



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 2000

No. 20

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1883. An act to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 400. An act to provide technical corrections to the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to improve the delivery of housing assistance to Indian tribes in a manner that recognizes the right of tribal self-governance, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution commending the people of Iran for their commitment to the democratic process and positive political reform on the occasion of Iran's parliamentary elections.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106-79, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following Senators to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE); and

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED).

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 min-

utes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

CREATING LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, a livable community is one where our families are safe, healthy, and economically secure. The Federal Government has an obligation to be the best partner it can in helping create and maintain livable communities. A critical element in creating the climate in which a livable community can thrive is reducing the threat of gun violence.

Since Richard Nixon was President of the United States, over a million Americans have lost their lives to gun violence. This is more than all the deaths in all the American wars since the Civil War. For every gun death, there are three to four injuries.

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly a major threat to the health of our communities. One hesitates to put a dollar cost on such tragedy, but the fact is gun deaths are the most expensive trauma-related deaths, costing over a third of a million dollars.

For each child shot by a gun, those injuries total what it would take to send them to college for a year. The total costs are over \$4 billion a year. If we add all of the indirect costs, lost of productivity, it is over \$100 billion by some estimates. It is important to note that no family today is safe from gun violence, whether it is in Jonesboro, Arkansas, whether it is in the high school in Columbine, Colorado, in my State of Oregon, in Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, this morning, as I was walking to this Chamber, I was given a notice that in Mount Morris Township, Michigan, this morning a first grader was shot by another pupil, a first grade child.

It is important for us to not be paralyzed in this Chamber and assume there is nothing we can do to reduce gun violence. There are a number of simple commonsense steps. I hope that the leadership in this Chamber will bring forward simple, commonsense gun violence provisions that passed the Senate and should find their way to the floor of this House.

There are other examples of what we can do. Yesterday's Washington Post had an article about the smart gun technology that the Clinton administration has proposed to invest in, a gun that can only be fired by one authorized person. In Maryland, Governor Glendening is proposing that there only be sold smart guns in 3 years.

Both of these proposals have merit and deserve serious attention by Congress and the Maryland Legislature. But there is another area that requires no massive legislation. And that is simple, for the Federal Government to lead by example to do what we are asking the rest of America to do.

Mr. Speaker, every year, the government purchases thousands of weapons for the men and women in law enforcement. If we decreed that only smart guns would be purchased from this point forward, we could use the market forces, the vast potential for sales to government to encourage, to incent the private sector to provide that need.

This is critical for men and women in law enforcement. One out of every six law enforcement officials who dies in the line of duty is killed by their own service revolver or by a service revolver of one of their colleagues. It would build a market for smart gun technology. It would send a signal that it is safe enough and important enough for law enforcement, that it is the right thing to do for private citizens.

□ 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.



Printed on recycled paper.

H513

Every day in the United States, over a million children go home to homes where there are loaded guns that they have access to. There are over a third of a million firearm deaths every year in this country. If we take the simple, common sense approach to have smart gun technology available, we can make a significant step towards reducing that carnage. For the Federal Government, to lead by example, by putting its money where our mouth is, would be an important step.

Mr. Speaker, and last, and by no means least, as I mentioned, I do hope that the leadership in this assembly will enable us to vote on the Senate-passed provisions to take those simple steps towards safe gun storage, reducing the magazine size for automatic weapons to 10 or fewer bullets, and having background checks at gun shows. These are things that can make our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

GRANTING CHINA PERMANENT MOST FAVORED NATION TRADE STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my concern about granting China permanent normal trade relations. According to the recently released 1999 State Department human rights report on China, it says, "human rights deteriorated markedly throughout the year." Every Member ought to read the report before they vote.

The State Department's human rights report describes the People's Republic of China as "an authoritarian state in which the Chinese Communist party is the paramount source of power." Did my colleagues know that the human rights report, it says that "numerous executions after summary trials"? Did my colleagues know that more people were executed in China last year than anywhere else in the world? My goodness, this Congress and this administration wants to give China MFN. For example, the State Department reports that a radio station in China reported that eight people were arrested and quickly executed right after being sentenced.

Do my colleagues know that the report says that China has still not accounted for those missing or detained in connection with the 1989 Tiananmen Square demonstrators? Eleven years. The moms and dads do not know where their children are. And this administration and this Congress wants to grant China permanent trade status? Shame.

Do my colleagues know that the State Department says that the Chinese Government has, "Intensified its efforts to suppress this dissent."? The

report says that by last year's end almost all the leaders of the China Democracy Party were serving long prison terms or were in custody without formal charges.

Do the Members of this body know that the report says that the Chinese Government sentenced numerous leaders of the Falun Gong spiritual movement to long prison terms and sent them to psychiatric hospitals? Do the Members know, does the Clinton administration know, does anybody care? The American people care. I do not know who cares up here or in the administration.

Do my colleagues know that the State Department reports that the Chinese Government ignores its own laws that are supposed to provide for fundamental human rights? Do my colleagues know that the report says the Chinese Government ignores these laws in practice with abuses that include extrajudicial killings, torture, mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, arbitrary arrests, detention and lengthy incommunicado detention? I have been in Beijing Prison Number One, and I can tell my colleagues that it is grim.

Do my colleagues know the report says the Chinese Government continues to restrict freedom of religion and has intensified controls on unregistered churches? Do my colleagues know that the report says the government infringes on its citizens' privacy rights, freedom of movement, freedom of press, freedom of free assembly?

Do my colleagues know that the report speaks to violence against women, including coercive family planning practices, which sometimes include forced abortions and forced sterilization? They track the women down and force them to have an abortion. The report speaks to trafficking, prostitution, discrimination against women, trafficking in women and children, abuse of children, discrimination against disabled and minorities. These are all problems. This is in the State Department report that every Member ought to read.

Do my colleagues know the report says that the Chinese Government continues to restrict tightly workers' rights and forced labor in prison facilities remains a problem? Do my colleagues know the report says child labor persists in China?

Do my colleagues know the report says that "Particularly serious human rights abuses persist in minority areas, especially in Tibet."? The Chinese government has plundered Tibet. They are persecuting the Muslims; they are persecuting the Catholic Church; they are persecuting the Protestant Church. Do my colleagues know that the report says that unapproved religious groups, including Protestant and Catholic groups, continue to experience varying degrees of official interference, repression and prosecution?

Do my colleagues know the report says that the Chinese "government

continues to require all places of religious activity to register with the government."? Do my colleagues know the report says that Chinese authorities, guided by national policy, make strong efforts to control unapproved Catholic and Protestant churches? Religious services were broken up and house church leaders or adherents were harassed and fined, detained, beaten and tortured? This is in the State Department report.

I could go on with other examples of human rights abuses by the Chinese Government, but I would end by asking if my colleagues know that the Chinese Government refuses to allow Catholics to recognize the authority of the Pope in matters of faith and morals?

Do my colleagues know the report says that numerous Catholic bishops and believers have been imprisoned and beaten? Do my colleagues know the report says that in May of last year, Bishop Yan Weiping was found dead in Beijing shortly after being released from prison? Do my colleagues know, looking at this picture, that this report says that the whereabouts of some of these bishops, like Bishop Su, reportedly arrested in 1997, are still unclear?

Every Member ought to read this report. And after reading this report, I know my colleagues will be with the American people and they will not support permanent normal trade relations for China.

A NINTH TIME ZONE FOR GUAM AND THE NORTHERN MARIANAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to a bill which I will introduce that fills a time void which has long existed, and that is the naming of a time zone which exists under the American flag but which has no official title.

Wherever the flag behind us flies there is a title for each time zone in which it flies, whether it is in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, with its Atlantic time zone; this city, with its eastern time zone; Chicago, with central time; Denver, with mountain time; Los Angeles, with Pacific time; Honolulu, with Hawaii standard time; Anchorage, with Alaska standard time; and even Pango Pango and American Samoa, with Samoa standard time. But there was a ninth time zone, where Guam sits and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas sits as well; and where there is no official title for this time zone. Not that there is no time there, but that there is no specific name for this time zone.

Perhaps this is an oversight. The fact that this time zone is on the other side of the international date line and could appropriately claim the title of being the first American time zone, could get

the competitive spirits of those in the Atlantic time zone aroused. But when information is being sent out about changes in national time or announcements concerning time, this ninth time zone, in geography going west but first in terms of time, frequently gets ignored. After all, the existing law only allows for eight time zones under the American flag.

Consequently, Madam Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which fills the void, which corrects this oversight, and which appropriately designates each and every American time zone. If all Americans count, then all Americans should be included in time, in political participation, and in the national census. Each and every time we look at the clock or look at our watch, we should recognize that there exists nine time zones.

□ 1245

The unique feature of this particular piece of legislation is that it is responsive to a quandary that does not quite exist in the other time zones. We have two jurisdictions with two distinct names. We have Guam and we have the Northern Marianas. We could call it the Guam slash or dash Marianas time zone. However, in time, Guam would take center stage and the remainder of the Marianas would be ignored. Or we could call it the Marianas time zone, but that would be taken as a signal that Guam is not included.

Therefore, in honor of the historical unity of both Guam and the Northern Marianas and the people who were the original inhabitants of the entire island chain, I have designated in this legislation this new time zone as Chamorro Standard Time. The word "Chamorro" refers to the indigenous people, possesses a proud cultural heritage, and forms the basis of the underlying historical and cultural connection between the people of Guam and the people of Luta, Tinian, Saipan, Agrigan, and other islands in the Northern Marianas.

ManChamorro ham todū gi tinituhon. We were Chamorros in the beginning.

ManChamorro ham esta pa'go. We are still Chamorros today.

This amendment to the Calder Act has been discussed with Federal officials in NIST of the Department of Commerce, and we anticipate only support for this effort.

Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to cosponsor and pass this legislation quickly, dare I say it, in a timely way. Let us not waste any time. Let us take the time to make time for all Americans.

ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, today is a big day. The House Committee on Ways and Means is going to act on another item on our agenda, an issue of fairness; and today, in the House Committee on Ways and Means, we are going to move forward on an item on the Republican agenda which helps 800,000 senior citizens, senior citizens over the age of 65, who because they need to work or want to work, they want to be active longer, or maybe they have two pensions, had their Social Security benefits taxed away. And that is called the earnings limit, or the earnings penalty.

Today we are going to pass legislation which will wipe out that unfair quirk in Federal law which taxes away two-thirds of the Social Security benefits of 800,000 senior citizen who happen to earn more than \$17,000 a year.

We can all think of seniors that we know in our local communities who have to work, maybe they are waitresses, maybe they work or have a little hobby or they set aside some money and saved and invested well that they are making more than \$17,000 a year, and today they are punished; they are penalized.

We are going to pass legislation which deserves bipartisan support which wipes out the earnings limit for 800,000 senior citizens. That is a big victory as we work to bring about fairness to every American.

Today I want to talk about another issue of fairness, an issue which this House has voted to address, an issue which responds to a fundamental question of fairness, the difference between right and wrong; and that is, is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples on average pay \$1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married?

Is it right that a working married couple with an identical income, identical circumstances, pays higher taxes than a couple that lives together outside of marriage with identical circumstances? Of course not. It is wrong; it is unfair that under our Tax Code a working married couple pays more in taxes just because they are married.

I want to introduce to my colleagues in the House Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers from Joliet, Illinois. Shad and Michelle, of course, teach public school; they just had a little baby, a young couple, a nice couple. They suffer the marriage tax penalty just because they are married.

They have a combined income of about \$62,000. They are two public school teachers supposed to have identical incomes of about \$30,000 each. They are middle class. Well, they pay the average marriage tax penalty.

Michelle pointed out to me, she said, Congressman, as you work to eliminate that marriage tax penalty, let your colleagues in the Congress know that that marriage tax penalty that the Hallihans pay would buy about 4,000 diapers for their newborn child.

It is real money for real people. And for other families in Joliet, Illinois, the hometown of Michelle and Shad Hallihan, that \$1,400, the average marriage tax penalty, is 1 year's tuition at Joliet Junior College or a local community college. It is 3 months' of day-care at a local childcare center in the south suburbs of Chicago. It is 7 months' worth of car payments. It is a washer and a dryer for couples like Michelle and Shad. And they are a beautiful couple. They are young.

But the marriage tax penalty is suffered by the elderly, as well. We have all heard the stories about elderly couples who get divorced because they can save money. Well, the marriage tax penalty punishes young and old just because they are married. And this House has done something about that. We have been working over the last several years to wipe out the marriage tax penalty. And 230 Members of this House joined together to cosponsor H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, legislation which wipes out the marriage tax penalty for couples like Michelle and Shad Hallihan.

I am proud to say that this House voted, in fact 48 Democrats joined with every House Republican to vote to wipe out the marriage tax penalty, benefiting 25 million married, working couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty.

Our legislation will essentially wipe out the marriage tax penalty for Shad and Michelle Hallihan. We do it in several ways. It has three key components. It is legislation designed to help everybody who suffers the marriage tax penalty, and we do it in three approaches.

One is, first we help the working poor. Those who participate in the earned income credit, which helps those working poor families, particularly with children, well, there is a marriage penalty and we adjust the income threshold so that working, married couples who participate in earned income credit will see their marriage penalty eliminated.

Let us remember that the biggest part of the marriage tax penalty is caused when we have a husband and wife like Shad and Michelle Hallihan, who, because they are married, they file jointly, they combine their income. We eliminate the marriage tax penalty by widening the 15 percent tax bracket as well as doubling the standard deduction.

The Senate needs to act. I hope the Senate will join us and move in a quick way, a timely way, and in a bipartisan way to join us in wiping out the marriage tax penalty.

IMPROVING BUDGET PROCESS—KEEPING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICAID SOLVENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized

during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk today about a couple of challenges facing this country.

One challenge is, is there a way to improve our budget process? Should we go to a biannual budget or other techniques that might be used to better serve the taxpayers of this country? And the second issue is the tremendous challenge of keeping Social Security and Medicare solvent.

In yesterday's Roll Call there was an article on page 46 of yesterday's Roll Call, I wrote an article: "Entitlement Reform the Way to Go."

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the article on page 46 of yesterday's Roll Call:

THE ONE THING I WOULD CHANGE ABOUT CONGRESS . . . ENTITLEMENT REFORM THE WAY TO GO

(By Rep. Nick Smith)

For 224 years, Congress has wrestled with the budget. As an ex-wrestler and current Budget Committee member, I know that can be both strenuous and challenging.

This has led some Members to seek a "quick fix" in an attempt to end the annual struggle. Biennial budgeting, however, is a mirage that distracts us from the real budget problems we face.

Biennial budgeting would be an enormous change in our budget processes, the biggest since at least 1974. The effects on the budget struggle would be far-reaching and very largely negative from the Congressional perspective. Biennial budgeting will deprive Congress of much of the leverage it needs to compete equally with the administration. Specifically, Congress gives up.

Reconciliation in off years. The Congressional majority could lose much of its power in election years to use reconciliation. This will endanger its priorities in election years and would rule over the House tax cut strategy for this year.

Congress could include multiple reconciliation instructions in a biennial budget resolution, but this deprives Congress of flexibility needed to react to changing political and economic needs. The majority would have to fashion its political strategy for the next two years just three months after the preceding election.

Control over the agencies. The annual budget process allows Congress to express its will to government agencies. I know that we were more eager to cooperate with Congress at budget time when I was a member of the Nixon administration. Biennial budgeting will reduce our leverage to hold agencies accountable and encourage defiance.

Budget accuracy and flexibility. Economic forecasting is highly uncertain. The Congressional Budget Office estimate for fiscal 2000 two years ago was for a \$70 billion unified budget deficit. That's \$240 billion off the current fiscal 2000 estimate of a \$170 billion unified budget surplus. The estimate has shifted by \$40 billion just since October 1999.

This uncertainty means, the President would bargain for high second-year spending, and we would frequently need or be tempted to reopen the budget. When we reopen the budget, we would find ourselves with little leverage against a pre-funded administration that can resist unwanted budget modification with near impunity. When revenue is lower or spending is higher than projected, the pressure to increase fees, taxes and borrowing, rather than cut the administration, would be considerable.

Leverage over spending. Congress will inevitably grapple with supplemental spending requests in the off years. In the absence of pressure to produce a complete budget, an administration will always have poll-tested and politically motivated requests in off years that will be hard to fend off in the absence of broader budget issues.

As a result, we will pass supplemental appropriations bills in most years that will grow as Members add their own pet election-year projects. All of this threatens even the very modest spending restraint that we've been able to exercise over the last five years.

I find it surprising, then, to hear of growing support for moving from our current annual budget to a biennial budget process. It does seem sometimes that we are on a budget treadmill that never stops. There is no solution, however, in ducking our responsibilities to exercise the power the Constitution grants us. Power atrophies unless it is used, and that is what will surely continue to happen to Congressional power if we adopt biennial budgeting.

Members interested in getting a handle on the budget should focus on substance rather than process. The truth is that the discretionary portion of the budget—which is the substance of the 13 annual appropriations bills—makes up just one-third of total federal spending.

The rest of our spending—chiefly, entitlement programs—is on automatic pilot and rising faster than inflation. This growth in entitlement spending puts enormous pressure on the other parts of the budget and will inevitably necessitate higher taxes or a return to excessive government borrowing.

