he did for us, but I hope he knows that we will never forget it.

I'll miss him.

SPECIAL AGENT BOB GLYNN AND DETECTIVE DOUG SHUGARS

Detective John M. Gibson and Officer Jacob J. Chestnut are American heroes. Their heroic actions and personal sacrifice was responsible for saving numerous lives and ensuring the freedoms which all Americans enjoy continue.

Officer Jacob J. Chestnut was a very professional member of the United States Capitol Police. The polite and friendly manner in which he did his job will always be remembered. Every evening as Congressman DeLay and his security would leave the U.S. Capitol, Officer Chestnut would always extend a friendly, "Have a good evening sir." This remark always made for a nice ending to a very long day.

Detective John M. Gibson was a cop's cop. Anytime John was working and there was some police action happening on Capitol Hill, John would be there. It might be stand-

ing in an intersection wearing a suit and directing traffic, assisting with the evacuation of a Congressional building that was on fire, or providing a backup for a fellow officer. John was always there. It was no surprise that John was involved in this kind of heroism. He would have had it no other way. John loved working the security detail for Congressman DeLay and took great pride in the assignment. John was considered to be a part of Congressman DeLay's staff and a very close friend to the DeLay family. John's unselfish actions and personal sacrifice ensured the safety and the lives of Congressman DeLay, his staff, and the public. John was an excellent police officer, a great partner and a wonderful friend. You will be missed.

There is an inscription on the National Police Memorial in Washington, D.C. by Vivian Eney, another survivor of a fallen Capitol Police Officer. This inscription is a fitting tribute to both Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson: "It's not how these Officers died that made them heroes. It's how they lived."

KELLY POTTER, A TRUSTEE FOR THE D.C. LODGE OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE

I keep this poem on my refrigerator at home, which I thought was appropriate:

A PART OF AMERICA DIED

Somebody killed a policeman today, and
A part of America died.

A piece of our country he swore to protect
Will be buried with him at his side.

The suspect who shot him will stand up in
court,

With counsel demanding his rights,

While a young widowed mother must

Work for her kids

And spend alone many nights.

The beat that he walked was a battlefield,
too,

Just as if he'd gone off to war.

Though the flag of our nation won't fly at
half mast,

To his name, they will add a gold star.

Yes, somebody killed a policeman today.

It happened in your town or mine.

While we slept in comfort behind our locked
doors,

A cop put his life on the line.

Now his ghost walks a beat on a dark city
street,

And he stands at each new rookie's side.

He answered the call and gave us his all,

And a part of America died.

SHAWNA BARNETT, FORMER DELAY STAFFER

May John's kind nature and selfless acts remind us always of our fallen hero. He is out of our grasp but so very close to our hearts.

TOM VINCENT, DELAY STAFFER

The biggest thing I remember was his sense of humor. I keep thinking of John taking a special effort to joke and tease Shawna Barnett and keep a smile on her face when she was down. It wasn't just Shawna he kept smiling, he made us all smile.

WILLY IMBODEN, DELAY STAFFER

When I reflect on John Gibson, I remember a man of quiet dignity, integrity, and resolve. He possessed a calming presence about him, his steady bearing lending a tranquil air to the constant chaos of Capitol Hill. In many ways, his 18 years of patient service to Congress and to the American people culminated finally in the greatest and noblest sacrifice, the laying down of his life for others. I am reminded of the Apostle Paul's words in the Epistle to the Philippians: "Do nothing from selfishness or empty conceit, but with humility of mind let each of you re-

gard one another as more important than himself; do not merely look out for your own personal interests, but also for the interests of others. Have this attitude in yourselves, which was also in Christ Jesus . . ." John Gibson's life and final sacrifice personified this ethic, and we are all humbly and eternally indebted to him."

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE
CARL S. SMITH OF HOUSTON,
TEXAS

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of a legend in both Houston and Texas politics, my constituent, the Honorable Carl S. Smith, who died Tuesday afternoon, at the age of 89.

Carl S. Smith dedicated his life to public service. He was first appointed as Harris County Tax Assessor-Collector in 1947. He was elected in 1948 and re-elected an unprecedented 12 times, serving a total of 51 years. In fact, Carl was so dedicated to public service that he never considered his job "work." That's not just an assertion—Carl never retired. Throughout all these years, Carl helped Harris County residents meet their common obligations to one another and to their government by making it more convenient for citizens to pay taxes and register to vote. He was also responsible for car registration, alcohol license fees, and a host of state levies.

Carl lived a long and good life. He was born just as the combustible engine was first being applied in cars. He ended his life riding the crest of the information age. Not only can Carl's life chart the course of American history, his acts of courage foreshadow great changes in American history. For example, in 1952, Carl was the first county official to promote an African-American employee to an important government position, a deputy clerkship. This was a small but significant act in the early days of the Civil Rights movement. Additionally, Carl was an advocate for the elderly. He wrote the statewide property tax exemption for senior citizens that was later adopted as a constitutional amendment. Finally, Carl was able to adapt to the times. In the past few years, Carl received accolades for automating and computerizing his office's operations.

Carl's dedication to public service is an example to all Americans of what government is capable of accomplishing. Carl was first elected to office just two years after our victory in World War II, when it was thought that we could accomplish anything. He held on to that belief even in this cynical era where government is among the least trusted of public and private institutions. He is a model to all Americans involved in public service and especially elderly Americans. A few years ago, Carl joked that while his body had aged, his doctor said he had the "mind of a 20-year-old."