Acting promptly and boldly will bring benefits as well. The unremarked secret of our current budget surplus is the welfare reforms enacted in 1996 and the Medicare changes enacted in 1997. To be blunt, we would still be in deficit without these reforms. But in both cases, one could also argue that the programs have been strengthened.

I have long believed that there are similar opportunities to improve our largest entitlement, Social Security, which is now 23 percent of total federal spending. As chairman of the Budget Committee Task Force on Social Security, I helped develop 18 unanimous and bipartisan findings that could serve as the basis for reform.

After the completion of the task force's business, I also introduced the bipartisan Social Security Solvency Act (H.R. 3206), which is scored to keep Social Security solvent based on these findings.

The effect of this reform (or of similar reforms such as the 21st Century Retirement Act (H.R. 1793)) would be to dramatically reduce the growth of government spending for decades to come. The charts on this page show how significant reform can be.

The first chart shows that federal spending will rise to nearly 35 percent of the nation's gross domestic product without changes in our entitlement programs, about 75 percent higher than it is today. Needless to say, giant tax increases will be needed to sustain this level of spending.

In contrast, the second chart shows what could happen if we simply adopt the Social Security Solvency Act. Under this scenario, we would experience a gradual reduction in federal spending as we shift to a retirement system based partly on worker-owned accounts starting at 2.5 percent of income and partly on traditional government-paid benefits.

This legislation would also fully restore the program's shaky finances and create opportunities for workers to live better in retirement by making full use of the power of compound interest.

This is not easy work. But if we do nothing, taxes will have to rise to the equivalent

of 40 percent of payroll by 2040 to pay for Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. Social Security and our other entitlement programs are complicated and alteration carries political risk.

The benefits from this effort, however, will also be substantial. Sound reforms will allow Congress to master the federal budget where gimmicky process reforms such as biennial budgeting are bound to fail.

Madam Speaker, what we are faced with in this country is an expanding cost of Social Security and Medicare. The two greatest challenges that the United States faces is the increased cost of the entitlement programs.

We have played around for the last 5 years desperately trying to reduce the expansion and increase of discretionary programs. But the entitlement programs account for almost two-thirds of Federal spending. One-third of Federal spending, the 13 appropriation bills that we agonize, that we argue, that we debate for almost 8 months of the year, only account for one-third of total Federal spending.

We have been successful in starting to slow down the increase in that expanding. So some years, in fact, it has been less than inflation. Generally, it is about inflation.

But the challenges that we are facing with Social Security and Medicaid are the hugest challenges we can say for future taxpayers. Because if we do not do something, Madam Speaker, if we do not force ourselves to deal with these kind of problems, because of the fact that life spans are increasing dramatically and because of the fact that the birth rate has substantially been reduced in the last 50 years, that means that fewer young people, fewer workers in this country are asked to pay a higher FICA tax to support the senior program.

The actuaries give an estimate that, if we are to continue the programs as they exist today, within 40 years, our payroll tax, our FICA tax, will be approximately 40 percent. Right now it is 15.3 percent. That is our FICA tax for senior programs.

Some people say, well, that would be unreasonable; that cannot happen. All we have to do is look at what is happening in countries around the world. Czechoslovakia, Japan, other countries in Europe are approaching already 40 percent payroll tax to support their senior program.

The country of France has an effective payroll charge, a payroll deduction, of 70 percent of what each worker in France earns to support their senior program. I mean, it is no wonder that France has such a tough time competing.

If we allow our entitlement programs to go on the way they are without some modification, without some change, without greater priority to use the surpluses for those programs, but we cannot do it with the surpluses alone, put all of the \$4 trillion surpluses that we expect over the next 10 years and it will be less than half

enough to pay for the unfunded liability of Social Security alone, let alone Medicare and Medicaid.

I just cannot urge my colleagues enough or the American people to look at the consequences of what is going to happen if we do not deal with these important programs. Number one, Social Security probably is the most successful program that we have in terms of making sure our senior population does not live out the remainder years of their lives in poverty. So I think we cannot afford to let it go by the wayside.

Neither can we afford to put off the decision. The longer we put off the decision on Social Security, the greater and more drastic the changes are going to have to be.

We should have done it 4 years ago. We should have done it 6 years ago. How do we develop the leadership in the United States to make the tough decisions that need to be made to change these programs? I mean, I appreciate the political vulnerability that any politician goes through if they suggest change in a popular program. We have approximately 12 percent of our seniors that depend almost entirely just on their Social Security check.

I urge my colleagues to read this article in Roll Call. I ask my colleagues and the President of the United States to be more aggressive coming forward with programs and proposals that can be scored to keep Social Security solvent for at least the next 75 years.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning hour debates, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Joseph S. Edmonds, First Baptist Church of Ballston, Arlington, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. We thank Thee for Thy presence and for Thy love.

Help us to lift up our eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh our help. Our help cometh from the Lord, which have made heaven and earth.

We thank Thee for enabling our forefathers to establish freedom of speech, freedom to worship Thee, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

We thank Thee for those who represent the American people in this House. I pray they will have the faith and courage of our fathers to make correct decisions. May they be a bridge to peace and justice in this troubled world, and may they bring joy and fulfillment to the American people. In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LANTOS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

THE REVEREND JOSEPH S. EDMONDS

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to introduce this morning's guest chaplain, the Reverend Joseph S. Edmonds. Actually, it is not morning. It is now afternoon. Reverend Edmonds serves as pastor of the First Baptist Church of Ballston in Arlington, which is just across the Potomac, in the 8th District of Virginia.

Madam Speaker, Reverend Edmonds was born in Gretna, Virginia, spent his childhood in the District of Columbia, not far from this very building. After attending public school in D.C., Reverend Edmonds obtained his undergraduate degree from Carson-Newman College in Tennessee and earned a Masters of Divinity at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in North Carolina.

Reverend Edmonds has been serving the Ballston community for over 10 years. He has been, and continues to be, a true shepherd to his congregation. Many have benefited from his spiritual guidance and generous spirit. Before moving to the Ballston area, Reverend Edmonds served communities in Maryland, D.C., and Florida.

On behalf of our district, I am pleased to welcome Reverend Edmonds here today.

RECOGNITION OF OCTORARA BOYS SOCCER CHAMPIONS

(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 honor some athletes from my district in Pennsylvania, the Octorara High School Boys Varsity Soccer Team. These outstanding young men are the 1999 Boys Double A Pennsylvania Soccer Champions.

Winning this State championship is no small feat. Octorara is not a large district, and they went up against some of Pennsylvania's traditional powerhouses. But what they lacked in size, they made up for in heart and determination.

Victory by victory, this team built a winning season and made it into a championship year. They were ably lead by their coaches, Chip Smallwood, Ken Baldt, and Paul Wood. The team is in Washington today with their principal, Hank Detering, receiving many well-deserved congratulations.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say that those of us from back home who watched this team fight its way to the top are very, very proud of them. So welcome to Washington, Octorara Braves. Let us do it again this year.

HAIDER'S INFLUENCE SEEN UNDIMINISHED

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

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, in a few days, we in this House will be voting on a resolution I introduced concerning the new government of Austria. Since the leader of this party, which is the Austrian government, the racist, xenophobic, neo-Nazi party has now resigned, it may be useful to ask why did he do so. He did not do so because he does not want to be part of the unpleasant political decisions that will have to be taken in Austria, tax increases, cutbacks on spending, layoffs of large numbers of government employees, but he is still the top man of this racist, xenophobic political party.

One of his principal allies, Deputy Speaker of Parliament Prinzhorn, yesterday said the following about his resignation: "It is not a resignation. He is a provincial governor and remains our strong man. It is a step backwards which is necessary in order to make two solid steps forward."

I am urging all of my colleagues who have not yet cosponsored this resolution to come on board. We cannot allow the new Europe to have governments in which neofascist parties play a key role. The European Union has expressed itself; it is time we do so.

TIME TO REPEAL THE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMIT

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, it has been said that the time to fix the roof is when the sun is shining. Our economy is shining brightly, and it is time to fix much of the unfairness in our Tax Code.

Right now our government unfairly punishes working seniors through the social security earnings limit. Americans have a strong work ethic. We have a strong desire to contribute to our surroundings. Yet, after the age of 65, our government punishes senior citizens who wish to stay in the work force.

Social security was designed to give some protection to senior citizens. It was not designed to be a program that would punish those who chose to keep working past the age of 65. Right now in this country more than 800,000 working senior citizens lose part or all of their social security benefits because of this earnings limit. This is ridiculous.

This week the Republicans in the House will bring up a bill that would repeal the social security earnings limit, and I hope the President will sign it. The time has come to give working seniors a break and repeal the social security earnings limit.

CRIMES OF THE FBI AT WACO, TEXAS, AND RUBY RIDGE, IDAHO

(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, reports say that the FBI lied to Congress about Waco. They withheld a memo that "warned FBI bosses to not use teargas because it would provoke a massive disaster."

Let us tell it like it is. The FBI and Janet Reno must answer for the 80 murders at Waco. The FBI and Janet Reno must answer for the murders of the Weaver family in Idaho.

And another thing, Congress must grow a backbone. Do Members realize when the FBI is accused of committing a crime, the FBI investigates the FBI and finds no crime? Beam me up. I yield back the crimes of the FBI at Waco, Texas, and Ruby Ridge, Idaho.

CONDEMNING RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL INTOLERANCE AT BOB JONES UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to denounce Bob Jones University, an institution of higher learning, for preaching hatred and practicing racism, religious intolerance, and segregation.

Today, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), I am introducing a resolution condemning the discriminatory practices prevalent at Bob Jones University. Bob Jones Uni-

versity espouses hate-filled, racist and anti-Catholic views upon its students.

While officials there say they are not anti-Catholic and they do not preach anything other than what is in the Bible, their own online magazine calls Catholicism "a satanic counterfeit," and says, "Papists are doing the work of the devil."

The University states that it is their First Amendment right to speak their beliefs. I support the First Amendment, but I do not support using a school to indoctrinate hate, segregation, and intolerance into today's youth.

We have seen, all too often in the past year, the results of hate: a school shooting targeted at a prayer group in Paducah, Kentucky; the shooting at a Jewish daycare center; the race-targeted killings in Illinois.

Hate propaganda may be free speech, but it must not be sanctioned by this body. We must loudly denounce it. As a Nation, we have fought too hard and come too far not to end discrimination and bigotry based on race and religion.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to begin my series of one-minutes that recognize the enormous problem that this Nation has with children who have been abducted internationally. There are over 10,000 American children who have been taken to foreign countries, like Saif Ahmed from my district.

My constituent, Melanie Al Mufti, was awarded sole custody of her son in 1998, but he was abducted by his father, Sayed Ahmed, to Cairo, Egypt, that same year. He was ordered to return the child to Texas, but instead, he ignored the order, and since then there is an FBI warrant out for his arrest.

Melanie contacted me that year, and I have been working closely with her ever since. She has worked with the Egyptian courts. I have worked with the Egyptian government, even spoken with President Mubarek. Yet Melanie has not had contact with her son since his abduction.

Melanie and parents like her need our help. I will be introducing bills that will focus on reuniting parents with their children. Madam Speaker, it is time for Congress, the media, and the American people to stand up for Melanie and Saif and the other American families who are being kept apart. We must bring our children home.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST INSTITUTE AN INVESTIGATION IN THE CASE OF AMADOU DIALLO

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, last week the Amadou Diallo family suffered a double tragedy, the loss of their son with 41 shots and 19 bullets to the body, and then a sense of injustice in our judicial system.

This is not a comment on that judicial process or the deliberations of the jury. It is simply a statement to America that we must stop tolerating man's inhumanity to man: an unarmed individual, an immigrant seeking only opportunity, not definitively told that police were asking him to stop, and in front of his own home.

I applaud the New Yorkers who have marched in peace, and I ask for Americans to join hands in peace, but at the same time, it is now appropriate for the Federal government to move in and to do a thorough and rightful investigation to determine whether or not Mr. Diallo's civil rights were violated.

Only when America understands that we are truly one America and that every life is precious, no matter how you came to this country, will we meet the promise for Americans for the 21st century.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Claire M. Maluso, senior counsel of Hon. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, Jr., Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 22, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I have received a subpoena for testimony before the grand jury issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

Sincerely,

CLARIE M. MALUSO.

COMMUNICATION FROM PRODUCTION OPERATIONS MANAGER, OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA, OFFICE OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Gary Denick, production operations manager, Office of Communications Media, Office of Chief Administrative Officer:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 17, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

GARY DENICK,
Production Operations Manager,
Office of Communications Media.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

DESIGNATING WILSON CREEK IN NORTH CAROLINA AS COMPO- NENT OF NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1749) to designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1749

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF WILSON CREEK IN NORTH CAROLINA AS A WILD, SCE- NIC, AND RECREATIONAL RIVER.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(161) WILSON CREEK, NORTH CAROLINA.—(A) The 23.3 mile segment of Wilson Creek in the State of North Carolina from its headwaters to its confluence with Johns River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classifications:

“(i) The 2.9 mile segment from its headwaters below Calloway Peak downstream to the confluence of Little Wilson Creek, as a scenic river.

“(ii) The 4.6 segment from Little Wilson Creek downstream to the confluence of Crusher Branch, as a wild river.

“(iii) The 15.8 segment from Crusher Branch downstream to the confluence of Johns River, as a recreational river.

“(B) The Forest Service or any other agency of the Federal Government may not undertake condemnation proceedings for the purpose of acquiring public right-of-way or access to Wilson Creek against the private property of T. Henry Wilson, Jr., or his heirs or assigns, located in Avery County, North Carolina (within the area 36°, 4 min., 21 sec. North 81°, 47 min., 37° West and 36°, 3 min., 13 sec. North and 81° 45 min. 55 sec. West), in the area of Wilson Creek designated as a wild river.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1749 was introduced by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), and would designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

When the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held a hearing on August 3, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the Forest Service testified in support of the bill. The bill was amended at subcommittee to make a technical correction.

Both the subcommittee and the full committee favorably reported this bill, as amended by voice vote.

□ 1415

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 1749.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, first I would like to certainly commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), my good friend, for his sponsorship of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1749 would designate 23.3 miles of Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Approximately 2.9 miles would be designated as scenic, 4.6 miles as wild, and 15.8 miles as recreational area.

The Forest Service deemed the creek, which is rich in aquatic and plant life, eligible and suitable for wild and scenic status since 1990. There is a great deal of local support in this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), the author of the bill.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 1749, to designate Wilson Creek in my congressional district as a Wild and Scenic River. And I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE), chairwoman of the subcommittee, for their support of this bill and their diligent efforts to get this bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I would like to invite any of my colleagues from Congress that get to our area, if they want to see something fabulously beautiful, look at the Wilson Creek. Wilson Creek is a free-flowing, crystal clear waterway which passes through some of the most beautiful scenery in the Nation. It provides pristine habitat for a multitude of fish species and plant life which live within the creek and along its banks.

From its headwaters below Calloway Peak on Grandfather Mountain in Avery County, to where it empties into Johns River in Caldwell County, Wilson Creek meets and exceeds all the requirements for such an important designation.

Specifically, my bill would designate 23.3 miles of Wilson Creek as a Wild and Scenic River. And in my opinion, having this creek designated as Wild and Scenic would help maintain its natural beauty while helping to improve the quality of recreational opportunities like hunting, fishing, camping, canoeing, and other activities for thousands of people who visit it each year.

Madam Speaker, the potential designation of Wilson Creek as a Wild and Scenic River has received tremendous support from the County Commissioners of both Avery and Caldwell Counties, as well as the local residents and outdoor enthusiasts. In fact, when I met with the County Commissioner in Caldwell and Avery Counties prior to the introduction of my bill, I was presented with letters of support from local residents, positive newspaper articles and editorials, and a letter from the U.S. Forest Service which indicated a willingness to help us in this effort.

Madam Speaker, I am convinced that the designation of Wilson Creek as a Wild and Scenic River is well supported within the communities which surround it. I know CBO is trying to find some cost for it. They have not been able to. There is no expense. And I believe this is an excellent bill that would do much to preserve Wilson Creek, making it both a natural asset and a natural treasure, and I urge its passage.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1749, designating Wilson Creek in northwest North Carolina as a wild and scenic river.

Madam Speaker, one of the hidden beauties—and there are few—of the ever changing North Carolina congressional district map is that in any given election, with the blessing of the electorate, the members our delegation are given the honor of serving different parts of different counties for short periods of time. During my first two terms of Congress, I had the opportunity to serve parts of Caldwell County that we are honoring today.

Although the majority of the legwork here in Washington was done by my colleague Mr. BALLENGER and his staff, the reason the designation is becoming a reality is the process by which it matured. You see, Mr. Speaker, this was not a decision forced upon the people of Avery and Caldwell County by a Federal bureaucracy with little or no local input. This project has been the result of local initiative, spearheaded by county commissioners and community leaders. These officials, at every step of the way, explained the process and benefits of wild and scenic designation to the local community and landowners, enlisting the advice and counsel of the local U.S. Forest Service. The professionalism of Forest Supervisor John Ramey, District Ranger Mike Anderson and Recreation Planner Kathy Ludlow quickly put to rest any misconceptions or fears

the local community may have harbored towards seeking this Federal designation.

Madam Speaker, this designation will do more than protect the 23 miles of river which rolls through the shadow of Grandfather Mountain. What also is being affirmed here is an example of how our Federal conservation policy should be administered—from local decisions by local leaders working in partnership with the Federal Government towards a universal goal of preserving the most pristine and natural resources of our country.

I thank Mr. BALLENGER for bringing this bill forward and I ask for its immediate approval.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1749, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN TRIBAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CONTRACT ENCOURAGEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 613) to encourage Indian economic development, to provide for the disclosure of Indian tribal sovereign immunity in contracts involving Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 613

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 "Indian Tribal Economic Development and Contract Encouragement Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS WITH INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 81) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2103. (a) In this section:

"(1) The term 'Indian lands' means lands the title to which is held by the United States in trust for an Indian tribe or lands the title to which is held by an Indian tribe subject to a restriction by the United States against alienation.

"(2) The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)).

"(3) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"(b) No agreement or contract with an Indian tribe that encumbers Indian lands for a period of 7 or more years shall be valid unless that agreement or contract bears the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or a designee of the Secretary.

"(c) Subsection (b) shall not apply to any agreement or contract that the Secretary (or a designee of the Secretary) determines is not covered under that subsection.

"(d) The Secretary (or a designee of the Secretary) shall refuse to approve an agree-

ment or contract that is covered under subsection (b) if the Secretary (or a designee of the Secretary) determines that the agreement or contract—

"(1) violates Federal law; or

"(2) does not include a provision that—

"(A) provides for remedies in the case of a breach of the agreement or contract;

"(B) references a tribal code, ordinance, or ruling of a court of competent jurisdiction that discloses the right of the Indian tribe to assert sovereign immunity as a defense in an action brought against the Indian tribe; or

"(C) includes an express waiver of the right of the Indian tribe to assert sovereign immunity as a defense in an action brought against the Indian tribe (including a waiver that limits the nature of relief that may be provided or the jurisdiction of a court with respect to such an action).

"(e) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Indian Tribal Economic Development and Contract Encouragement Act of 1999, the Secretary shall issue regulations for identifying types of agreements or contracts that are not covered under subsection (b).

"(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

"(1) require the Secretary to approve a contract for legal services by an attorney;

"(2) amend or repeal the authority of the National Indian Gaming Commission under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.); or

"(3) alter or amend any ordinance, resolution, or charter of an Indian tribe that requires approval by the Secretary of any action by that Indian tribe."

SEC. 3. CHOICE OF COUNSEL.

Section 16(e) of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly referred to as the "Indian Reorganization Act") (48 Stat. 987, chapter 576; 25 U.S.C. 476(e)) is amended by striking ", the choice of counsel and fixing of fees to be subject to the approval of the Secretary".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Madam Speaker, Senate 613, authored by Senator CAMPBELL of Colorado, would amend existing law to provide that the Secretary of Interior approve only those Indian land contracts which encumber Indian lands for a period of 7 or more years. Senate 613 would update Federal laws enacted in 1872 by removing antiquated and unnecessary Indian land contract approval requirements which apply to "all" contracts, irrespective of their brevity or insignificance.

We must maintain some Federal control over contracts which encumber Indian lands for 7 or more years because of the trust responsibility incurred by the Federal Government when the land was initially taken into trust.

Madam Speaker, this bill was passed unanimously in the Senate and is long overdue. I urge my fellow Members to support it and thus forward it to the President for his signature.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, Senate bill 613 would amend provisions of law requiring certain contracts made with Indian tribes to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The current law, commonly referred to as Section 81, was enacted in 1872 in response to concerns that Indian tribes were being taken advantage of by non-Indian attorneys in bringing claims against the United States for treaty violations.

Numerous contracts were signed between attorneys and Indian tribes which provided for exorbitant attorneys' fees. For decades, the Bureau of Indian Affairs interpreted Section 81 as applying solely to such tribe-attorney contracts.

During the 1980's, several Federal Court cases ruled the Secretary of the Interior was required to approve any contract that was found to be, and I quote, "relative to Indian lands." End of quote. Because of the ambiguity of this phrase, more and more contracts were submitted for Secretarial approval. Today, the Secretary of the Interior is asked to approve contracts for everything from construction of a new building to the purchase of tribal office supplies. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is overwhelmed by these unnecessary requests and the process severely hinders economic development on Indian lands.

Madam Speaker, Senate bill 613 would eliminate the current requirement that tribes seek approval for contracts between Indian tribes and attorneys, unless the tribe's constitution requires such approval. The bill instead provides that only contracts that encumber Indian lands for 7 or more years be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Additionally, this bill explicitly leaves in place the National Indian Gaming Commission's authority to review and approve Indian gaming agreements.

Madam Speaker, I am concerned about one provision of the bill which affects the sovereign immunity of Indian tribes. This bill requires that contracts which continue to be approved include remedies for breach of contract, disclosure of tribe sovereign immunity, or express waiver of the right to assert immunity as a defense.

Recent Supreme Court cases have strongly affirmed that notions of sovereignty that existed when the Constitution was formed have lost none of their relevance in the subsequent two centuries. A most basic component of sovereignty is the right to decide for itself when and under what circumstances a sovereign will be sued. These provisions would force Indian tribes to address, disclose, or waive their sovereign immunity in basic contracts, where a State or the Federal

Government would not be required to do so.

Madam Speaker, I also note that this bill defines the term "Indian tribes" using the definition from the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act. That definition of the tribe includes, and I quote, "any Alaska native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Act." End of quote.

Senate bill 613 has no application on Alaska, and the Alaska Corporation does not possess "Indian lands" as such lands are defined in this bill. It is unfortunate that the Senate has not been more careful in the drafting of Senate bill 613. There is no reason to confuse the matters by references to tribes and the corporations in Alaska, especially since the bill has no impact or application to the State of Alaska and the treatment of the Native Alaskans.

However, Madam Speaker, since this bill does have the support of the administration and the National Congress of the American Indians, I urge support of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 613.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 396

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H. Res. 396.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

LOWER SIOUX INDIAN COMMUNITY LAND TRANSFER

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2484) to provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2484

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

SECTION 1. APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED TO VALIDATE LAND TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, without further approval, ratification, or authorization by the United States, the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota, may lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any part of the Community's interest in any real property that is not held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Community.

(b) TRUST LAND NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section is intended or shall be construed to—

(1) authorize the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota to lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any part of an interest in any real property that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Community; or

(2) affect the operation of any law governing leasing, selling, conveying, warranting, or otherwise transferring any interest in such trust land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2484, legislation which will give the Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota the right, without further approval from the Federal Government, to lease or sell land which the tribe has bought but which has not been taken into trust.

Existing Federal law enacted in 1834 provides that an Indian tribe may not lease, sell, or otherwise convey land which it has acquired unless conveyance is approved by Congress. This antiquated law applies even though the land was purchased by the tribe with its own money, and even though the land is located outside the tribe's reservation, and even though the land has never been taken into trust for the tribe.

The Lower Sioux Community has found this law to be a major detriment to economic development. The law puts the tribe at a distinct disadvantage, because it finds that it cannot develop or use land which it has acquired to its full advantage.

H.R. 2484 will allow the Lower Sioux Indian Community to use the fee land it has purchased just like any other landowner, without having to come to Congress any time it wants to sell, lease, or even mortgage that land.

Madam Speaker, this is important to this small Minnesota tribe and I recommend its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), my good friend, for sponsoring of this legislation. This legislation would permit the Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota to lease or sell certain lands the tribe currently holds in fee status without further approval by the United States Government.

This provision would apply only to lands held in fee by the tribe and not lands held in trust by the United States for the tribe's benefit.

Current law and regulations established to protect Indian lands from alienation have been, in some instances, interpreted in a very restrictive manner. The Lower Sioux Indian Community has had trouble leasing and selling land which is not held in trust but in fee status without receiving prior approval of the Secretary of the Interior. This legislation would allow the tribe to make decisions and use land it has purchased and holds in fee status in the same manner as any other landowner, without having to commit to additional congressional or Secretarial approval.

Madam Speaker, although no formal administration views have been received by us on this legislation, I have been told informally by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that they do support the legislation, provided it does deal solely with lands held in fee status.

Not all tribes have encountered problems like this, Madam Speaker, when selling or leasing fee land. However, we need to address the problems faced by the Lower Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota, and I do urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1430

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MINGE) in response to this bill.

(Mr. MINGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINGE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Speaker and I would like to thank the Chair and the ranking member of the subcommittee for moving this legislation through the committee.

I would also like to report that I am familiar with the Indian tribe that is involved here, the Lower Sioux community. It is in my congressional district. It is a relatively small Indian community, Native American community; but I would like to emphasize it is very well administered. It has acquired this land and feels that, in order to remove a cloud from title, this act of Congress is necessary.

I would like to suggest to the subcommittee that it consider legislation that deals with this type of situation

because I expect that the Lower Sioux community is not the only Native American group in the United States that faces this type of obstacle to the disposition of land that it has purchased which has not been in trust status which is off of its reservation area.

As we see here in the 21st century, we have a number of Native American communities that are becoming more prosperous. They are engaging in commerce. I think that it would certainly facilitate the activities of these communities if, in these fairly well-defined situations where there is not a concern about any abuse in connection with the assets of the community, that they had the flexibility to, on their own, make these transfers and not have the cloud on title that exists in situations such as this one.

I have worked with the community in crafting this legislation, with the administration, and also with the committee and subcommittee staff. I would like to express my appreciation to the staff, members of both the committee and the subcommittee.

At the request of the Lower Sioux Indian Community I have sponsored legislation that would exempt land owned in fee by the Community from the effect of the Indian Nonintercourse Act, 25 U.S.C. 177 (1994) (INA). In recent years, the Community has acquired several parcels of property outside the boundaries of its Reservation. It is likely that not all of those parcels will not be needed for the development which the Community contemplates. Therefore, the Community should have the ability to dispose of any unneeded portions of fee land as and when appropriate purchasers may appear. At present it is unclear whether the INA prohibits such transactions absent an Act of Congress. It was this problem which prompted the Community to seek legislation that will permit similar conveyances without resorting to the cumbersome and time-consuming legislative process each time an individual sale is agreed to.

The terms of the INA does not distinguish between fee land and trust land. My bill states that "No conveyance of lands from any tribe of Indians shall be of any validity unless the same be made by treaty or convention entered into pursuant to the Constitution." In the past, this has been interpreted to mean that Congress must either give direct approval or must establish the process for giving such approval. Although Congress has allowed the Secretary of the Interior to approve the conveyance of lands owned in trust for tribes by the United States, Congress has never set up any process for approving the conveyance of fee lands.

The "clouding" effect of the INA is illustrated in a discussion contained in a brief filed with the United States Supreme Court by the United States Department of Justice, in *Cass County, Minnesota v. Leech Lake Band of Chippewa Indians*. The brief observed that "[i]n recent times, Congress and the Executive Branch have assumed that the INA requires congressional approval of sales of all tribally owned lands, whether or not those lands are within a reservation". [Brief of the United States as Amicus Curiae, supporting Respondent, Case No. 97-174 (January, 1998), at 28 (footnote 13).] Congress repeatedly has

passed legislation allowing individual fee parcels of tribal land to be sold. Congress has on several occasions in recent years adopted legislation similar to that which the Community seeks.

For example, P.L. 86-505, § 1, 74 Stat. 199, authorizing the Navajo Tribe to dispose of its fee lands without federal approval; P.L. 101-630, 104 Stat. 4531, authorizing the sale of a parcel of land owned in fee simple by the Rumsey Indian Rancheria; P.L. 101-379, § 11, 104 Stat. 473, authorizing the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians to convey a particular parcel of its fee land; P.L. 102-497, § 4, 106 Stat. 3255, authorizing the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians to convey certain lands which it owned in fee.

The Supreme Court has never ruled that the wording of the INA does not apply to fee lands. In fact, in a case decided just last year, the Court made a point of saying that the question is open: "This Court has never determined whether the Indian Nonintercourse Act . . . applies to land that has been rendered alienable. . . . *Cass County v. Leech Lake Bank*," U.S., 118 S.Ct. 1904 (1998). The assumption has been, and still is, that the Act prevents the sale of fee land without congressional approval. This is the legal position of the United States, citing the amicus brief of the United States in the *Cass County* case. And the Department of the Interior has taken the position that it cannot not give the Lower Sioux Community permission to sell fee land because Congress has not given the Department that authority.

Most importantly, purchasers assume that the consent of Congress is required before tribal fee land can be sold. The effect of all this is that the Lower Sioux Community is stymied. The wording of the INA seems to say that congressional permission is needed to sell fee land; the Justice Department acknowledges that; the Department of the Interior acknowledges that; Congress has acknowledged that; and purchasers acknowledge that. This bill will solve that problem for the Lower Sioux Indian Community. This is a matter of fairness.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2484.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1749, S. 613, and H.R. 2484, the three bills just debated.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

HERITAGE AND HORIZONS: THE AFRICAN AMERICAN LEGACY AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it is always a great opportunity for me to have opportunity to address the Congress in a special order, particularly when the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) is the Speaker pro tempore.

Our theme today is Heritage and Horizons: The African American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st Century. As we come to the close of the celebrated African American history month, it is a great opportunity for the Congressional Black Caucus to organize a special order to celebrate black history. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman CLYBURN) for designating me to organize this special order.

I took up the mantle after my predecessor, the Congressman from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, Congressman Louis Stokes, who had this responsibility for his 30 years in Congress.

The theme for this year's Black History Special Order is Heritage and Horizons: The African American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st Century.

As we embark upon a new millennium, I believe it painful and powerful that this theme allows us to pay tribute to our past and allows us to make plans for our future. The question is how do we plan for our future. One way is to plan for our future by giving tribute to our past, learning the lessons of our past and paying tribute to our successes as a people.

I believe the past can serve as a blueprint for future generations on how to get things done.

There are many events that have shaped and defined the African American experience in America today that never should be forgotten. What should never be forgotten is the sacrifice that others have made to ensure future generations' success.

For that reason, I have chosen to highlight my predecessor, the former Representative, Congressman Louis Stokes. He retired from Congress on January 2, 1999. He currently serves as senior counsel at Squire, Sanders and Dempsey, a worldwide law firm based in Washington, D.C. He is also a member of the faculty at Case-Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, where he is a senior visiting scholar at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences.

On November 6, 1968, Louis Stokes was elected to the United States Congress on his first bid for public office.

By virtue of his election, he became the first African American Member of Congress from the State of Ohio. First sworn in at the 91st Congress, Congressman Stokes served 15 consecutive terms in the United States House of Representatives. When he retired at the end of the 105th Congress, he became the first African American in the history of the United States Congress to retire having completed 30 years in office.

In the 105th Congress, Representative Stokes was a member of the Committee on Appropriations where, by virtue of his seniority, he was the third-ranking minority member of the full committee and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies. In addition, he served as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

He was the ninth Ranking Democratic Member of Congress. By virtue of his seniority, Congressman Stokes also served as the Dean of the Ohio Congressional Delegation. He is also a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus and chaired the CBC Health Braintrust.

He was born February 23, 1925 in Cleveland, Ohio to the late Charles and Louise Stokes. His father died when he was a young boy and Louis and his brother, the late Ambassador Carl B. Stokes, were reared by their young widowed mother.

Stokes was educated in the Cleveland public schools, graduating from Central High School. Following 3 years in the United States Army, from 1943 to 1946, he returned to Cleveland and utilized the G.I. bill to attend Western Reserve University. He received his Doctor of Laws degree from Cleveland Marshall Law School in 1953.

Prior to his election to the United States Congress, Congressman Stokes practiced law for 14 years in Cleveland. He was chief trial counsel for the firm of Stokes, Character, Terry, Perry, Whitehead, Young and Davidson. As a practicing lawyer, Representative Stokes participated in three cases in the United States Supreme Court, including the landmark "stop and frisk" case of *Terry versus Ohio*.

Congressman Stokes' younger brother, the late Carl B. Stokes, made history in 1967 when he was elected mayor of Cleveland, serving with distinction as the first black mayor of a major American city. Carl Stokes also enjoyed a career as an award-winning broadcaster and municipal court judge. In 1994, he was appointed by President Bill Clinton as U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles. Ambassador Stokes died in April 1996.

Louise Stokes, a proud mother who always encouraged her sons to get an education, lived to witness many of her sons' historic achievements. Prior to her death in 1978, she was the recipient of numerous awards, including Cleveland's "Woman of the Year" award in 1968 and Ohio's "Mother of the Year" award in 1969.

Let us talk a little bit about Congressman Louis Stokes' congressional career. In his first term in public office, he served as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor in the House, Committee on un-American Activities, later renamed the House Committee on Internal Security.

In his second term, he was appointed the first African American to sit on the Committee on Appropriations in the House. On February 8, 1972, Louis Stokes was elected as the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. He served two consecutive terms.

In addition to his seat on the powerful Committee on Appropriations, on February 5, 1975, he was elected by the Democratic Caucus to serve on the newly formed House Committee on Budget. He was re-elected to the Committee on Budget twice, serving a total of 6 years.