While he was tax assessor at the time of my birth and I remember learning his name at an early age, I first came to know Carl when I became the Chairman of the Harris County Democratic Party in 1990. Ever since then,

whenever I was in the Harris County Administration Building, I would stop to say hello. Whether I was there on business or to register a car, Carl would always call me in to sit down and talk politics in his office, which consisted of maps, floor to ceiling boxes, and records. Just a few years ago, I was picking up new license plates, and Carl summoned me to another part of the office where he was helping staff and conducting a seminar. In his 51 years at the helm, it is fair to say that Carl S. Smith probably did every job there was to do in the Tax Assessor-Collectors' Office he ran.

Carl S. Smith was a good and great man. He was my constituent, but more importantly, he was my friend and one whose counsel I often sought. As much as Harris County loved and respected Carl, his family has suffered an even greater loss.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article and obituary which appeared in the Houston Chronicle on July 29, 1998.

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 29, 1998]

CARL SMITH, TAX CHIEF FOR 51 YEARS, DIES
(By Bob Tutt)

Carl S. Smith, who served 51 years as Harris County's tax assessor and collector and was the senior elected official here, died Tuesday afternoon. He was 89.

His death came at St. Luke's Hospital where he had been confined just over two weeks for treatment of heart problems and other complications.

The Harris County Commissioners Court appointed him to the tax assessor's office in 1947 upon the death of the incumbent, Jim Glass. The next year Smith won election to the post, then was re-elected 12 times. If he had completed the last two years of his term, he would have been 91.

County Judge Robert Eckels announced Smith's death during Tuesday's session of Commissioners Court, prompting gasps from the audience.

"The county has lost someone who's been an institution here," Eckels said. "He was a great leader . . . and someone who cared a great deal for the people of this country."

Eckels then led the court in a moment of silence in Smith's memory.

Commissioner Jim Fonteno, a 24-year veteran of the court, said Smith made him look like the new kid on the block.

"He's been a good one," Fonteno said. "He's been dedicated. He'd get with you too. If you said something he didn't like, he'd take you to task on it."

District Clerk Charles Bacarisse joined other department heads in praising Smith, calling him an "icon" of county government.

"He clearly was a man of honor and integrity and ran his office in an honorable fashion," Bacarisse said.

Jack Loftis, Chronicle executive vice president and editor, reflected, "To say that Carl Smith was the consummate public official would not be giving him proper credit for the 51 years of honest and gracious service he provided to the citizens of Harris County. He was an extraordinary man in every way."

Eckels added, "I remember that he would be down here many times at midnight helping people to file their taxes by the deadline so they wouldn't have to pay a penalty."

The court appointed Loretta Wimp, Smith's chief clerk, as temporary tax assessor-collector. Later it will appoint an acting assessor-collector to serve until a replacement is elected in November.

Under state law a successor to fill out Smith's term will be selected in an election held as part of the Nov. 3 general election. Had Smith died after Aug. 30, Commissioners Court would have named his successor.

Smith had considered retiring in 1996. He said he decided against it because his doctor had pronounced him very fit and he wanted to oversee installation of a new computer system to process motor vehicle titles and licenses. David Minberg, the Democratic County Chairman, also had urged him to run again.

At the time, Smith joined, "My doctor said I have the mind of a 20-year-old, but that's stretching a bit."

He noted at the time that his years of service in the county's employ would make him eligible for a pension greater than his \$93,000 salary.

In winning re-election in 1996 Smith captured almost 60 percent of the vote. He and state District Judge Katie Kennedy turned out to be the only Democrats to win county-wide elections that year.

Reflecting on his tenure in office, Smith said he took special pride in establishing tax office substations around the county to dispense automobile and voter registrations and provide other services.

That, he pointed out, enabled citizens to avoid long lines at county offices downtown.

Smith also said he was proud of efforts he and the late state Sen. Criss Cole made in support of state legislation allowing homestead exemptions to reduce property taxes for senior citizens.

Smith boasted that in keeping with changing times he had computerized and upgraded his office's operations.

His responsibilities also included directing registration of voters and maintaining voter registration rolls.

A native of Lindale in Smith County in northeast Texas, Smith spent most of his life in Houston. A graduate of Reagan High School, he got a law degree from the Houston Law School in 1934, in addition to taking courses at the University of Houston.

Smith had served as president of the Tax Assessor-Collectors Association of Texas as well as the International Association of Assessing Officers.

His wife of 59 years, Dorothy, died in 1991. They were parents of two daughters, Nancy Stewart and Pam Robinson, both of Houston.

Visitation will be from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. Friday at the Geo. H. Lewis & Sons Funeral Home, 1010 Bering Dr. Services will be held at 10 a.m. Saturday at Bethany Christian Church, 3223 Westheimer.

CARL S. SMITH

HARRIS COUNTY WILL MISS ITS LONG-TIME
PUBLIC SERVANT

The secret of Harris County Tax Assessor-Collector Carl Smith's five decades in office has to be that he changed with the times yet managed to remain an old-fashioned public servant. His reputation is that of an effective manager and an admirable man.

In his last terms in office, Smith became used to hearing about himself as "an institution" and "the dean" of Harris County government. He made no bones about his advancing years, sometimes joking that he could tune out nonsense by turning down the volume on his hearing aids. Smith was appointed to head the tax office after the death of the incumbent, Jim Glass, in 1947, and was fond of noting that he was elected in 1948, the same year Harry Truman was elected president.

"Youth and inexperience are no match for age and determination," Smith would say,

crediting the comment to former President George Bush.

Well liked and respected at Commissioners Court, Smith was revered by many of his employees, from whom he insisted on unwavering courtesy to the public. A number of Smith's employees have been with him for decades. It was frequently said that when Smith finally left office, the average age of tax office employees likely would decline significantly.