On September 21, 1976, Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker Carl Albert to serve on the House Select Committee on Assassinations. The committee had a mandate to conduct an investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. On March 8, 1977, Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill appointed Congressman Stokes as chairman of this committee. On December 31, 1978, Congressman Stokes completed these historic investigations and filed with the House of Representatives 27 volumes of hearings, a final report, and recommendations for administrative and legislative reform.

In February of 1980, in the 96th Congress, Congressman Stokes was appointed by Speaker O'Neill to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, also known as the Ethics Committee. In the 97th, 98th, and 102nd Congresses, he was elected chairman of this committee. Also, in the 101st Congress, Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker Wright to serve on the Ethics Task Force.

In February of 1983, the 98th Congress, Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker O'Neill to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. In the 99th Congress, Representative Stokes was elected chairman of the Subcommittee on Program and Budget Authorization for the committee. In January of 1987, the 100th Congress, House Speaker Jim Wright appointed Congressman Stokes as chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. In the 100th Congress, Representative Stokes was also appointed to serve on the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran, and the Pepper Commission on Comprehensive Health Care.

As a result of the 1990 census and the redistricting mandate in 1992, the 21st Congressional District of Ohio was redesignated as the 11th Congressional District. In the 103rd Congress, which commenced in January of 1993, Congressman Stokes was elected to chair

the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies. He also served as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, and the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Congressman Stokes is married to Jeanette (Jay) Stokes. He has children: Shelley, Angela, Louis, and Lorene. Angela is an elected official in Cleveland in the Cleveland municipal court. Shelley and Louis C. are both involved in broadcasting, one in New York and the other in Michigan.

He has several grandchildren. He is a graduate of the Cleveland public schools, Case-Western Reserve University, and Cleveland Marshall College of Law where he received his doctor of law.

He has been given numerous designations and honors, among them, the 100 Most Influential Black Americans/Black Achievement Award. The Louis Stokes Bridge was named in his honor, which is a bridge over Lake Shore Boulevard over Euclid Creek; Louis Stokes Telecommunications Center/Cuyahoga Community College; the Central High School Hall of Fame; the Louis Stokes Community Center; the Louis Stokes Wing of the Cleveland Public Library. A street is called Stokes Boulevard in the city of Cleveland named after him and his brother. There is a Louis Stokes Health Sciences Center at Case-Western Reserve University. There is a Louis Stokes HUD Hall of Fame. He has been given the award by the National Minority Transplant Hall of Fame. There is a Louis Stokes Head Start Day Care Center. There is a Stokes Rapid Transit Station in Windermere. There is a Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library at Howard University. There is a Stokes Web site.

There is a Stokes Family Library and Museum, which is housed at the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority in the area where Congressman Stokes grew up as a boy. There is a Louis Stokes Cleveland Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center. There is a Louis Stokes building at the National Institutes of Health.

He has received more than 23 honorary degrees from colleges and universities across this country.

I would like to particularly personally pay tribute to Congressman Louis Stokes. It is through his support and encouragement that I stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives today. I can only recall with great admiration all of the wonderful things that he did on my behalf and on behalf of the 11th Congressional District. For me to be able to stand, the daughter of a skycap for United Airlines and the daughter of a woman who worked in a factory, standing here as a Member of the House of Representatives, one of 39 African Americans who serve in the House of Representatives, and in fact the first African American woman to serve in the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to recognize and give Congressman Stokes his roses while he can still smell them on this February 29, the year 2000, as the CBC honors Black History Month.

FORMER CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES

Former Congressman Louis Stokes retired from Congress on January 2, 1999. He is currently Senior Counsel at Squire, Sanders and Dempsey L.L.P., a world-wide law firm based in Washington, D.C. He is also a member of the faculty at Case-Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, where he is Senior Visiting Scholar at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences.

On November 6, 1968, Louis Stokes was elected to the United States Congress on his first bid for public office. By virtue of his election, he became the first African American Member of Congress from the State of Ohio. First sworn in at the 91st Congress, Representative Stokes served fifteen consecutive terms in the United States House of Representatives. When he retired at the end of the 105th Congress, he became the first African American in the history of the U.S. Congress to retire having completed 30 years in office.

In the 105th Congress, Representative Stokes was a member of the Appropriations Committee where, by virtue of his seniority, he was the third ranking minority member of the full committee, and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs-Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies. In addition, he served as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Services-Education. In the Congress, Representative Stokes ranked eleventh overall in House seniority. He was the ninth ranking Democratic Member of Congress. By virtue of his seniority, Congressman Stokes also served as Dean of the Ohio Congressional Delegation. He is also a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) and chaired the CBC Health Braintrust.

BACKGROUND

Congressman Stokes was born on February 23, 1925, in Cleveland, Ohio, to the late Charles and Louise Stokes. His father died when he was a young boy and Louis and his brother, the late Ambassador Carl B. Stokes, were reared by their young widowed mother. Stokes was educated in the Cleveland Public Schools, graduating from Central High School. Following three years in the United States Army from 1943 to 1946, he returned to Cleveland and utilized the G.I. Bill to attend Western Reserve University. He received his Doctor of Laws Degree from Cleveland Marshall Law School in 1953.

Prior to his election to the United States Congress, Congressman Stokes practiced law for fourteen years in Cleveland. He was chief trial counsel for the firm of Stokes, Character, Terry, Perry, Whitehead, Young and Davidson. As a practicing lawyer, Representative Stokes participated in three cases in the United States Supreme Court, including the landmark "stop and frisk" case of Terry v. Ohio.

Congressman Stokes' younger brother, the late Carl B. Stokes, made history in 1967 when he was elected Mayor of Cleveland, serving with distinction as the first black mayor of a major American city. Carl Stokes also enjoyed a career as an award-winning broadcaster and municipal court judge. In 1994, he was appointed by President Bill Clinton as U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles. Ambassador Stokes died in April 1996. Louise Stokes, a proud mother who always encouraged her sons to get an education, lived to witness many of her sons'

historic achievements. Prior to her death in 1978, she was the recipient of numerous awards including Cleveland's "Woman of the Year" award in 1968 and Ohio's "Mother of the Year" award in 1969.

CONGRESSIONAL CAREER

During his first term in public office (91st Congress), Congressman Stokes served as a member of the Education and Labor Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee, later re-named the House Internal Security Committee. In his second term in office (92nd Congress), he was appointed the first black Member ever to sit on the Appropriations Committee of the House. On February 8, 1972, Louis Stokes was elected as Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. He served two consecutive terms in this office. In addition to his seat on the powerful Appropriations Committee, on February 5, 1975, he was elected by the Democratic Caucus to serve on the newly formed Budget Committee of the House. He was re-elected to the Budget Committee twice, serving a total of six years.

On September 21, 1976 (94th Congress) Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker Carl Albert to serve on the House Select Committee on Assassinations. The Committee had a mandate to conduct an investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. On March 8, 1977, Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill appointed Congressman Stokes as Chairman of this committee. On December 31, 1978, Congressman Stokes completed these historic investigations and filed with the House of Representatives 27 volumes of hearings, a Final Report and Recommendations for Administrative and Legislative Reform.

In February of 1980 (96th Congress), Congress Stokes was appointed by Speaker O'Neill to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (Ethics Committee). In the 97th, 98th, and 102nd Congresses, he was elected Chairman of this committee. Also, in the 101st Congress, Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker Wright to serve on the Ethics Task Force.

In February of 1983 (98th Congress), Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker O'Neill to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. In the 99th Congress, Representative Stokes was elected Chairman of the Subcommittee on Program and Budget Authorization for the committee. In January of 1987 (100th Congress), House Speaker Jim Wright appointed Congressman Stokes as Chairman of the Intelligence Committee. In the 100th Congress, Representative Stokes was also appointed to serve on the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran, and the Pepper Commission on Comprehensive Health Care.

As a result of the 1990 census and the redistricting mandate, in 1992 the 21st Congressional District of Ohio was re-designated as the 11th Congressional District. In the 103rd Congress, which commenced in January of 1993, Congressman Stokes was elected to chair the House Appropriations Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies. He also served as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Services-Education and the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Birthdate: February 23, 1925.
 Wife: Jeanette (Jay) Stokes.
 Children: Shelley, Angela, Louis C. and Lorene.

Grandchildren: Brett S., Eric S., and Grant W. Hammond; Kelley C. and Kimberly L. Stokes; Alexandra F. and Nicolette S. Thompson.

Education: Cleveland Public Schools (Giddings and Central High School), Western

Reserve University, Cleveland Marshall Law School (The Cleveland State University)—Doctor of Jurisprudence.

DESIGNATIONS AND HONORS

Throughout his tenure in the United States Congress, Representatives Stokes has played a pivotal role in the quest for civil rights, equality and social and economic justice. He is the recipient of countless awards and honors which recognize his strong leadership and commitment.

100 Most Influential Black Americans/Black Achievement Award. Each year since 1971, Congressman Stokes has been named by Ebony Magazine as one of the "100 Most Influential Black Americans." In 1979, he was nominated by Ebony in three categories for the Second Annual American Black Achievement Awards. His nomination was based upon his becoming the first African American to head a major congressional investigation and to preside over nationally televised hearings which revealed new facts on the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and President John F. Kennedy.

William Dawson Award. Congressman Stokes has twice received the Congressional Black Caucus' William L. Dawson Award. In 1980, Congressman Stokes was presented the prestigious award in recognition of his "unique leadership in the development of legislation." In 1994, he received the second Dawson Award for "significant research, organizational and leadership contributions in the development of legislation that addresses the needs of minorities in the United States.

Louis Stokes Bridge. On June 24 1988, the Board of County Commissioners Cuyahoga County dedicated the Lake Shore Boulevard Bridge over Euclid Creek as the "Louis Stokes Bridge," in recognition of Congressman Stokes' leadership in public service, and his support for federal funding to support road and bridge improvement projects.

Louis Stokes Telecommunications Center/Cuyahoga Community College. On September 24, 1988, Cuyahoga Community College designated the Louis Stokes Telecommunications Center in the Unified Technologies Center in honor of Congressman Stokes.

Central High School Hall of Fame. On March 30, 1990, Congressman Stokes' alma mater, Central High School (now Central Middle School) recognized his historic achievements by presenting him with the school's Alumnus Award and including him into the school's Hall of Fame. On that occasion, the school also dedicated its auditorium as the "Louis Stokes Auditorium."

Louis Stokes Community Center. On September 5, 1992, in recognition of the achievements of Ohio's first and only African American to serve in the United States Congress, the community center in Outhwaite Homes was renamed as the "Louis Stokes Community Center" by the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority.

Louis Stokes Wing/Cleveland Public Library. On January 19, 1994, the Cleveland Public Library Board of Trustees unanimously adopted a resolution to name the new Cleveland Public Library East Wing in honor of Congressman Stokes. The resolution stated that his career "has extended into areas of law, civil rights, support for education and public libraries, and congressional, national and local leadership on a wide range of issues important to the Cleveland area and the nation."

Stokes Boulevard—Cleveland, Ohio. To mark Congressman Stokes' historic achievements in the United States Congress, the City of Cleveland voted on June 6, 1994 to designate East 107th Street and portion of

Fairhill Road as "Stokes Boulevard." Appropriate signs mark this special salute to Congressman Stokes.

Case Western Reserve University/Louis Stokes Health Sciences Center. Case Western Reserve University honored Congressman Stokes on June 24, 1994 with the dedication of the "Louis Stokes Health Science Center." Congressman Stokes was lauded for his work "to improve the lives of all Americans and to ensure the full participation of members of minority groups in the many initiatives in health, science, education, and public welfare."

Louis Stokes HUD "Hall of Fame." On April 5, 1995, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development inducted Congressman Stokes into the nation's first "Public Housing Hall of Fame." Located in HUD's Washington, D.C. Headquarters, the Hall of Fame recognizes Congressman Stokes as a strong advocate of safe and affordable housing for America's families.

National Minority Transplant Hall of Fame. On September 18, 1996, Congressman Stokes was chosen for inclusion in the first National Minority Transplant Hall of Fame. The designation recognizes Stokes' strong leadership in the area of organ transplant education and awareness.

Louis Stokes Head Start Day Care Center. Dedicated during the weekend of June 20, 1997, the "Louis Stokes Head Start Center" was built specifically to serve the needs of pre-school children in the Metropolitan Cleveland Area. The Center was named for Congressman Stokes for his dedication in fighting for the rights of Cleveland's disadvantaged.

Stokes Rapid Transit Station/Windermere. On November 17, 1997, Cleveland's Regional Transit Authority designated the Windermere Rapid Transit Station as the "Louis Stokes Station at Windermere" in honor of Congressman Stokes for his support for public transit.

Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library/Howard University. Howard University voted to recognize Congressman Stokes for his strong leadership in the United States Congress. On August 11, 1998, Howard University paid tribute to "one of our nation's most prolific Members of Congress" by naming their new health sciences library "The Louis Stokes Health Science Center."

Stokes Web Site. On August 11, 1998, top executives from Cleveland's business community announced that a web site will be set up in Congressman Stokes' name to inform young people of internships, scholarships and job training opportunities. The site will be called the "Living Legacy Project: Aim High." Stokes was known for autographing photos for young students with the phrase "Aim High!"

The Stokes Family Library and Museum. Unveiled during Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority's Louis Stokes Day 1998, on September 12, 1998, Congressman Stokes' boyhood home in the Outhwaite housing projects will be transformed into the "Stokes Family Library and Museum." The Library will serve as a home for many of the Congressman's awards and memorabilia for organizations around the country.

Louis Stokes Cleveland Department of Veteran Affairs Medical Center. On October 6, 1998, on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, Congressman Stokes was honored with the naming of the Cleveland Department of Veteran Affairs Medical Center in his honor. The designation recognizes a lawmaker who worked tirelessly on behalf of the nation's veterans and other citizens throughout his 30-year career.

Louis Stokes Building, National Institutes of Health. On October 20, 1998, the House of Representatives voted for passage of an Om-

nibus Appropriations Bill to fund the Departments of Labor-Health and Human Services-Education. The bill includes language designating Building #50, the Consolidated Laboratories Building on the campus of the National Institutes of Health, in honor of Congressman Stokes. The renaming honors Congressman Stokes for his staunch leadership on the health front.

Honorary Degrees. Congressman Stokes is the recipient of 23 honorary Degrees from colleges and universities across the nation. The degrees were conferred upon Congressman Stokes in recognition of his national leadership and strong commitment to public service.

Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for yielding to me. Even more so, I thank her for the leadership she is showing in making sure that the month of February does not go by without yet another black history celebration in the name of her predecessor, I must say who was always in charge of this particular feature on the House floor when he was here.

□ 1445

And you follow in his footsteps in many ways, I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio, and this is a wonderful one which both honors him and to make sure that the Congressional Black Caucus is once again heard on this floor for Black History Month and all that it stands for.

If I may say to the gentlewoman, I would like to discuss two subjects this afternoon related to black history. One is some finished business that this House finished only this month, and the other is tragically unfinished.

The finished business has to do with a bill that was passed on the floor on February 16 that will allow the home of Carter G. Woodson to become a national historic site under the National Park Service. The reason that this was so important is that Carter G. Woodson is the father of black history, the man who discovered black historiography, the second black person to receive a Ph.D. from Harvard in the early part of this century, and yet his house, which is a gorgeous Victorian house, stands closed, virtually boarded up.

So here we are celebrating Black History Month every year and right there in the Shaw district, a historic part of the district which was the virtual seat of black America, is the home of the man who is responsible for what was, when I was a child called Negro History Week and has developed into Black History Month, closed. With the bill that the House passed just before we recessed, Carter G. Woodson's home will be open to the public the way Frederick Douglass' home is open to the public in this city and the way that Mary McLeod Bethune's home is open to the public, and will be kept open under the National Park Service, as it deserves.

This man was of immense importance. Without uncovering black his-

tory we could never have gotten to the civil rights remedies, because the portrayals of African Americans were so pervasively stereotyped and negative after slavery, with Jim Crow and all that it stood for, that Carter G. Woodson's work looms much larger than life. He started the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, which continues his work today. They would like to occupy this house when it is fully renovated. He used his house not only to live but to train researchers. It is a glorious history in and of itself.

May I say to the gentlewoman, I would like to remark on some unfinished business having to do with African Americans. This is a majority black city. Historically it was the capital of black intellectual life because of Howard University and because freed and runaway slaves often found their way here. The Capitol where we now debate was built with the help of slave labor. A glorious kind of intellectual leadership emanated from this city. It always had a large black population, probably because it was so close to the South and, therefore, there was a large segment of freed slaves and a large segment of runaway slaves, one of whom was my great grandfather.

This city has been the home of Benjamin Banneker, who of course helped design the city, and of many great African Americans; Charles Drew, who is responsible for the discovery of the blood bank and the use of stored blood; Duke Ellington, whose 100th birthday we celebrated last year; Frederick Douglass; Mary McLeod Bethune; Senator Edward Brooke, who graduated from the same high school I graduated from, Dunbar High School; and yet, Madam Speaker, this is the only part of the United States where black and white people do not enjoy the full privileges of citizenship.

This used to be the place where people from the South came escaping the harshness of segregation and terrible discrimination. We who live in the District, particularly we who are native Washingtonians, have seen the whole of the South come into its own, with people able to vote, as models for self-government throughout the South, and yet in this town, where the majority of the population is African American, there is still not the same basic rights that blacks throughout the South have finally been able to win.