Smith, a native of Lindale, Texas, took a law degree from Houston Law School before a great many of his Harris County constituency were born. Talk around the county was that Smith, one of the Harris County's last remaining Democrats elected countywide and serving his 12th term, was clinging to the office to keep it out of Republican hands. But there is no denying he managed an efficient shop.

Through the years, Smith fought off usurpers to his domain of tax collection and tax bill distribution, voter registration, motor vehicle registration, alcohol license fees and other state levies. Smith fended off a proposal by powerful former Mayor Bob Lanier to give a portion of his office's tax collection function to a law firm. And in his most recent re-election, Smith put down a challenger's campaign to shutter the tax office, pass voter registration duties to the county clerk and privatize tax collection.

Smith, in 1952, was the first county official to promote a black employee to an important government position, a deputy clerkship. And he wrote the statewide property tax exemption for citizens over 65 that was later adopted as a constitutional amendment.

Smith's wife of 59 years, Dorothy DeArman Smith, died in 1991. They were parents of two daughters, Nancy Stewart and Pam Robinson, both of Houston.

His mind clear, his wit sharp and his sense of humor intact, Smith's heart failed him in the end. He died at 89 at St. Luke's Hospital, where he was being treated for heart problems. Carl Smith will be long missed and remembered always.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STAND DOWN AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Stand Down Authorization Act of 1998. This important legislation will build up and expand the VA's role in providing outreach assistance to homeless veterans.

According to the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), more than 275,000 veterans are without homes every night and twice as many may be homeless during the course of the year. Based on this statistic, one out of every three individuals who is sleeping in a doorway, alley or box in our cities and rural communities has put on a uniform and served our country. Unfortunately, these numbers are only expected to increase as the military downsizes.

In times of war, exhausted combat units requiring time to rest and recover were removed from the battlefield to a place of safety. This procedure was known as "Stand Down."

Today, Stand Downs which help veterans are held across our nation. Stand Downs are grassroots, community-based intervention programs designed to help the estimated 275,000 veterans without homes in our country. Today's battlefield is too often life on the streets for our nation's veterans.

The Stand Down Authorization Act of 1998 will direct the VA to create a pilot program that would establish Stand Down programs in every state. Currently, only 100 Stand Down events take place in a handful of states annually. In addition, my legislation would also authorize the VA to distribute excess supplies and equipment to Stand Downs across the nation.

The first such special Stand Down, held in 1988, was the creation of several Vietnam veterans. The goal of the event was to provide one to three days of hope designed to serve and empower homeless veterans. Since, the Stand Downs have provided a means for thousands of homeless or near-homeless veterans to obtain a broad range of necessities and services including food, clothing, medical care, legal assistance, mental health assessment, job counseling and housing referrals. Most importantly, Stand Downs provide a gathering that offers companionship, camaraderie and mutual support.

Thousands of volunteers and organizations over the past decade have done an outstanding job donating their time, expertise an energy to address the unique needs of homeless or near-homeless veterans and their families. Currently, the VA coordinates with local veteran service organizations, the National Guard and Reserve Units, homeless shelter programs, health care providers and other members of the community in organizing the Stand Down events annually. However, much more action is needed to address the persistent and growing number of homeless veterans who have fought honorably to preserve our freedom and now face personal crisis in their lives.

Veterans in past service unconditionally stood up for America. Now we must speak up and stand up for veterans today. I urge all members to join with me in providing outreach assistance to veterans without homes by co-sponsoring the Stand Down Authorization Act of 1988.

CLEVELAND HOPKINS
INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a very important issue in my district, Cleveland Hopkins International Airport.

Just yesterday, the United States House of Representatives passed the Transportation Appropriations bill, an important piece of legislation for this country. The Honorable Chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Committee, Mr. WOLF, has crafted a bipartisan piece of legislation that will serve this country's transportation needs for the coming fiscal year.

Accompanying this bill is the House Committee Report (105-648). I would like to clarify something in the RECORD that is contained in this report as it relates to Cleveland Hopkins International Airport.

Cleveland Hopkins is vitally important to Northeast Ohio. It not only connects Northeast Ohio with the rest of the world, it provides jobs and economic opportunity for the people who live there. Cleveland Hopkins is also within the city limits, and is surrounded by residential communities that are being asked to adjust to the growing demands being placed on the airport.

Because the airport is very close to reaching overcapacity, the city of Cleveland has embarked upon a plan to expand the capacity of the airport and to improve it so that it may meet the needs of the 21st century. Improving the airport and expanding its capacity in the least intrusive manner to surrounding communities is something that I wholeheartedly support.

However, there is language in the Transportation Appropriations Committee Report that needs to be clarified. The language states on page 78, "The Committee urges the FAA administrator to give priority consideration to a request for discretionary funding for site and engineering studies for the proposed runway expansion at the Cleveland Hopkins International Airport.

The case to expand a specific runway has not yet been made, and singling out this one aspect of the proposed expansion could be misleading. Expanding the capacity of the airport to handle increased air traffic would not necessarily be advanced by merely lengthening one runway.

It is my understanding that it was not the intention of the Committee to determine particular airport improvements. The Committee wishes to urge the FAA to give priority to necessary studies of airport improvements at Cleveland Hopkins. Such studies might include a wide range of possible projects. All legitimate proposals for expanding the airport deserve equal consideration, as well as scrutiny by the FAA, air traffic controllers, local officials from the affected communities, residents, and my Congressional office.

To this end, I intend to work with the House-Senate Transportation Appropriation Conference Committee to clarify that the House Committee did not mean to specify a runway expansion, but to instruct the FAA to make Cleveland Hopkins airport improvements generally a priority for engineering and site studies.

Thank you Mr. Speaker for giving me this opportunity to clarify the Committee's intention for the RECORD.

HONORING ADMIRAL ROBERT E.
KRAHEK

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Admiral Robert E. Kramek, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for

his devoted service to the U.S. Coast Guard and his commitment to our country.

Admiral Kramek began his long road to become the 20th Commandant of the United States Coast Guard when he graduated with honors from the USCG Academy with a B.S. in Engineering in 1961. He attended post graduate schools at the University of Michigan, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of Alaska. He has received Master of Science Degrees in Naval Architecture, and Marine Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Engineering Management. He also attended the U.S. Naval War College in Newport, RI and graduated with Highest Distinction. Admiral Kramek was selected for Flag rank in 1986. After selection for Flag rank, he completed the "Capstone" Program at the National Defense University Institute of Higher Defense Studies.

ADM Kramek had many assignments before relieving ADM J. William Kime as Commandant on June 1, 1994. He was Chief of Staff of the U.S. Coast Guard and commanded two Coast Guard Districts: the 13th District in the Pacific Northwest and the 7th District in the Southeast U.S. and Caribbean. He commanded the Coast Guard Base at Governors Island, New York. He led the interdiction and rescue of 37,000 Haitians when he commanded the High Endurance Cutter *Midgett* and the Haitian Migration Task Force. During this same time period, he was also on the Drug Czar's Coordinator for the War on Drugs in the Southeast U.S. and Caribbean. He served as Regional Emergency Transportation Coordinator (RETCO) for the Secretary of Transportation in the Pacific Northwest. He also commanded Maritime Defense Zone sectors Pacific Northwest and Sector 7 Southeast U.S., which are Navy Coastal Defense Commands.

During his four years as Commandant, ADM Kramek has been responsible for many achievements within the U.S. Coast Guard. He launched four new classes of cutters: The *Keeper*- and *Juniper*-class buoytenders, the 87 foot Patrol Boat, and the Polar Icebreaker. He led the Coast Guard in an international effort to target chokepoints in the illegal drug trade, while overseeing record-setting cocaine seizures in Operations Frontier, Shield, Gulf Shield, and Frontier Lance. He oversaw the integration of Reserve forces with the active-duty Coast Guard and advanced the Coast Guard's reputation as the world's premier maritime service. He created a fully integrated leadership development program that led to the Leadership Development Center of Excellence. He negotiated a memorandum of understanding with the Russian Federal Border Service that led to joint U.S.-Russian operations in the Bering Sea. He also set a government-wide example in National Performance Review improvements and signed a memorandum of agreement with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation defining the Coast Guard's unique defense role in the post-Cold War era.

In addition to his accomplishments, ADM Kramek has received many awards. These awards include two CG Distinguished Service Medals, two Legion of Merit awards, the Meritorious Service Medal, four CG Commendation Medals, the CG Achievement Medal, CG Unit

Commendations, the Meritorious Unit Commendation, the Special Operations Ribbon with silver star, the Humanitarian Service Medal with bronze star, and the Sea Service Ribbon with bronze star.

Admiral Kramek has left his own personal influence on the Coast Guard, which has helped make the United States Coast Guard such a valuable part of this country. Let us not forget the man we honor today, who lives his life to serve the United States of America.

Congratulations to Admiral Robert E. Kramek on his extraordinary life and career, and may God continue to bless him, his wife Patricia, and his four children, Tracy, Joseph, Suzanne, and Nancy.

"VIETNAM: THE LAND WE NEVER KNEW"—GEOFFREY CLIFFORD'S PHOTO EXHIBIT ABOUT PEOPLE, NOT WAR

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. LANTOS: Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to call to the attention of my colleagues the work of an exceptional Bay Area photographer, Mr. Geoffrey Clifford. In an exhibit of his photographs—"Vietnam: The Land We Never Knew"—he shares with us his images of the people of Vietnam. I believe that it would be helpful for all of us to view Mr. Clifford's beautiful pictures, to obtain a greater understanding of the innate beauty of Vietnam, its ancient culture and its strong people. Those photographs are on display this week in the Cannon Rotunda here on Capitol Hill, and I urge my colleagues to stop for a moment to enjoy this outstanding exhibit.

Geoffrey Clifford first arrived in Vietnam not as a photographer, but as a soldier. He served his country as a helicopter pilot for 10½ months during the early 1970's, flying combat assaults and supply missions from bases in Chu Lai and Da Nang. He experienced Vietnam during its greatest turmoil, when its citizens were divided and its communities and landscapes ravaged by war.

Upon his return to the United States in 1972, Mr. Clifford built a career and started a family. But he never forgot Vietnam, and his inescapable memories led to his return many years later. As he wrote in the introduction of his stirring book "The Land We Never Knew" (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1989):

I was never able to wander along Vietnam's back roads, experiencing life as it might be in that country; never able to see, feel, smell, touch or taste what I wanted; and most frustratingly, never able to make friends with the Vietnamese, to share common feelings in conversation with innocent people. . . . Vietnam was a trauma that had been lingering inside me for more than a decade. Photography allowed me to return and assemble a body of work that might benefit our progress. My sincerest wish is that this book, this "work in progress," will aid others with their perceptions of Vietnam and help guide us away from future tragedies.