I am the only representative of the District of Columbia. Although I won the right to vote on the House floor, that vote was taken from me when the majority assumed power. We do not have a full voting representative in this House. We have no voting representative in this House. Does this not sound like the Old South? This is the new capital. This is the capital of the United States I am talking about.

There is rage in this town, particularly because more than 60 percent of the people are African Americans and have seen their folks down home come

into full citizenship, while in this town we still exist without the basic rights that everybody else takes for granted. We saw the Congressional Black Caucus expanded by 50 percent, largely from people from the old Confederate States, sent here by whites and African Americans; and yet we cannot send a full voting Member to this House, even though we pay full Federal income tax.

What we have done is to sue in court. And I say to my colleagues, every time an attempt is made to attach a rider to the appropriation of the District of Columbia, consisting of our money not these other Members, democracy is defamed in the United States. And that is why my colleagues will see me on this floor and will always see me on this floor as long as I am a Member of this House reminding my fellow colleagues of that defamation of democracy. The court suit we have brought intends to rectify this situation, since we have not been able to get it rectified in this body.

Some have said that the reason the District has never had its full rights is because of its large African American population. I am not so sure of that. Until the 1970s, this city was majority white. The city, the Jim Crow-segregated city in which I grew up, the segregated schools that I went to, was in a majority white city, and this body was willing to deny those whites their full rights in the House, the Senate, and their full home rule as much as they are willing to deny it to blacks.

And yet there may well be something to the notion that the city always had a large black population. If we look at the history books, that seems to have influenced the way the Congress looked at the District of Columbia. Well, the Congress needs to take that taint off of it. It needs to grant my white constituents and my black constituents the same rights that their white constituents, their Hispanic constituents, and their black constituents have.

Until that happens, until that happens I will not, I will not let an appropriate opportunity go by to remind this body that we have not lived up to our stated ideals. One appropriate time to inject that reminder into the record is during Black History Month, in a largely black city where black citizens and white citizens and citizens of every background wait, no longer patiently, but wait for the same rights that many other Americans have.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, as part of our special hour I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Cummings).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. for her words.

There is absolutely no question that she is absolutely right, and we in the Congressional Black Caucus and many others in this great body stand with

her and behind her. And I want to commend her for constantly keeping an issue that is so significant and very important, and one that shows the contradictions of this country and what we are doing in this Congress, shows it up so clearly. I want to thank her for all that she does every day to keep us aware of the situation that we find ourselves in in the very place where we write the laws. So I thank her.

I want to go on to say, Madam Speaker, that this month, through a series of Dear Colleague Letters, I saluted several famous African American Marylanders, and today I rise again to recognize African Americans from my home district of Baltimore, Maryland, for their significant contributions to the American political and educational process, and for distinguishing themselves as the first African Americans to achieve in their chosen professions.

The recognition of these individuals comes as we nationally observe Black History Month. This year's theme, Heritage and Horizons, the African American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st Century, is most appropriate to these Baltimoreans who, by accepting the challenges and overcoming the obstacles of their day, have prepared us to meet the challenges facing us in this new millennium.

I cite Roberta B. Sheridan, the daughter of a life-long resident of Baltimore and educated as a teacher. She was dedicated to public education. Even though she was denied the opportunity to teach in the black public schools, because African Americans at that time were deemed unqualified, she persisted in her efforts. With the help of the African American community, a campaign was waged to allow African Americans to teach in black public schools. This campaign resulted in the appointment of Roberta Sheridan in 1888 as the first African American teacher in a Baltimore City public school. Indeed, in the State of Maryland.

Her goal was to ensure that African Americans received a quality education, and she sought to end the educational inadequacies fostered by white teachers who dominated the education of blacks following the Civil War.

I also cite Harry S. Cummings, no relation, from Baltimore's ward 11, one of the two first African American males to graduate from the University of Maryland School of Law in 1889. Mr. Cummings' career focused on the legal, educational, and political professions. He was known as the father of the Colored Polytechnic Institute because he introduced a measure for establishing this educational facility and other high schools for African Americans in this area.

Politically he was successful in becoming the first African American to be elected to the Baltimore City Council in 1890. In 1904, he had the distinction of seconding the nomination of Theodore Roosevelt at the Republican National Convention in Chicago. He re-

ceived acclaim for his speech. In 1907, he was again elected to a 4-year term to the Baltimore City Council, representing the 17th ward. He served two additional terms in 1911 and 1915. As a fellow University of Maryland graduate, I am pleased to honor him.

I also cite Thurgood Marshall, lawyer and product of a Baltimore black middle class and the impetus for the Civil Rights movement in the United States. Beginning his career, he served as counsel to the Baltimore branch of the NAACP. He argued cases before the United States Supreme Court 32 times, winning 29 cases. He is probably most famous for *Brown versus Board of Education*, which we won in 1954.

□ 1500

With this success, doors were opened ending segregated schools and educational inequalities for African Americans. Using the legal process, Thurgood Marshall's legacy was to ensure that African Americans would no longer be excluded from participating in the American fabric because of discrimination.

When asked for a definition of "equal," Marshall stated, "Equal means getting the same thing at the same time in the same place."

Thurgood Marshall's achievements culminated in his appointment as the Nation's first African American Supreme Court justice on August 30, 1967. Because of his achievements, I have urged adoption of my resolution urging the United States Postal Service to issue a commemorative stamp in his honor because he is immediately deserving of this recognition.

Finally, I cite Parren J. Mitchell, a native Baltimorean, who represents several firsts. He was the first African American to graduate from the University of Maryland Graduate School with a master's degree in sociology. Coming from a family involved in local politics and community affairs, he embarked upon an educational, human resources, and political career. He was Maryland's first black Representative to the United States House of Representatives from Baltimore's 7th Congressional District and one of my predecessors to this body.

Elected to the 92d Congress beginning in 1971, he remained in the House for seven succeeding Congresses until 1987. He enjoyed a successful Congressional career, serving as chairman of the Committee on Small Business for the 97th, 98th, and 99th Congresses. He was instrumental in the formation of the House Black Caucus, now known as the Congressional Black Caucus, to bring to the attention of Congress and the President of the United States legislative concerns primarily affecting African Americans.

I am honored to recognize these African Americans from my district of Baltimore who were the firsts, who dared to meet the challenges of their day, who paved the way and opened doors to ensure equal opportunities for African

Americans and their succeeding generations. Indeed, they represent a legacy that gives us hope and confirmation that African Americans continue to succeed and contribute to this wonderful American structure.

As we live today, as we look at our pasts, and as we look to our future, we can take pride in the rich heritage that these individuals have bequeathed to all of us as Americans.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure at this time to yield to the gentleman from Chicago (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to first of all thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. JONES) for organizing this special order and certainly for giving me the opportunity to share in it with her and the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the rich legacy and heritage that our ancestors have contributed to American life. I want to use the few minutes that I have to pay homage to the African American church.

There are many outstanding religious institutions in the district that I live and represent, notwithstanding even the one that I hold membership in, the New Galilee Missionary Baptist Church, under the leadership of the Reverend Charlie Murray, where they let me serve as a member of the deacon board sometimes when I am there.

But I really want to use the few minutes that I have to pay homage to two other churches, Quinn Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church, under the leadership of Reverend Thomas Higgonbotham, and the First Baptist Congregational Church, under the leadership of Dr. Arthur Griffin, both located in the 7th Congressional District of Illinois.

These two churches have followed the historical tradition of the black church as being the most stable, viable, and reliable entity in black life. Throughout slavery, segregation, black codes, and injustice, the church has served as the major instrument for hope and for change. It was the black church that produced some of our greatest leaders, educators, theologians, scientists, and administrators.

Quinn Chapel was formed in 1847 under the leadership of the Reverend George Johnson. The church was named in honor of the renowned Bishop William Paul Quinn. Bishop Quinn was one of the most prolific circuit-riding preachers in the 1800s who personally organized 97 AME churches, prayer bands, and temperance societies.

It is interesting to note that Quinn Chapel's first community project focused on the abolition of slavery; and, ironically, Quinn Chapel became a stop on the Underground Railroad. For over 150 years during race riots, depressions,

recessions, the great Chicago Fire of 1871, and a myriad of other natural disasters and human crises, African Americans came to Quinn Chapel for protection, information, support, and inspiration.

Quinn Chapel was the birthplace of Provident Hospital of Chicago, organized by Dr. Daniel Hale Williams in 1891. Dr. Williams was the first surgeon to successfully operate on a human heart, and Provident was the first United States hospital where African American nurses could be trained and employed.

In addition, it was Quinn Chapel who initiated in 1898 the first known retirement home for African Americans. Most recently, Quinn Chapel was one of the locations that hosted a regional Congressional Black Caucus hearing on law enforcement misconduct.

Similarly, the First Baptist Congregational Church, formally known as the Union Park Congregational Church, was founded in 1851 under the leadership of Philo Carpenter. Philo Carpenter and a group of 48 abolitionist members left the parent church, the Third Presbyterian, over the issue of slavery. The departing members felt that the General Assembly had not adopted a strong enough position against slavery. Ironically, the church also served as a stop along the Underground Railroad.

Carpenter was Chicago's first drug-gist, opening a drugstore in a small log home on the bank of the river at the point that is now Lake Street. In addition to meeting the congregants' need for spirituality, the church was instrumental in forming several institutions of higher learning.

Among the black colleges founded by this church include Dillard University in Louisiana, Fisk University in Tennessee, LeMoyne-Owen College in Tennessee, Talladega College in Alabama, Tougaloo College in Mississippi, and Huston-Tillotson College in Texas.

Obviously, these colleges represent some of the finest institutions of higher education. And so this church like Quinn Chapel has been instrumental in shaping the minds of some of our greatest thinkers and leaders.

I attended a meeting just last week of another church at the Rock of Ages Missionary Baptist Church in Maywood, Illinois, where Reverend Marvin Wiley had more than a thousand residents come out to talk about community development.

I also take this opportunity to highlight the work of Reverend Bill Winston at the Living Word Christian Center in Forest Park, Illinois.

Madam Speaker, these churches have all helped to set the standards by which other institutions have learned to live. Even today, they continue to inspire through the three cornerstones of life: faith, hope, and love. Because of the contributions of Quinn Chapel AME and First Baptist Congregational, Chicago is indeed a better place in which to live. But more importantly, the

United States of America and people throughout the world have benefited from the shining light that has emanated from these institutions.

And so I thank my colleague for the opportunity to share this moment with her and again commend her for putting this special order together.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and all my other colleagues for supporting me in this process.

I am expecting a couple more of my colleagues, so I am going to proceed with a few more things that I have in front of me until they get here.

It is appropriate today that I recognize or memorialize from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio a gentleman by the name of Gus Joiner. Mr. Joiner's funeral is today at the Second Tabernacle Baptist Church in Cleveland, Ohio. Unfortunately, I could not be there. But it would be appropriate at this time that I talk a little bit about Mr. Joiner right here on the floor of the Congress.

"Gus Joiner, a former union organizer," and this comes from the obituary section of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, "who became chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Federation of Retired Workers in Cleveland, died Friday at Hospice of the Western Reserve.

The 90-year-old Cleveland resident spent his life fighting unfair labor practices, racism and injustice. He also encouraged others to stand up for their rights.

Mr. Joiner, who worked for the Euclid Road Machinery Co. from the 1940s to the 1970s, once went to court to force the independent union at the company to allow non-Caucasians into its ranks. Later, he was instrumental in bringing his fellow workers under the umbrella of the United Auto Workers as Local 426.

After retiring in 1976, he joined the Federation of Retired Workers and spoke out on behalf of senior citizens throughout Greater Cleveland. He showed up at Cleveland City Council committee meetings to share his views on pending legislation and attended hearings to protest the rising cost of utilities.

His most recent crusade was to preserve Madonna Hall, an inner-city nursing home, as a charitable asset of the State of Ohio. Mr. Joiner, chairman of the nursing home's board until stepping down from the unpaid position in 1997, led the trustees' battle against attempts by the home's landlords to claim ownership and sell the nursing home.

"He was the crusader," said Mary Davis, the lawyer who represented him in a lawsuit filed in conjunction with the case. "He had a sense of what was right and what was fair. It's not that often you see somebody willing to risk themselves for what's right or put themselves on the line for what they believe in. He was a person of such extraordinary faith that everything is going to work out OK. When you look at the difficulty of his life, he turned to joy, thanksgiving and celebration rather than bitterness."

Mr. Joiner, an Alabama native, was a teenager when he started working at a coal company's coke yard in Virginia. He moved on to Chicago to work in the stockyards, but was laid off during the Depression. For a while, he hopped freight trains and rode the rails in search of work.

In the 1930s, he joined relatives in West Virginia, where he worked in the coal mines and organized labor unions under volatile circumstances. As a local officer and organizer with the United Mine Workers out of Fairmount, W. Va., he once chaired the speakers' platform with legendary UMW President John L. Lewis at a state convention. Mr. Joiner also worked undercover to help organize unions in the western Pennsylvania communities of Johnstown and Uniontown.

During World War II, he worked in the Navy yard in Norfolk, Va. By the mid-1940s, he was in Cleveland and working at Euclid Road Machinery.

Mr. Joiner considered voting not only a right, but a responsibility. He voted in every primary and general election for 66 years, including the general election of November 1999.

He had been church treasurer, Audit Committee chairman and trustees secretary at the Second Tabernacle Baptist Church in Cleveland, where he was a member for more than 50 years. In 1972, he was named the parish's Man of the Year. He also was a trustee of the United Black Fund.

When his children were younger, Mr. Joiner participated in PTA activities at John Hay High School, where he complained about the better resources given to the white West Side schools.

"He was an advocate for us if we had any trouble or problem at school," said his daughter, Margaret of Cleveland. "That same zeal he used to make sure the little person wasn't trampled, he used to defend his children."

Mr. Joiner and his wife, Mildred, who died 15 years ago, raised seven daughters and a son.

In addition to Margaret, Mr. Joiner is survived by daughters, Mary Heard, Betty Pittman, Barbara, Victoria and Kathryn, all of Cleveland, and Carolyn Williams of Albany, N.Y.; son, Franklin of Cleveland; 12 grandchildren; 14 great-grandchildren; and a sister.

I stand here with pride, even on the day of the memorial services of Mr. Joiner, to talk about this wonderful 90-year-old man that I knew all the time that I grew up in the city of Cleveland, as well as part of my public life. I am glad that I had the opportunity to get to know him as well as to memorialize him in the RECORD of the United States Congress.

□ 1515

Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) a member of this august body for whom I have the greatest admiration and the respect for in terms of her commitment to justice and equality for all people. I am very happy that my distinguished colleague has allowed me to be just a very brief part of this black history celebration in the month of February that was inspired by Carter G. Woodson many years ago, first as the Negro History Week, if you will, and later extended to a whole month.

It is ironic, I believe, that it is in the shortest month of the year, that is, the month of February, given that we have so many virtues to extol of so many African Americans who have done a yeo-

man's job in building this great Nation in which we all enjoy freedom. Very briefly, let me pay a special tribute to a young man, a young man who at the age of 108 years old just last year made his transition, Dr. John Morton-Finney.

At the time of his transition he was believed to be the oldest practicing attorney in the whole United States. But even more importantly, John Morton-Finney was the first teacher to join the staff of Crispus Attucks High School when it was opened in 1927, an African American school in my district for which I am a proud graduate that was built on the bedlam of racism but indeed produced some of the most outstanding scholars and noted sportsmen that this country has ever known.

John Morton-Finney finally had the education center in Indianapolis named for him after a year of my insistence that began because John Morton-Finney's work, his life, his legacy is a hallmark in terms of the contributions of African Americans in my particular district; and it stands there as a beacon of hope, a beacon of testimony, a beacon of illustration of what people can be if they decide that that is what they want to be.

John Morton-Finney had over 30 earned degrees. He headed up the language department. He was a quasi-scientist, quasi-inventor and just a noble, noble individual. I am so happy that our school board in Indianapolis finally got around to paying due where due was certainly earned because in the course of an ordinary life, many of us would leave some things undone, but in the life of John Morton-Finney it is a challenge to figure out what in the world it was that he did not do or what it was that he left unaccomplished and that is merely one of the qualities of his life so worth celebrating, especially in this month of African American history celebration for their contributions. I want to thank my colleagues that preceded me and thank the gentlewoman from Ohio specifically for bringing this to the floor of the United States Congress, to the ears and eyes of America and certainly for allowing little old me from Indianapolis, Indiana to have just an infinitesimally small part of this very vital process.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I would like to thank my colleague for being so modest but as she sits here she is the one who had the idea of awarding Rosa Parks the Gold Medal.

Madam Speaker, I await the chairman of the CBC, and so I have a poem that I am going to attempt to do very quickly in his absence. The author is Gloria Wade-Gayles. The poem is entitled *And The Women Gathered*. I think it is appropriate that I do this poem right now because it talks about black history and then we are on the brink of the month of March, which happens to be Women's History Month as well.