"The Land We Never Knew" has achieved tremendous critical success, as Clifford's pic-

tures are skillfully laid out and beautifully complemented by the poetic and thoughtful text of John Balaban, a professor of English at Pennsylvania State University. The brilliance of this book reflects years of diligent effort by these men; of the 10,000 photographs taken by Clifford over a period of several years, only the finest 200 made it into the book. Wrote the Los Angeles Times: "His handsome pictures celebrate the beauties of the land and the resilience of its people." Since "The Land We Never Knew" was published, Clifford's work has appeared in Life, Travel and Leisure, Fortune, and the New York Times Magazine.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the House will debate the future of our relationship with Vietnam. Trade, security, and POW/MIA issues may be discussed. Regardless of one's position on these important matters, I believe that it would be of great benefit to each and every one of my colleagues to view this exhibit, as the true beauty of Clifford's pictures rests in its apolitical content.

In contrast to most of the Vietnam images that we have seen over the past half-century—war, destruction, bloodshed, assassination—the theme of "The Land We Never Knew" is one of resilience. Despite decades of destruction to the culture and communities of Vietnam, we see in Clifford's photographs a people that refuse to allow a legacy of three millenniums collapse in a heap of napalm, bombing, and death. We witness in this beautiful book landscapes that reflect this irrepressibility—beautiful forests, river villages, and lotus ponds that display a pristine radiance seemingly unaffected by years of military strikes and counterstrikes. "The Land We Never Knew" is about the Vietnamese nation, not the Vietnamese government. It is about the people of Vietnam, not the Vietnam War.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in praising Geoffrey Clifford, who so ably uses his wondrous talents to communicate a greater understanding and appreciation for Vietnam. I strongly urge my fellow Members to admire his exhibit this week in the Cannon Rotunda.

TRIBUTE TO JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Jefferson Elementary School. Jefferson Elementary has been credited as a California Distinguished School. The faculty and students of Jefferson Elementary exemplify excellence with exceptional student achievement.

Reflecting their school's motto, "High Above the Rest", Jefferson students demonstrate the highest tradition of individual academic success, school pride and ownership of their educational facility. Jefferson Elementary's mission is to enable each student to have equal access to the core curriculum regardless of his/her academic and language proficiency. Jefferson's school-wide goals are linked to their District's Mission. Jefferson has devel-

oped strong partnerships with the School Site Council (SSC) and the Bilingual Advisory Committee (BAC). Their "Student Compact" actively involves students, parents and teachers in focusing on the importance of student achievement and accountability, both academic and social.

Jefferson School is a well-established K-6 campus located on the southeast side of Dinuba (population 13,950) in rural Tulare County. Jefferson School serves approximately 700 students and their families. They are one of five schools (K-6) in the Dinuba Elementary School District. Dinuba Elementary School District has been experiencing steady growth in the student population over a number of years. Today it serves nearly 3,000 students.

Jefferson School's state-of-the-art technology gives students an added dimension to their educational program. Each teacher has a personal classroom computer that is networked to a school-wide web. E-mail and Internet will soon enhance teacher communication and professional discourse. To prepare students for a successful transition to middle school, their sixth grade students are introduced to a morning core block rotation, stressing reading/language and math. Jefferson Elementary, in recognition of the importance of solid study skills, provides all intermediate students with a Student Agenda, organizational tools and a vital home/school connection.

Student success in the result of a collaborative effort of all members of the Jefferson learning community. Their growth and achievement is showcased by their mathematics program, effective reading strategies, instruction of second language learners, judicious use of well-trained instructional assistants, Extended Day programs, use of technology and their P.E. and sports program.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to Dinuba Elementary School District Jefferson Elementary School. The students and faculty in this school exemplify a care for the community and a dedication to hard work. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Jefferson elementary many more years of success.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4059, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Military Construction Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 1999 (H.R. 4059).

I am particularly pleased the House and Senate authorizing and appropriating committees have listened closely to the case I have been making for many years on behalf of funding the P-208 Lakehurst Aircraft Platform Interface (API) laboratory, and they are now responding.

I also want to extend my thanks to the support extended to the API lab by the Chairman

of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, RON PACKARD, and on the Senate side, by my New Jersey colleague, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG. It is very encouraging to see that the report language contained in the House and Senate versions of H.R. 4059 have survived and are included in the final product tonight. As a result, H.R. 4059 includes directive report language that earmarks \$1.65 million in planning and design funds to be used to begin designing the P-208 Lakehurst API lab project.

At my urging, the House reaffirmed its support for the P-208 project in the report accompanying H.R. 3616, the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Authorization Act, and now Congress is specifically appropriating the funds to adequately finance the planning and design of the P-208 API lab.

I also want to commend the Navy for moving forward with this vital project in an expeditious manner. The Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC), in response to one of my inquiries, has informed me that on May 22, 1998, the Navy issued the necessary authorization to begin the planning and design of those military construction projects listed for fiscal year 2000, which includes the Lakehurst API lab. The only questions remaining now are how many square feet the facility will have and what it will look like.

Mr. Speaker, today is a very good day for America, for naval aviation, and for the people of the 4th Congressional District. It has been a long, grueling fight to successfully get the Lakehurst API consolidation project to this point, and the battle is by no means over. However, in the end, our Navy pilots and carrier crew will be able to operate more safely, more efficiently, and more effectively because of the improvements that will be brought about by the P-208 API lab project.

IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB CHESTNUT AND SPECIAL AGENT JOHN GIBSON

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memories of Officer Jacob Chestnut and Special Agent John Gibson. The untimely and tragic deaths of these two men demand from all of us contemplation as to the awesome costs of freedom as well as the delicate nature of life.

The freedoms that we, as Americans, enjoy today are a direct result of a brave decision made long ago by the first Americans, a decision reaffirmed by every generation of the nation's citizenry. This was the decision made by Officer Jacob Chestnut and Special Agent John Gibson this past Friday. The measure of America's greatness, a greatness in which Officer Chestnut and Special Agent Gibson share, is this brave commitment to a free society.

The burden of this commitment is an unflinching vigilance against those who threaten our freedoms. Officer Chestnut and Special Agent Gibson devoted their lives to providing

the very security that allows our free society to flourish. It was in providing this security that these two men lost their lives, a sacrifice which demands the reverence of a grateful nation.

My fellow colleagues, let us learn from the sacrifices of Officer Chestnut and Special Agent Gibson. The legacy of these two patriots offers important lessons to us all.

HONORING THE MEMBERS OF THE CHATTANOOGA ALL-STAR TRAMPOLINE AND TUMBLING TEAM

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Courtney Bailey, Allison Bovell, Alice Ann Caldwell, Lindsay Davis, Sarah Harris, Lori Hughes, Samantha Robinson, Nat Davis, Caleb Hicks and Ashley Nickols for their competitive performances at the USA Trampoline and Tumbling National Championships in St. Paul, Minnesota on July 1-8, 1998. During these competitions, these fine young athletes earned eight first place national championships and made Tennesseans proud.

Even more outstanding that recognition, medals or fame is how these students have overcome the obstacles of our society and let their determination and perseverance win the ultimate goal. With all the negative publicity brought on our youth today, it is good to know that children like these are our true future of tomorrow. Their persistence has brought honor, pride and dignity not only to the state of Tennessee, but to the nation as a whole. With these achievements, these remarkable young athletes serve as role models for members of the younger community. I would also like to congratulate the coaches, teachers, parents and/or guardians who have provided these "champions" with spiritual and mental guidance. Without this influence, these extraordinary young men and women might not have learned how to excel in all realms of life.

I want to conclude with a special "thank-you" to Courtney, Allison, Alice Ann, Lindsay, Sarah, Lori, Samantha, Nat, Caleb and Ashley for their achievements. And I encourage them to continue to strive for their goals and to be a positive influence on those around them.

FAREWELL TRIBUTE TO ITZHAK OREN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me today in bidding farewell to Itzhak Oren, who for the past four years has been the Minister for Congressional Affairs at the Embassy of Israel here in Washington, D.C. During this time, he has been a major influence in maintaining and fostering the strong and friendly relationship between the United States and the State of Israel. For Members of

Congress and for congressional staff, Itzhak has been a ready source of information and assistance.

Mr. Oren will shortly take up his new position as the Ambassador of Israel to Nigeria and Benin.

Mr. Oren has served in the Israeli Foreign Ministry for 17 years. Prior to assuming his position in Washington, he was head of the Foreign Ministry's Coordination Department and served as political advisor to Prime Ministers Yitzhak Rabin and Yitzhak Shamir. In 1991 and 1992, he was a participant in the multilateral peace talks in Moscow, Tokyo and the Hague. He has served a number of years in the United States as Consul of Israel in Boston, and prior to that he was posted in New York City.

Prior to joining the Foreign Ministry, Itzhak served as an officer in the Israeli Defense Forces and as an intelligence analyst. He holds a B.A. degree from Bar Ilan University and an M.A. from the City University of New York.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE FRESNO BEE

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fresno Bee on receiving the first-place award for general excellence from the California Newspaper Publishers Association. This is the second straight year the newspaper has won the organization's highest honor and the Fresno Bee is very deserving of this award.

The Fresno Bee has a daily circulation of 158,851 and a Sunday circulation of 191,963. It was judged against other daily newspapers with circulations of 75,001 to 200,000 copies. Clearly, this award displays the outstanding efforts of not only the Fresno Bee journalists, but of an entire newspaper staff who are committed to giving Fresno and the Central Valley a comprehensive, first-class newspaper. Naturally, the Fresno Bee exhibits strong local coverage, outstanding local photography and good local enterprise stories.

In addition to the general excellence award, the Fresno Bee received first-place awards for editorial comment, illustration/information graphics and design.

Associate Editor Russell Minick was honored for an editorial on a white supremacist groups' spreading of propaganda on the California State University Fresno campus. Mr. Minick took second place in the same category one year ago.

Bee artists John Alvin, Bob Campbell, Andrea Cooper and Severiano Galvan were given the graphics award for a two-page layout on the once-dominating Central Valley wetlands. Mr. Galvan earned the first-place award in the same category one year ago.

Bee photographer John Walker took second place for his photos featured in his portrait of Little Rascals star Tommy "Butch" Bond.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I congratulate the Fresno Bee on receiving the

first-place award for general excellence from the California Newspaper Publishers Association. The Fresno Bee has provided 75 years of outstanding service to the Central Valley, using its excellent staff to create what truly is a first-class production. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing the Fresno Bee and its staff many more years of success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 279 through 308. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall votes 279, 281, 286, 287, 288, 290, 294, 295, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 303, 305 and nay on rollcall votes 280, 282, 283, 284, 285, 298, 291, 292, 293, 296, 302, 304, 306, 307, and 308.

HONORING GRAND MASTER SEOUNG EUI SHIN FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NASHVILLE COMMUNITY AND THE SUCCESS OF THE SOUTHERN U.S.A. TAE KWON DO CHAMPIONSHIPS

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Grand Master Seoung Eui Shin and the 23rd Southern U.S.A. Open Tae Kwon Do Championships, of which he is director. Master Shin has served the Nashville community faithfully for more than twenty years, donating his time and talents to make a difference in the lives of countless children and young adults.