I want to give my best at doing this piece of poetry. I would also like to give appropriate credit to my former

chief of staff, Marcia Fudge, the national president of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., who is now the mayor of Warrensville Heights, Ohio. It is as a result of her love of poetry that I even learned about this particular poem. I think Gloria Wade-Gayles does a fabulous job of writing. It is entitled *And the Women Gathered*.

AND THE WOMEN GATHERED

(By Gloria Wade-Gayles)

And the women gathered.
 And the women gathered.
 And the women gathered.
 Thin women
 Stout women
 Short women
 Tall women
 Young women
 Not so young women
 Flat chested women
 Big bosomed women
 Women with blue eyes
 Green eyes
 Brown eyes
 Women with silky hair
 Curly hair
 Bleached hair
 Permed hair
 Graying hair
 And the women gathered.
 Coming by planes
 Buses
 Vans
 Cars
 Trains
 And strong feet never tired
 To gather for freedom
 Married women
 Divorced women
 Single women
 Widowed women
 The Women Gathered
 Cocoa
 Cream
 Nut brown
 Beige
 Caramel
 Fudge
 Blackberry black
 As different as the stars that grace the night
 The women gathered
 As one constellation.
 And the world took notice
 That women are warriors
 (Always have been even in the beginning)
 And so they gathered as women will
 In the very eye of the storm
 Pushing against its fury
 With their own
 And the world took notice
 That women birth babies
 And revolutions
 The women gathered
 Ten thousand Rosas inspired by one
 You saw them.
 You saw them.
 You saw them.
 You saw them.
 The world saw them.
 Montage from the movement: Headlines
 Montgomery, Alabama
 December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks, a seamstress
 in Montgomery, Alabama refused to
 surrender her seat to a white man when
 ordered by a local bus driver. The
 Montgomery bus boycott begins.
 Blacks walk, walk, and walk for free-
 dom and dignity.
 Women were there.
 Greensboro, North Carolina
 February 1, 1960. Students sit in at lunch
 counters and are refused service. Re-
 turn. Are arrested.
 A wave of sit-ins spreads to 15 cities in five
 southern States.

Women were there

May 4, 1961. The freedom rides begin. Blacks and whites ride together on a chartered bus. Savage beatings, arson, legal harassment.

Women were there.

Birmingham, April 3, 1963.

Bull Connor turns on water hoses and unleashes ferocious dogs. Physical violence. Mass arrests.

Bombings.

Women were there.

Birmingham, September 15, 1963.

Four young black girls are killed in church bombing. Mississippi, summer of 1964

Civil rights activists, blacks and whites invade the State, registering voters establishing freedom Schools.

The South.

During the course of one year, 80 people were physically assaulted, 30 buildings bombed, 1,000 arrested and five murdered.

Women were there.

Throughout the movement,

Women sang the songs passionately.

"We shall not. We shall not be moved.

"Woke up this morning with my mind stayed on freedom.

"Ain't gonna let nobody turn me round, turn me round.

"And before I'll be a slave, I'll be buried in my grave, and go home to the Lord and be free."

And the women gathered.

In need of empowerment for themselves but they gathered to change the South.

They gathered because women do not sleep through nightmares.

We shall not call the roll.

It is as long as the Nile
Where civilization was born.

We shall not call the roll.

The women wore their courage
And not their names.

It is that way with women.

And so we say.

Women warriors

Trailblazers

Torchbearers

Activists

Thinkers

Movers and shakers

Dreamers

Revolutionaries

We salute you.

And we promise

That we will not

Sleep through the nightmares

Of homelessness, unemployment,

Poverty, violence against children, women,
men, Ignorance

Oppression of all kinds.

We promise that

A new generation

Of women

Will gather.

We are that generation.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, there is much to celebrate. The economic climate is improving significantly. African American businesses are borrowing, investing, and building capital at record levels. For African Americans, median household income is up, the poverty rate is sharply down, and the unemployment rate is down to the lowest level on record (8.1 percent).

However, despite our economic progress and electoral gains, we still have not achieved all we can. In addition to the disparity of income in our country, one important area we must address is environmental justice—a significant human rights issue for this century. The issue of environmental justice stems from the concern that impoverished communities,

frequently comprised of people of color, suffer larger and disproportionate environmental risks compared to other Americans. The environmental justice movement also concerns inequality, including wealth and income disparities, inadequate schools, gaps in medical services, uneven economic opportunities and investment inequities.

In recent years, America has significantly improved its air and water quality and reduced waste disposal and toxic chemicals. However, the improvements have been uneven and the benefits skewed. These factors cause troubling health problems and threaten all our other progress. The fight for a healthy environment has been led by many local grassroots leaders. In San Francisco, Linda Richardson has helped lead the fight to address these problems and achieve environmental justice. Mrs. Richardson founded Southeast Alliance for Environmental Justice, a San Francisco based environmental organization. She also is a member of the San Francisco Planning Commission and an expert on the impact of environmental pollutants on poor communities.

Her work has demonstrated the importance of implementing safe, healthy, and equitable environmental policies to bring about environmental justice. Thanks to this grassroots work, Americans now realize that it is no longer tolerable for pollution and environmental toxins to prey heavily on our Nation's vulnerable population, including impoverished Americans; minorities; and our children.

Despite this realization, too many still take our Nation's environmental health for granted. For example, each year, more than 2.2 billion pounds of pesticides are used on crops, lawns, and public spaces. Consumers Union reports that many children are eating fruits and vegetables with unsafe levels of pesticide residues. This residue is dangerous and plagues our children at every meal. Our children are our most important resource.

Mrs. Richardson is committed to ensuring that our civil rights include the right to live in a clean and healthy environment. I commend her work and believe that a nation that preserves its environmental health establishes the foundation for a healthy, stable, and prosperous society. To complement the work of grassroots leaders, my colleagues joined me to request an increased budget for the Environmental Protection Agency to employ trained staff with a civil rights background. Our vision cannot be achieved without the combined force of private and public sector work toward the same goals.

To commemorate Black History Month, we should join together to organize, educate, and fight for better environmental, health, education, and economic outcomes for all Americans. While we work to adequately fund enforcement activities and implement safe environmental policies, we must also demand funding initiatives in infant mortality, heart disease, AIDS, immunizations, cancer screening and management to eliminate racial health disparities. Let's follow Linda's success and work to implement a more progressive vision that eliminates environmental injustice.

Mr. BISHOP. Madam Speaker, first, I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues in recognizing Black History Month, and I thank Congresswoman, JONES for arranging this year's Special Order to remember the far-reaching role that black Americans have played through the centuries in making our

country what she was, what she is, and what she will be.

Our topic is, "Heritage and Horizons: The African American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st Century."

This is a big subject!

The legacy is certainly big—as so is the challenge!

Historian Benjamin Quarles has pointed out in his ground-breaking work on black history that, except for native American Indians, blacks are the country's oldest ethnic minority. In fact, the roots of black Americans sink deeper in the histories of the 13 original colonies than any other group from across the Atlantic.

America was born in diversity, and many groups have played a part in the country's phenomenal growth and development. And the part played by Americans of African descent has been huge. We are just now beginning to understand the impact that black America has had on every period in the country's history.

It's an historic fact that America could not have emerged as a great world industrial power as quickly or as forcefully as she did without the presence of a skilled black labor force, or without the contributions made by black Americans in every field, including the sciences, technology, exploration, business, religion, government and politics, the military, the arts, and in all aspects of our society.

As I took the floor this evening, I found myself thinking of Henry Flipper.

Some of you will recognize the name Henry Flipper—who was born in Thomasville, Georgia, which is located in an area of southwest Georgia that I have the privilege of representing—is remembered as the first black graduate of West Point, who went on to serve with distinction as a young military officer on the western frontier, and who was wrongly forced out of the service on the basis of false charges, even though he had been fully exonerated from those charges.

When he died in Atlanta in 1940, he was a forgotten man, and was buried in an unmarked grave. But, in recent years, historians have dug more deeply into his life. And what they have found is truly remarkable.

In spite of his bitter setback in the Army, historians have learned that he made enormous contributions to America's growth in the late 1800's and early 1900's. He helped develop the railroad in the West. He had a pioneering role in developing the oil industry. As an engineer, inventor, surveyor, and, later in his career, as a top advisor to the U.S. Secretary of the Interior, he played a big part in the country's Westward expansion.

Although born in servitude, he helped change the face of America.

There are countless examples of African-Americans who have made a real impact on the country's history. Henry Flipper is just one of many great black leaders produced by my own state of Georgia. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is another. As the leading figure in the Civil Rights Movement, he played a big role in the transformation that took place in our country in the middle of the 20th Century.

Their stories all tell us that our country's unique diversity has been a great source of strength, and should be celebrated. In fact, America's heroes are not limited to any race, or creed, or gender or national background. We find examples of greatness among all people in this patchwork of cultures that has become the strongest, freest, and most productive nation the world has ever known.

By observing Black History Month, we learn more about our history; we celebrate our diversity; and we become inspired and motivated by Americans who have helped lead the way toward fulfilling the country's great promise of equality of opportunity and justice for all.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to represent to citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District to pay honor and tribute to scores of African-Americans who have paved the way for the realization of the American dream.

African-American history is American history. Even before there was a United States, Crispus Attucks became the first American martyr when he was killed during the Boston Massacre of 1770, fighting against taxation without representation. Over 5,000 black soldiers and sailors fought in the American Revolution, only to be told that they were only three-fifths human when the Constitution was ratified.

Africans transplanted to America endured centuries of oppression, beginning before they even set foot on the American shore. The middle passage was a terrible, often fatal voyage of slaves from Africa to the New World. Africans were herded like livestock into the lower decks of a ship, where they were shackled together in inhumane conditions, fed only substance portions, and thrown overboard in shark infested waters if they got sick, weak, or the weight of the ship was simply too heavy. Once here, they were subjected to every oppressive tactic known to man, from the spirit breaking submission demanded on the plantation, to the family breaking practice of slave breeding and trading, to the mind numbing laws forbidding slave education.

Yet, even in the days when it seemed that "hope unborn had died", Africans in America reached amazing heights of achievement in all areas of endeavor, from science and medicine to politics and education, from Benjamin Banneker and Daniel Hale Williams to Shirley Chisholm and Martha Collins. Over stony roads, African-Americans have trod over the obstacles to success, each time redefining the American Dream as they fought on to victory.

I would like to take this special opportunity to highlight the enormous contribution to African-American history, and thus, American history, by African-Americans from Texas, and, in many cases, from my district. Maynard Jackson, who went on to become the first and one of the most successful mayors of Atlanta, was born in Dallas in 1938. As mayor of Atlanta, he laid the foundation for the new South's centerpiece city by ensuring that all races were allowed to take part in Atlanta's economic opportunity.

"Blind" Lemon Jefferson used Dallas as a base to launch an extraordinary blues career, during which he made over 100 recordings of his intricate melodic rhythms and influenced countless artists, including B.B. King. Before Rafer Johnson went on to be a gold medalist and a world decathlon record holder, he also lived in Dallas.

Dallas native Bobby Seale went on to lead tens of thousands of African-Americans toward heightened political consciousness. Dallas served as a launching pad for James Farmer, the noted Congress of Racial Equality leader and winner of the Presidential Medal of Freedom. And as the first black mayor of Dallas, Mayor Ron Kirk continues to lead the city into unprecedented economic success.

North Dallas has produced extraordinary African-Americans. Dallas native Ernie Banks set records in baseball and was voted the "Greatest Chicago Cubs Player of All Time". Austin native Bill Pickett was the first black working cowboy, and revolutionized the genre with his unique style of bulldogging. From my birthplace, Waco, TX native Monroe Majors became the first black to practice medicine west of the Rocky Mountains, and Jules Bledsoe changed the face of opera through his groundbreaking production, "Showboat."

Madam Speaker, I have just scratched the surface of North Texas African-American contributions to the American fabric. From Al Lipscomb, who led the fight to make Dallas elected officials more representative of the populace, to Royce West and John Wiley Price, who led the fight for justice in Dallas today. As I look to the dawn of a new century, I am proud to be a part of America's esteemed legacy of African-American achievement.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the last day of Black History Month to share with you a tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The remarks to follow were given by my good friend and esteemed colleague, Representative JOHN SPRATT from the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina. Representative SPRATT's remarks on the late Dr. King bring a very refreshing and much-needed view on the subject of America and where we ought to be heading as we enter the new Millennium. Our home State of South Carolina is involved in a national debate, as I've spoken about recently, regarding the confederate battle flag flying atop the Statehouse in Columbia. Were we all to read Representative SPRATT's remarks and take them into close consideration, we might be one step closer to understanding the past and moving towards the future that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. envisioned for our nation.

Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following remarks given by Representative JOHN SPRATT on January 17, 2000, at the Mt. Prospect Baptist Church in Rock Hill, South Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.—
REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN SPRATT, MT. PROSPECT BAPTIST CHURCH, ROCK HILL, SOUTH CAROLINA, JANUARY 17, 2000

Martin Luther King, Jr. was born January 15, 1929. He was 26, in the pulpit of Dexter Avenue Baptist Church less than two years, when he was drafted to lead the Montgomery bus boycott. He was 39 the night he told the sanitation workers in Memphis that God had taken him up on the top of the mountain and let him see the promised land. "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord," he said. "I'm not fearing any man."

He would have been 71 on Saturday, had he lived. But the next day in Memphis, he stepped out onto the deck of the Lorraine Motel, and a gunman, filled with the venom he had tried all his life to pacify, fired a rifle bullet through his jaw, and killed him instantly.

American history is pock-marked with violence, but it is also marked by turning points where God gave us great leaders who steered us in the right direction. George Washington was one. Abraham Lincoln, another. Franklin Roosevelt lifted us out of the Depression, assuring us we had "nothing to fear but fear itself." Martin Luther King, Jr. called us to "rise up and live out the true meaning of our creed, that all men are created equal."

There were Americans then, and there are Americans now, who have never understood that Dr. King was speaking to them when he stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. But surely everyone can be thankful for this: that when African-Americans demanded their rights, they did not rally behind a leader filled with bitterness and belligerence; they turned to this man who told his followers, "The means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek."

Langston Hughes wrote, "We too sing America," but it was Martin King, Jr. who showed how. He brought audiences to their feet merely by reciting "My Country 'Tis of Thee." In a voice that sounded like the trumpet of Gideon, he called on America to let freedom ring, and all who heard it never forgot it.

At his funeral, they called him "a warrior for peace." A leader willing to die for his cause but not willing to kill. A protester who was also a peacemaker. A black man, of an oppressed people, who reached out to everyone, even his enemies, because his objective was not to win but to reconcile. He was a Nobel Prize winner who could have become a messianic figure, and preached in pulpits all over the country, but he chose to go to his death marching with the garbage men of Memphis.

His greatest achievement was, in his words, "a method of struggle that made it possible to stand up against an unjust system and fight it with all your might, yet never stoop to violence and hatred in the process." He gave Gandhi credit for helping him understand the philosophy of nonviolent protest. But he believed that this spirit was rooted in the black church, in three centuries of Christian stoicism when African-Americans were gripped in bondage.

In the dark days of the Montgomery Bus Boycott, Martin Luther King, Jr. told his congregation at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, "You who protest courageously, yet with dignity and Christian love, when the history books are written in the future, the historian will have to say, 'There was a great people, a black people, who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization.'"

This national holiday is not created out of magnanimity. It is created out of respect for a people who have earned it, to honor a man who belongs with the greatest American leaders.

We honor only two other Americans with national holidays bearing their names: George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. I am proud to say I voted for law designating this day, but I will be first to admit that all it does is make the third Monday in January a legal holiday. This can become just another "day off" unless we make it "a day on," a time to reach into our souls and ask what we can do to make the dream a reality.

Lyndon Johnson explained why this day matters long before it was ever designated, thirty-five years ago. The week after Bloody Sunday in Selma, Alabama, LBJ addressed the nation on television. John Lewis had been beaten into the ground after crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge, but he was watching, and as LBJ spoke, his spirit soared. This, he says, was the "strongest civil rights speech any president ever made."

LBJ began by saying, "At times history and fate meet at a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week at Selma, Alabama."

"Rarely," he said, "in any time does an issue lay bare the heart of America itself . . . But the issue of equal rights for American Negroes is such an issue. Should we defeat every enemy, should we double our

wealth and conquer the stars, and still be unequal to this issue, we will have failed as a people and as a nation."

After thirty-five years, LBJ's words still ring true. The stakes are the same, and failure is not an option. That's why this holiday and what it's about are vitally important, not just to African-Americans but to all Americans.

Last spring, I went with my colleague and friend, John Lewis, on a pilgrimage to Selma, and to Birmingham and Montgomery. We prayed in the church in Birmingham, where the lives of four girls were cruelly cut short by dynamite, exploded in the midst of a Sunday morning worship. We sat in the pews at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, and listened to Dr. King tell his congregation during the bus boycott: "The tension in this city is not between white people and black people. The tension is, at bottom, between justice and injustice, between the forces of light and the forces of darkness." and on the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, we marched, arm-in-arm, across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

On the way back, a reporter asked why I had made the trip, and I told him I thought everyone should come to Birmingham and Selma. Everyone should know the Edmund Pettus Bridge as well as Concord Bridge in Massachusetts; and everyone should know what happened in Kelly-Ingram Park as well as what happened on Lexington Green.

If you fast forward thirty-five years from LBJ's speech, you have to say we have come a long way. Dr. King's mission is far from finished; but that doesn't make the accomplishments of the civil rights movement any less momentous. We should not let ourselves or our children diminish what was achieved in the 50's, 60's, and 70's, or say that race relations are no better now than then. We grew up in the segregated South. We know better.

And besides, we have to remember how far we've come because it inspires us to keep going. We should remember Philip Randolph, telling the Judiciary Committee that "when Negro Americans travel the highways of this country, we are stalked by humiliation." And remember how Rosa Parks, a seamstress in Montgomery, helped put an end to that indignity. When we think there is little we as ordinary citizens can do, heroines like Rosa Parks remind us we are wrong.

They remind us also that Martin Luther King, Jr. would have accomplished little or nothing, but for those who stood behind him and those who charged ahead, as shock troops of the movement. They were ordinary Americans like Dub Massey and Jim Wells and the Friendship Nine. But it was, in Dr. King's words, "their sublime courage, their willingness to suffer, their amazing discipline in the midst of almost inhuman provocation" that gave us the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Among the early protesters was a young woman named Diane Nash, an organizer of SNCC. At the time of the Rock Hill sit-ins, SNCC was in dire financial straits, and meeting to discuss how they could keep going. One of the Friendship protesters, Tom Gaither, used the single phone call allowed him at the jail to call SNCC collect in Atlanta. Gaither called to tell SNCC that the Friendship students didn't want bail and wouldn't be asking SNCC for bond money. They were going to serve out their thirty days in jail. This became a precedent for the whole movement, and so inspired SNCC that four of those at the meeting in Atlanta drove to Rock Hill, sat-in at McCrory's, and joined the Friendship Nine in the county jail.

Diane Nash was among them, and today, she issues us a caveat. She says that "the movement made Martin rather than Martin making the movement." She says this not to

diminish Dr. King, but so that "young people will not think that this was his movement, and say 'I wish we had a Martin Luther King today to lead us . . . If people know how the movement started and why it succeeded,'" says Diane Nash, "they will be more likely to ask the right question, which is: 'What can I do?'"

Every community needs stories of sublime courage, discipline, and principle like these. These are our epic poems, and we should be telling them and teaching them because they build respect; they show us we are stronger than we think; they inspire our better selves.

Those who want to keep the Confederate flag flying over our Capitol claim it as their heritage. But Confederate veterans served in the General Assembly from 1866 to the early 1920s, and never resolved to raise their old battle flag over the dome of the Capitol. If we want to preserve our heritage, what about the motherlode of heritage in the civil rights movement? In a country where there is too much violence in the home, in the schools, on the streets, here is a rich history of non-violence worth our study.

Every school child in South Carolina should know stories like these. They should know the story of those black children in Clarendon County who walked miles to school every day, as busses full of white children passed them by. They should not study South Carolina history without learning the name of Levi Briggs and those brave parents who put their lives on the line to correct this inequity, and went on to the Supreme Court with Briggs v. Elliott. They should know the twisted road to school integration and the quiet heroes, like Matthew Perry and Judge Waring, who helped clear the way.

We should teach character, teach it by telling the stories of Rosa Parks and Levi Briggs, John Lewis, and the Friendship Nine. And while we are at it, we should preach persistence, to our children and ourselves. For one of our country's virtues has been our capacity to struggle endlessly with our problems, and never be completely satisfied with our solutions. We have to keep seeking solutions; and even if we never see closure, never give up in the search for a society that matches our ideals and principles. In the realm of racial justice and equality, progress has been slow, and it has been uneven, but we have not just been spinning our wheels in a rut of racism. We have made progress.

Look, for instance, at the difference the Voting Rights Act has made. Take the Congress. In 1965, John Lewis was spearheading SNCC, in the streets protesting. Today he is in the Congress, Chief Deputy Whip on the Democratic side. He serves there alongside 38 other African-Americans, Jim Clyburn among them, the first black elected to Congress from South Carolina since 1896. Charlie Rangel of New York is another; if Democrats gain control of the House in the next election, Charlie will take the chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, the most powerful committee in Congress.

America is better for all Americans, but it is still not what it ought to be; and old symbols, like the flag flying over our Capitol, are too much to be dismissed as mere "vestiges of the past." We stand on the doorstep of America's fourth century, three hundred years from the day the first African slave set foot on this soil, and we cannot say this is the country we want it to be.

Dr. King liked to say that he wanted more than "just physical proximity with no spiritual affinity." He wanted a country where "not only elbows but hearts rub together." We cannot say that we are such a society, nor can we say that we will become one by laissez-faire policies, benign neglect, or mere evolution. Martin Luther King, Jr. warned us years ago from his cell in the Birmingham

jail that "human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability. It comes from the tireless, persistent efforts of men willing to be co-workers with God.

Now that we have reached certain goals, I think we need a higher goal. Americans have always believed that we have, in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, a rendezvous with destiny. At a time when most people in the world lived barely above the level of animals, Americans showed that government of the people is the only government for the people. We showed that when church and state are separated, both fare better. We showed that when people from countries like Ireland are liberated from strife and prejudice, they thrive in a tolerant land. We showed that free education, made available to all, is like a rising tide; it lifts all the boats in a society. We showed that people can come from the simplest backgrounds, like Martin Luther King, Jr., the grandson of slaves and sharecroppers, and give birth to great things.

Now that the barriers that segregated us have been removed, our challenge, and I think God's purpose for us, is to show the world—from Belfast to Bosnia, from Cape Town to East Timor, that different races and ethnic groups need not cripple and debilitate a country; they can make a country richer and stronger; that we can not only co-exist, but thrive on our differences.

This is our heritage, and it should be our mission, our creed, our high calling. If as a people we can embrace this goal, we can make our country that shining city on a hill that the Puritans set out to build three hundred years ago. We can make our country the country Martin Luther King, Jr. dreamed of, "where justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream."

Our goal does not have to be a completely color-blind, totally homogenized society. That's too utopian, and frankly, I think, too bland. I think our richness as a people derives from our differences. I think it is enough to strive for a plural, multi-racial society, where the visible differences of race, color, and culture no longer carry the stigma of somehow not being a full-fledged American.

If we make this our goal, we can put the flag flying over our State Capitol in perspective. It's a wedge issue, and we need to be rid of it, so that we can get on with far more important tasks, because time is running short. Halfway through this new century, our population is expected to hit 400 million. Fifty-three percent will be white. Twenty-five percent will be Hispanic, 14 percent will be black, 9 percent Asian, and one percent American Indian. Our existence as a people is moving toward a level of complexity the world has never seen before. In the 21st Century, the United States will be the world's nation; the American canvass will be painted with colors from every shade of the earth.

Surely, we do not want this racially more diverse America to be a racially more divided America.

Surely, we want the world to look to America in this century, as it did in the last, and see that future works, see many races not only surviving but thriving, richer as a culture and as a country because of our differences.

Two years ago, I went to Bosnia to visit our troops in a forlorn place, ripped asunder by ethnic warfare. When I landed at Tuzla, I was met by Major General Morgan, an African-American, who commanded our troops there. When I went to Sarajevo, I was met by General Shinseki, a Japanese-American, who commanded the entire NATO mission. I doubt that any racial message was intended by the assignment of these two officers. But I have to tell you, I was proud to see my

country making that statement in that ethnic-torn part of the world. And I believe that America can cast that beacon, that sign of hope, that message of racial harmony, all over the world.

How do we plot the route to an interracial society over the next fifty years? Well, there are lots of ways. But on the map of racial progress, education is the name of almost every road. Almost all studies come to one conclusion: education is our best solution and our greatest challenge.

For one thing, the public schools right now have a racial or ethnic composition comparable to what the whole nation will look like in 2020. The school age population is 66 percent white, 15 percent black, 14 percent Hispanic, and 4 percent Asian. The future of diversity in this country will depend heavily on how well the schools work out the issues of full and equal inclusion.

In saying this, I am not shifting the burden onto teachers and school administrators. I am speaking to all of us as parents, to churches, to people, to the whole community. All of us have to pitch in and make our public schools second to none, up to the challenge of educating every child to the limit of his potential.

Which brings me to my last point. Americans need to realize that though we came over here on different ships, we are all in the same boat now. The burden of change should not rest on African-Americans alone. The burden should rest on all of us if we believe our creed.

In that connection, let me commend the City of Rock Hill, the Council, and Mayor Doug Echols, in particular, for sponsoring "No Room for Racism," and for your resolution on the Flag.

No Room for Racism may be mostly dialogue, but I believe it is dialogue that we need I believe that efforts like this can blossom, so that one day, ours is country where all sing America. And I believe it is God's purpose, Dr. King's dream, and our duty to make it just that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Black History Month. I thank my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus very much for their leadership on this very special order and tribute to black history and appreciate tremendously these members who have joined me on the floor of the House to acknowledge this very special month.

I am thrilled to stand here on the House floor as an American and as an African-American Member of Congress. In the 211 years of congressional history there have been only 105 African-American Members of Congress. 101 African-Americans have been elected to the House of Representatives, and only 4 have been elected to the Senate. I am boldly able to stand here today, Madam Speaker, because other courageous and brave African-American pioneers stood valiantly before me. During Black History Week, but most importantly throughout the year, I am reminded of the legendary achievements that have paved the way for my colleagues and I.

This year marks the first Black History Month celebration of the 21st Century. Appropriately, the Association for the Study of African American Life and History has labeled "Heritage and Horizon—The African American Legacy and Contributions of the 21st Century" as the theme for this year's celebration. I think you will agree, African-Americans have played an integral part in the development and prosperity of our nation. Tonight, I would like my remarks to reflect the rich legacy of the Afri-

can-American experience, and its relationship to American history.

Seventy-four years ago, a bold and daring scholar had a vision to honor the Legacy of African-Americans. As you know, this legendary scholar, Carter G. Woodson founded what was then called "Black History Week." Now, our nation celebrates the entire month of February as Black History Month. And if I might quote my 14-year-old son Jason Lee, "we should not be regulated even by a month, for African American history is a history of a people and the history of America."

So I would hope that as we take to the floor of the House on the last day of this month, my colleagues will join me in additional days in which we will spend talking about African American history, and I would hope that we would begin to explain to the American people how intimately woven this history is with America. As we recall African-American history, we should not be afraid to say that it is American history, and we should not be afraid to recount it over and over again, not out of hatred or hatefulness, but out of the need to educate and to allow this country to move forward and to build upon the richness of its diversity and to solve some of the very problems that we confront today.

African-American history is rightfully recounting the contributions of great Americans. Americans who dared to change not only their individual community, but also their surrounding nation. As I recall the legacy of African-Americans, I remember the brave and bold leaders of our past. There is no shortage of articulate, influential African-American leaders in our nation's history. These individuals influenced both the African-American community and our society at large in powerful ways as they fought to win freedom, fair treatment, and better lives for all of America. For example, brave men like Nat Turner, Gabriel Prosser, and Denmark Vesey, who organized and led doomed but valiant slave rebellions against brutal slave owners. Abolitionists like Frederick Douglas and Sojourner Truth, who undermined the institution of slavery by speaking, writing, and lobbying against it—at considerable personal risk. And brave individuals like Harriet Tubman, who risked her life and her hard-won freedom to return to slave-holding states to lead other African-Americans north to freedom along the Underground Railroad. And the Civil War, where over 200,000 African-American men fought in the Union Army and Navy—to free their enslaved brethren, and prove that African-Americans too were committed to Democracy and the preservation of America.

And in the early 1900s, African-Americans like Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. DuBois, and Mary Church Terrell shaped attitudes within the African-American community and won the respect of all Americans across the country. Also, Marcus Garvey led what was labeled the Black Nationalist movement and fought institutional racism in the United States.

In the 1920s, '30s, and '40s, A. Philip Randolph worked to organize African-American workers and end the division of the labor movement along racial lines. He also worked diligently to end discrimination in the military and the government.

And after World War II, African-American leaders like Charles Hamilton Houston, William Henry Hastie, A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., Thurgood Marshall, Martin Luther King, Adam

Clayton Powell, Jr., and Malcolm X made significant marks on American history—in our courts, our schools, our government, our politics, and in foreign affairs. African-American women like Fannie Lou Hamer, Shirley Chisholm, and Barbara Jordan, one of my personal heroes, broke old barriers and won the respect of millions of Americans for integrity, their intelligence, their dedication, and their professional accomplishments.

This recitation of African-American leaders is by no means all-inclusive! In fact, it touches upon only a few of the vast amount of African-American leaders who have shaped this country's history and added to the legacy of African-American accomplishments in America. I mention these names to merely observe the fact that African-Americans have always played an integral part in the history of the United States.

As part of this annual observation of Black History Month, it is vital to remind America that in the face of racism, discrimination, and violence, many African-Americans have changed the very fabric of this nation. I would like to stress that all of America can draw great satisfaction and strength from this history. It is important, because as we embrace this history, it provides not only inspiration for African-Americans, but also all of America on the dawn of the 21st Century.

Madam Speaker, I believe that we must speak about African-American history throughout the year, because there are still many barriers that America has yet to hurdle and face at the dawn of the 21st century. America has not accepted in a collective and collaborative fashion that African American history is a history of America. Issues that impact our communities such as increased funding for nutrition programs, affirmative action, the Voter's Rights Act, reparations for African-Americans, racial profiling, equitable funding for Historically Black College and Universities, equitable training and funds to children for access to the Internet, and a multitude of other critical issues are concerns that Americans must join together and combat. If America embraces African American History as American History, we would go so much further in solving these problems and many other critical problems.

In closing, I strongly feel that all Americans must have a better understanding of each other. Our rich diversity has been (at the same time) the reason for our continued struggles and progress. We must learn each other's history! African-American history must be the kind of history that is living; that is accepted; that is widespread; and that all people can understand. This great nation must embrace this rich history of the past and the present, and use it as a guide for reshaping America's future.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for this opportunity to present issues with regard to Black History Month this year. Our theme again was Heritage, Horizons, Accepting the Challenges of the 21st Century.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND LEGISLATIVE AGENDA OF REPUBLICAN CONGRESS REGARDING EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee for the majority leader.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the accomplishments of the Republican Congress with respect to education and to address areas where we believe the administration is simply wrong in the proposals that they put forward for improving education in this country.

The recent budget submission by the President included the same old pattern of creating new programs where Washington is in control and the people who know best at the State and local level are left out of the decision-making process. Before I came to the Congress of the United States, I was a high school principal and then a superintendent of schools, and I was both during the time when the well-intentioned programs of the 1960s, coming from the Federal Government, back to local educators, were supposed to have closed the achievement gap.

It was very obvious that it was not going to happen. So when I came to the Congress, I knew what was wrong, I thought I knew how to fix it, but it was very, very difficult to talk about quality. It was very difficult to talk about giving flexibility to local districts who knew better how to make the changes than we did in Washington. And so for 20 years, not very much changed. Even though in the first 10 years, every Head Start study indicated that it was not doing what we had intended it to do. Instead of being a program to have preschoolers become reading ready and school ready, it turned out to be a poverty jobs program, it turned out to be a baby-sitting program. And it was so obvious because we were talking about quantity, how many children could we cover rather than quality, and every time I would say, "But if you're covering those children with mediocrity, you're not helping them at all."

First let me talk a little bit about what all Americans can agree upon in relationship to a basic education policy. All Americans agree that a high quality education for their children is important. All Americans agree that safe schools, good discipline, high academic standards, parental involvement and responsibility, well-prepared teachers, appropriate school buildings, access to higher education and training and assistance for children with special needs are certainly worthy objectives.

Most Americans agree that decisions on local school policy should be determined locally. Most Americans agree that equitable funding for our schools is ideal. Most Americans agree that the role of the Federal Government is limited but necessary. Now, where do we, the Republican majority, disagree with the administration? The problem begins when we talk about you how do we achieve these goals.

The President believes that the Federal Government should create a new program for every identifiable education problem. So in his State of the

Union address, he said, hire more teachers. This is the Federal Government speaking. Establish Federal accountability measures. End social promotion, provide afterschool and summer school support. Shut down schools that do not perform, require teachers to have majors in the subjects they teach, require local school report cards, offer parents a choice of public schools their children attend. It took him a long time to get to that point. Support more charter schools. Require consistent discipline policies, and provide funds to build or modernize local schools.

Now, we agree with many of the goals that the President has outlined. Where we disagree is that creating a new program every time you think you have an identifiable problem will not solve the problem, particularly if it is coming from Washington, D.C. with a one size fits all for the local school districts. So we agree with many of the goals the President has outlined, but we do disagree with the need to create new programs every year to address these goals.

Why do we disagree? First of all, we have to understand that States and local communities are so far ahead of us when it comes to school reform, way ahead of anything that we can even think about on the Federal level. So States and local communities are already taking action to build new schools, repair old ones, hire new teachers, close schools that do not work, raise standards for teachers, offer public school choice, open charter schools, hold schools accountable for academic progress. We believe that the best way to support local schools and communities is by providing flexibility in how States and local governments use Federal funds, increasing funding for special education and sending more Federal dollars directly to the classroom.

□ 1530

When we became the majority, we set seven key goals, and those seven key goals are reflected in every piece of legislation that we have put forward. Those goals are on this chart.