Master Shin was born in North Korea and grew up in South Korea during the turbulent times following World War II. By the age of 13, he had earned his black belt in Tae Kwon Do. He began to teach the art in high school and, later, in the Korean Army. He came to the United States and Nashville in 1974, and has been an invaluable member of the community ever since.

Now a ninth degree black belt, Master Shin is recognized around the world for his Tae Kwon Do abilities and his contributions to the martial art. He has become a leader in Nashville's Korean community and operates Shin's Martial Arts Institute in Bellevue. He gives freely of his time to programs at local elementary schools and community centers. Through his instruction, Master Shin has influenced the lives of many of his students. His students learn the value of control and self-discipline while gaining new respect for themselves and others. Several of Master Shin's students have gone on to teach Tae Kwon Do themselves, passing on what they have learned.

Seoung Eui Shin, by giving selflessly of his time to the youth of Nashville, has quietly

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

made our world a better place and his become a role-model for us all. I thank you Master Shin for your contributions to our community and congratulate you and all the participants in the 23rd Southern U.S.A. Tae Kwon Do Championships.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4194) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep regret that I rise today in opposition to the VA-HUD Appropriations measure for fiscal year 1999. I believe it provides inadequate funding for veterans' health care, and I cannot support a bill that shortchanges America's veterans in such an unjust manner.

As a veteran, I am acutely aware of and deeply grateful for the sacrifices that America's veterans have made in service to their country. As a legislator, I am committed to ensuring that the needs of these citizens are accorded the highest priority. I have great respect for Chairman LEWIS and Representative STOKES and am convinced of their concern for the welfare of our veterans. I also recognize the budget constraints which have forced them to make many difficult decisions. However, I believe that we can do better, and I am voting against this measure with the hope that veterans' health care and other programs will be granted the funding they deserve once it is made clear that this House will not tolerate such treatment of veterans' programs.

The funding levels provided in this measure are simply not sufficient to ensure the high quality health care our veterans deserve. The tragic result of such a shortfall will surely be the elimination or reduction of many VA specialized care programs and the inability of the VA to guarantee adequate care to the veterans who depend on its services. I trust that my fellow Members will agree that this is not the way we should demonstrate our appreciation for their service and sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this measure in an effort to make it clear to the American people and to the leadership of this body that we assign the utmost importance to funding programs that will meet the needs of America's veterans, and that this bill is a woefully inadequate expression of that priority.

COMMEND SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE EFFORTS TO REVIVE FAST TRACK

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would take a moment to commend the members of the Senate Finance Committee for their efforts last Tuesday to give "fast-track" authority to the President by attaching fast-track legislation to S. 778, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. This action by the Senate was also applauded on the editorial page in the July 24, 1998, edition of The Omaha World-Herald, as necessary to protecting the economic health of our nation by giving the President the flexibility and authority to negotiate international trade agreements expeditiously.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration, which initially stated fast track was one of their top legislative priorities, labeled this initiative by the Senate Finance Committee as "political mischief." Why is it that the Nebraska press can readily identify legislation designed to safeguard the interests of U.S. workers and consumers when all the administration can do is play politics?

[From the Omaha World-Herald,
July 24, 1998]

CLINTON'S SWITCH ON FAST-TRACK A PUZZLING POLITICAL MANEUVER

The Senate Finance Committee has resurrected a plan that was considered dead: giving President Clinton "fast-track" authority to negotiate international trade deals. But now the administration seems to be balking.

Fast-track authority enables presidents to negotiate international trade agreements without interference from Congress. When a deal is made, Congress can say "yes" or "no," but cannot rewrite it. Presidents have had the authority, granted by Congress, since 1974. But in 1994, the authorizing legislation lapsed.

Efforts to revive it earlier this year were supported by President Clinton, many congressional Republicans and business groups. But opposition was strong from protectionist labor groups and environmental organizations worried about pollution abroad. Those groups with the cooperation of Democrats, helped kill the proposal.

Maverick Republicans also had a hand on the ax. They attempted to hold fast-track hostage until Clinton agreed to reduce family-planning aid to Third World countries.

The Finance Committee voted 18 to 2 Tuesday to attach fast-track to a bill, already passed by the House, that would expand trade with Africa. President Clinton should be delighted.

But no. Press Secretary Mike McCurry asserted that the committee vote was "political mischief" rather than a commitment to free trade. Senate Democrats, too, were unhappy with the revival of the potentially divisive issue before an election.

Fast-track eases the way for U.S. negotiators to join in drafting international agreements. Without it, possible trading partners aren't motivated to make their best deal because they know Congress can always revise any agreement that is reached.

International trade has become increasingly important to the U.S. economy. That

is especially true in the Midlands, where agricultural exports are growing fast. In Nebraska, for instance, exports have increased fivefold in the last five years.

Surely something that was so important just a few months ago remains important, even though an election is approaching. The president still needs the flexibility and authority granted by fast track to deal with trade agreements expeditiously.

When President Clinton declared that fast-track authority was one of his top legislative priorities, he was speaking out of a concern for U.S. trade relations. Senators and members of the House who pushed the issue had the same worthy motive.

Political maneuvering had no place in the conversation then. It still does not.

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONDEMNNS PERSECUTION OF CHINESE IN INDONESIA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a resolution condemning the persecution of Chinese in Indonesia which was recently adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the city of San Francisco. I want to mention in particular two outstanding Supervisors—Mabel Teng and Le-land Yee—who took the initiative in calling for a resolution to condemn the at-times brutal treatment of ethnic Chinese living in Indonesia.

Mr. Speaker, the recent popular unrest in Indonesia led to gross abuse of the human rights of the Chinese population there. At my direction the Congressional Human Rights Caucus holds a briefing for Members of Congress and congressional staff today to understand the dimensions of this tragic assault against ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. The U.S. Government must make clear to the government in Jakarta that such abuses are totally unacceptable, and we must be certain that the Indonesian Government works to prevent the recurrence of such actions.

At a hearing of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights which was held last Thursday (July 23) and which focused on human rights in Indonesia, I raised the issue of Chinese human rights violations in Indonesia with our Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, John Shattuck. I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, what I said on that occasion. I earnestly hope that the cataclysmic changes which are sweeping over Indonesia today and which will have enormously negative ramifications for tens of millions of Indonesians in an economic sense, will herald the opening up of the process of democratization and respect for human rights—and particularly, respect for the rights of the Chinese population living in Indonesia.

One of the sad aspects of our Nation's own human rights record has been our failure to press for equal rights for the Chinese population of Indonesia, which has been pivotal in the economic development of that country. In the hearing last week with Assistant Secretary

Shattuck, Mr. Speaker, I asked and received assurance that the Department of State will press the government of Indonesia for a full investigation of the brutal and violent acts taken against the ethnic Chinese community there and that we will actively and aggressively urge full observance of the human rights of Chinese in Indonesia.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution recently adopted by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors is an important statement on this important issue, and I commend Supervisor Teng and Supervisor Yee for their initiative. I submit the full text of this resolution to be placed in the RECORD.

CONDEMNING THE PERSECUTION OF CHINESE IN INDONESIA

Condemning the persecution, racial violence and sexual brutality against ethnic Chinese in Indonesia and urging our congressional representatives to call for a full investigation into these atrocious acts of violence and pressure the Indonesian government for a full investigation to seek accountability and justice.

Whereas, recently 1,200 people died in Indonesia as a result of targeted and vicious attacks and riots; and

Whereas, ethnic Chinese in Indonesia were targeted for racial violence, looting and sexual brutality; and

Whereas, various human rights groups report that at least 70 Chinese women were systematically raped, and 20 of those women died due to complications from their injuries; and

Whereas, rape victims included young girls; and

Whereas, Indonesian Chinese have been subjected to organized persecution that included looting, burning of churches and homes and mass raping in public; and

Whereas, human rights groups, including the Jakarta Legal Aid Institute, have accused the Indonesian government represented by security forces of failing to control the violence, and encouraging the brutality; and

Whereas, the Jakarta Legal Aid Institute and other human rights groups have filed a class action lawsuit against the Indonesian government for these attacks; and

Whereas, much of the media worldwide covered the student demonstrations in Jakarta, however, the specific reports of the widespread violence and attacks against the ethnic Chinese have been largely ignored; and

Whereas, the United States must condemn and denounce these horrific atrocities of violence and express the moral outrage of the American people; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors in the City and County of San Francisco condemns the persecution, racial violence and sexual brutality against ethnic Chinese in Indonesia; and be it

Further Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors in the City and County of San Francisco urges that our Congressional Representatives call for a full investigation into these atrocious acts of violence and pressure the Indonesian government for a full investigation to seek accountability and justice.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, due to business in my Congressional District, it is with deep regret that I was unable to vote in support of rollcall vote 340, a resolution honoring the slain capitol police officers, Jacob Chestnut and John Gibson. My sincerest condolences go out to their families and loved ones.

IN MEMORY OF ALAN J. GIBBS, LIFELONG PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Alan J. Gibbs, died Saturday, July 25, at the age of 60. Most recently, Alan served as the Director of the National Transit Institute (NTI) at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

He was dedicated to public service, having worked for over 35 years at the federal, state, and local levels of government.

I join with his family, as well as my colleagues at Rutgers and throughout the State of New Jersey in remembering him, and honoring his accomplishments and great leadership. I know Rutgers is particularly proud of Alan's accomplishments at the National Transit Institute. Established at the Rutgers-New Brunswick campus in New Jersey's Sixth District in 1992, the NTI was created by Congress to develop education and training programs for transportation professionals and transit agencies across the nation. The NTI has trained thousands of individuals from transit agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, state departments of transportation, and employees of federal-aid transit systems to improve public transit in the United States.

Prior to heading the NTI, Alan served as the State Commissioner of the Department of Human Services, to which he was appointed by Governor Jim Florio in 1990. Under his leadership, the largest department in the State government underwent a major downsizing, reallocated resources to focus on non-institutional care for the developmentally disabled and mentally ill, developed a managed care program for Medicaid recipients, and implemented a welfare reform program.

Mr. Gibbs began his public service career in 1963 with the National Labor Relations Board. In 1968, Alan became the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) first Area Director for Alabama and Tennessee. He then moved to Washington, DC to continue his work at the EEOC at the federal level. From 1970 to 1974, Alan served in the New York City Health Services Administration. In 1972, he was the first layperson to be appointed First Deputy Commissioner of Health.

Then, in 1974, Governor Brendan Byrne of New Jersey appointed Mr. Gibbs to serve as Deputy Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Human Services. In that capacity,

ATTENTION OF SENATE

1954

The following information is being furnished to you for your information. It is requested that you advise this office of any changes in the information furnished herein.

The following information is being furnished to you for your information. It is requested that you advise this office of any changes in the information furnished herein.

The following information is being furnished to you for your information. It is requested that you advise this office of any changes in the information furnished herein.