First of all, hopefully we have everyone now talking about quality instead of quantity; and as I said, it took 20 years to get that message across. The important thing was the quality of the program. It was very obvious in Head Start that you could not hire early childhood people, because there are not many, first of all, who are early-childhood prepared, at \$10,000. But the idea was let us see how many students we can get there, and we will use all the money to get the children there; and we will not worry about the quality of the program. In our last two reauthorizations of Head Start, with help from the Democrats, we have changed that; and we moved the programs toward quality.

Better teaching. I have tried to impress upon the President over and over

again, I do not care what he says about 100,000 new teachers. First of all, there are about 14,000 school districts, there are about 1 million school buildings, so 100,000 does not go very far. But it does not matter whether your pupil-teacher ratio is 30 to 1, 20 to 1, 10 to 1, or this famous figure, and I don't know where they got it, of 18 to 1. That does not matter unless there is a quality teacher in the classroom.

They went through this exercise in California, spent billions of dollars as a matter of fact, and what happened? They reduced the class size in the early grades; and in Los Angeles alone, 33 percent of all the new people they had to hire in order to put somebody in with these new classrooms they just created had no qualifications whatsoever to be teaching.

Local control. If you do not have the local people very much involved, that includes parents, that includes administrator, school boards, I will guarantee you, there is nothing from the Federal level that we will do to reform and improve education on the local level. That has to be done on the local level.

Accountability. Again, when I got two pennies from Washington D.C. as a school administrator, I had to make sure that even though it did not help at all it had to be spent according to the way the Federal Government said it had to be spent. So if I got \$15 for this program and \$1,000 for that program, do not ever commingle one of those programs or you are in real trouble with the Federal Government. Even though combining some of those programs would have produced outstanding programs, you just could not do it.

Accountability. The auditors did not come to see whether as a matter of fact anything good was happening. They came to see where you were spending the dollars. I thought well, gee, we ought to be able to do something about that. But, do you realize, I found for those 20 years the most important thing was the money is going to the right place. It did not matter whether we were accomplishing anything.

So accountability is one of our key goals. If we give you the flexibility in the local level, you have to show us that every child has improved academically. That is what it should be all about.

Dollars to the classroom. Again, every time we create a Federal program, we create a Federal bureaucracy; and then that goes out, and they must create a State bureaucracy; and by the time the money gets down to the local school district, there is not much left. So, of course, we have been saying over and over again that 95 percent of all dollars should get down to that classroom.

Then basic academics. We got carried away with so many fads, it was unbelievable, and got far away from basic academics. Now every piece of legislation that we bring forth to this floor includes the fact that we must return to basic academics.

Parental involvement and responsibility. The first and most important teacher has to be some adult in that child's home, whether it is a mother, a father, an aunt, an uncle. That is where it all begins, and that parent must be the child's first and most important teacher.

So we seek effectiveness; we seek results in all Federal education programs. Federal programs should result in increased student achievement, or they should be eliminated. The whole purpose of Title I, and we have already spent \$120 billion on Title I, the whole purpose of Title I was to close the achievement gap; and every study shows we have made no headway, after \$120 billion and all these years.

Let me then move on to what we have done in the 105th Congress and what we are trying to do in the 106th Congress. Of the many legislative accomplishments that occurred during the 105th Congress, I am proud of several bills that address those seven basic goals. Let me point those out.

First of all, in a bipartisan and bicameral fashion, as a matter of fact, we dealt with the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, the amendments of 1997. Here again, we were so overly prescriptive that it was very difficult for the local districts to really do the kind of thing that they needed to do to help the children with special needs.

What we basically did as a matter of fact was take most of the other money that they had for all the other students and cause them to have to spend it on a program that we mandated and a program that we said we would send 40 percent of the excess costs, and we sent 6 percent by the time I became chairman. We will be up to about 15 or 16 percent this year. All that other money has to be raised locally and taken from every other program.

First of all, let me indicate what we have done with the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. In that reauthorization, schools were made safer for all students by improving the procedure for quickly removing dangerous students from the classroom. Parent participation in key decision-making meetings was strengthened. Mediation was offered to resolve disputes. Sometimes millions of dollars were spent on attorney fees with nothing accomplished as far as giving the child a better education.

Costly referrals to special education were cut. Over-identification is a major problem. We will never get to 40 percent if they keep over-identifying special education students. It is a disaster for the child who is over-identified and put into a special education class, many times with a mere reading difficulty that could be handled without becoming a special education student for life. Costly referrals to special education were cut, schools were given more flexibility, and most importantly, education programs for children with disabilities were improved.

The Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998, I am very proud of those. With that enactment, students received the lowest interest rate on student loans in 17 years. The maximum student award under the Pell Grant Program was authorized at the highest level in history. The Work Study Program was expanded to address the literacy needs of the community. The Work Study Program would have been the ideal program without getting into AmeriCorp, which had to turn right around and set up a bureaucracy in Washington and several bureaucracies in every State, when all you had to do was say if you are going to get any work-study money, you will do community service and you will determine what the percentage of that community service will be. That bureaucracy is already set up. You did not need to create anything new in order to do that.

A performance-based organization was created within the Department of Education in order to improve, simplify, and streamline the cumbersome student aid process. This administration decided that 100 percent of student aid should be done through the Federal Government. Now, you tell me one program that we have done very well. I cannot name one, and I doubt whether you can.

Well, obviously we could not become the biggest bank in the world; and of course, they got into all sorts of trouble with only having about 30 percent of the loans. So we tried to improve that, because we indicated that this body will move in that department and see whether they cannot straighten out the problems that are there, people who know how to deal with student aid.

The enactment of the Head Start Amendments of 1998 I mentioned earlier. We spent \$53 billion, and we never expected quality in the program. So for year after year after year, the children most in need who needed an early childhood program, who needed a program to help them become reading ready, did not get it. Not only did they not get it, but we left the parent out altogether, and in many instances we had to improve the parent's parenting skill, we had to improve the parent's literacy skills so they could be the child's first and most important teacher.

We changed that with our Head Start bill. The first reauthorization 5 or 6 years ago, I was only able to get 25 percent of any new money going to quality. The last reauthorization, with the help of the Secretary downtown, we got up to 60 percent, saying that these programs must improve. The Secretary has also closed a lot of programs that, as a matter of fact, were not doing the job. We adopted new performance standards and new measures by which we determined whether they are meeting those performance standards, and we required that the majority of Head Start teachers have a college degree.

One of the problems we found in Title I, for instance, was that in one State, they used I think something like 60 percent of all that money to hire teacher aides, and that is no problem if they are doing things teacher aides would normally do. But do you realize that they did not even have to have a high school diploma? They did not even have to have a GED. In many instances they were actually doing the teaching.

The enactment of charter school legislation has been very important, because it gives some parents choice in the public education of their children. I can take you two blocks from the Capitol and show you an outstanding charter school. But in that charter school, everybody knows what the rules and regulations are, parents included. Everybody knows that you are going to be well disciplined, everyone knows you are going to do your homework, everyone knows that the parent must be involved. And it has changed things completely for all of those children, and they have a long waiting list.

Charter schools legislation signed into law increased the authorization level from \$15 million to \$100 million while curtailing the funds available to the Department of Education for national activities. We want the money to get out there where the local charter schools are. The legislation also encouraged more private capital investments into charter schools and ensured the charter schools received their fair share of the Federal education dollar.

We passed the A+ Education Savings Account legislation. Unfortunately, it got vetoed. What a tragedy. If it had become law, the legislation would have allowed parents, grandparents, friends, scholarship sponsors, companies, or charities to open an account for a child's educational needs for attendance wherever that child could get the best education. Unfortunately, it was vetoed. We will try again this year.

Prohibiting new Federal tests was very, very important. Again, it was a fast track effort put on by the administration to come up with a Federal test, which had to mean that there had to be a Federal program of what it is you are going to teach in order to use the Federal test. But where the administration was wrong, if you are going to test your students, first of all someone must determine what those standards are. If these are new, higher standards you are going to teach to, and certainly in the 21st century we have to do that, then you have to design those. Then you have to prepare the teacher to teach to the new standards. Then you have to test the teacher to see whether they are ready to teach to the new standards.

Now, after you have done all that, then you get around to testing the student. Otherwise, you spend the \$100 million that the President was talking about to tell 50 percent of our students one more time what they have heard all their lives; you are not doing very well. It would be so much better to

take \$100 million and help them do far better.

We enacted the Workforce Investment Act. The first thing I discovered was that we had at least 100 or 150 job-training programs coming from the Federal Government, from all departments, from all agencies, with no one having any idea what the other was doing.

□ 1545

So we consolidated 60 of those Federal training programs through the establishment of three block grants to the States for adult employment and training, for disadvantaged youth, and for adult education and literacy programs. We emphasized long-term academic improvement and occupational training while eliminating numerous Federal requirements, including duplicative and costly planning, paperwork, and reporting requirements.

We are not interested in the process. That is what they were interested in all the time before. We are interested in outcome. We are interested in accomplishments. We are interested in achievement. We are interested in results, not process.

We enacted the Vocational Technical Education Act, that provides approximately 7 to 10 percent of the funding for vocational technical education programs for secondary students, with more dollars going directly to the local level. Again, we emphasized strong academics and State and local flexibility in the use of funds.

Every time we talk about flexibility, we say to the local and State, show us how every child is going to improve academically and prove to us, and then we give them the flexibility to design the program to meet their specific needs at their local level.

Passing the Dollars to the Classroom Act, this legislation consolidated 31 programs top down from Washington down to the State and then to the local government, and we consolidated 31 of those top-down, Washington-based Federal education programs into a single grant to States, giving State and local decision-makers authority in how to distribute the money within each State. And we said, 95 percent of it must get to the classroom.

In the 106th Congress, as we started this 106th Congress, we began by reviewing the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For more than three decades, the Federal government has spent in excess of \$185 billion to the States through scores of Washington-based education programs. Has the enormous investment helped improvement student achievement? Unfortunately, we have no evidence that it has. After 30 years and more than \$128 billion, Title I has not had the desired effect of closing achievement gaps between those who have and those who do not.

That is why we must continue our commitment to quality teaching, greater respect for local control and in-

creased flexibility, bolstering basic academics, sending more dollars to the classroom, and fostering parent responsibility and involvement.

Our commitment to these goals was most clearly evident early in 1999, with the successful enactment of the Education Partnership Flexibility Act, known as Ed-Flex. Thanks to our efforts and with help from 50 Governors, the President decided that it was a good idea, after objecting to it early on.

Ed-Flex gives schools and school districts more freedom to tailor Federal education programs to meet their needs and remove obstructions to reform. It is designed to make categorical Federal programs work better at the local level. One size does not fit all. The local government knows best. But States will have to follow Federal priorities and requirements that may or may not address the needs of children in their State unless they have that flexibility.

It is time to modernize the Federal education funding mechanism investment so it reflects the needs of schools and school districts in the 21st century. With the passage of Ed-Flex, we turned our attention to teacher quality.

Let me just indicate that Ed-Flex was a possibility for 12 States for many years. When we passed a reauthorization years ago, we said to 12 States, if they can prove to us that they can have the flexibility to get waivers from the Federal requirements and use those Federal dollars and improve the academic achievement of all their students, they may have that flexibility.

A couple of the States really took advantage of that and did an outstanding job. Unfortunately, not all 12 took advantage, because it really takes a lot of ingenuity on the State and local level. They have to do the planning. No one is doing it for them. They have to determine how they are going to have every child improve their academic standing.

The State of Texas I believe got more than 4,000 waivers. They now can show that their Hispanic and black students are above the average of all their students because they made that commitment. They said, give us the flexibility and we will show you that we can improve the academic achievement of all of our students.

We all know that after parents, the most important factor in a child's academic success is the quality of the teacher in the classroom. We have passed the Teacher Empowerment Act, and it allows schools to find the right balance for teacher class size, not us, for teacher quality, not us, by giving schools flexibility in deciding how best to meet the needs of their teacher corps and enhance their professional skills.

With the first group of the 100,000 teachers, no requirements were made that they had to have anything other than the ability, I suppose, to get up in the morning and go and report to the

school, nothing else. So what they found in those first hirings, as a matter of fact, they found an awful lot of people who went into that classroom with no qualifications whatsoever.

This act allows schools to find that right balance, whether they need in-depth in service training, and not some of the nonsense that goes on where they take an afternoon off or an evening off and somehow or other they are going to improve the quality of teaching, but in depth.

I can give an example of how that works. I recently visited in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, an advanced physics-calculus combined program. That would not have been possible several years ago because they would not have had the teacher in that classroom that could possibly have handled that assignment. But because of the opportunity for a couple of those teachers to go to an in depth program two summers in a row for the entire summer, they have one of the most outstanding combined programs I have seen in advanced calculus and physics. Again, the quality of the teacher made the difference.

I like to remind all of my Congresswomen here in the Congress that 60 percent of that class were women. Only 40 percent were men.

The Teacher Empowerment Act holds schools accountable by ensuring that these funds are used to increase student achievement through high quality teaching, and ensures that parents are given information on the quality of their child's teacher.

When I was negotiating with the administration at the end of last year, as we were going through this budget process and got into this 100,000 teacher business, the very day we began negotiating a New York newspaper, the entire front page said, "Parents, you are being cheated. Do you recognize 50 percent of all the teachers are not qualified to teach in the subject area in which they are teaching?" That made it a little bit easier to get my point across when I was trying to make them understand that it is the quality of the teacher in the classroom, not necessarily the pupil-teacher ratio.

Most importantly, the Teacher Empowerment Act is not a Washington-knows-best program because it allows schools to spend these funds on what meets their individual needs.

The third piece of legislation that successfully passed the House was the Student Results Act. This legislation authorizes and reforms Title I. We are working at the present time on the whole reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Unlike the way we have done it in the past, in the past we usually said, we will just take this whole lump and just give it more money, and somehow something is going to happen that is going to be better. We said, we are going to look at each individual program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We are going to see how

well it is doing. If it is not doing well, we are going to get rid of it, or find a way to improve it so it does well.

In the Student Results Act, we reformed Title I education for the disadvantaged and many of the other categorical K through 12 programs by targeting at helping disadvantaged children.

The Student Results Act was put together with four overarching principles in mind: quality, accountability, choice, and flexibility. For too long we have maintained low expectations for Title I and the disadvantaged students it serves. We really do not expect enough from any student, unfortunately, but it is particularly true in the case of disadvantaged students.

We have spent nearly \$120 billion, as I said before, in Title I since its inception, yet it continues to be the subject of study after study pointing to its ineffectiveness. We failed to focus enough on quality reforms, and with enactment of the Student Results Act, we usher in a new era of high expectations for all children and for children served by this key program.

In many Title I schools, the most disadvantaged children are taught by the least qualified teacher and teacher aides. The Student Results Act makes it clear that disadvantaged children deserve the same high quality teachers and teacher aides as all other students.

The Student Results Act includes other quality reforms, like rewarding excellence by allowing States to reserve up to 30 percent of their new Title I funds to provide cash rewards to the schools if they are making substantial progress in closing that achievement gap.

Finally, the bill reduces bureaucratic overhead and ensures that more dollars reach the classroom than ever before. As the saying goes, we want to make sure more of this money gets into the hands of classroom teachers who actually know the names of the children in the classroom.

In order to ensure quality, we need to have accountability. We retain State and local standards and assessment provisions that are part of current law, and we applaud the efforts of States and localities to build strong standards-based systems. We build upon these important provisions by ensuring that vital information about the academic performance of Title I schools is provided to parents and the tax-paying public.

The bill does not provide for more accountability to the Federal government. It does insist upon more accountability to parents. We intend to shine a bright light on the Title I program and give parents real, understandable information about how their children and their schools are performing.

For those programs that do not meet the test of high quality and increased accountability, we have included new and innovative public school choice provisions in the bill. Why should chil-

dren have to go to a failing school when everybody is reporting that it is a failing school? The Student Results Act says that children attending schools classified as low-performing must be given the opportunity to attend a higher quality public school in their area. This enshrines in law a very simple commonsense concept: Children should not be forced to attend failing schools.

The Student Results Act sends a powerful message to failing schools throughout this Nation that enough is enough, they must improve or their children will leave to attend another school.

Finally, on October 21 the House passed a far-reaching education reform bill called the Straight A's Act. For those States or school districts that choose to participate, it is not a mandate, but if they choose to participate, Straight A's will fundamentally change the relationship between the Federal government and the State. Straight A's will untie the hands of those States that have strong accountability systems in place in exchange for meeting student performance improvement targets.

This sort of accountability for performance does not exist in current law. States must improve achievement to participate in Straight A's, and if their scores go down for the first 3 years, they get kicked out before the 5-year agreement that they thought they made with the Federal government. We are not going to wait 5 years. Currently, nothing happens to States that decline for 3 years.

Straight A's frees States to target all of their Federal dollars on disadvantaged students and narrowing achievement gaps. Under current law, States could not target more Federal dollars for this purpose. They could not combine any of the funds coming from the Federal level for different programs. This legislation will reward those States that significantly narrow achievement gaps with a 5 percent reward, an incentive that does not exist under current law.

With the enactment of Straight A's, all students, especially the disadvantaged students who were the focus of Federal legislation in 1965, may finally receive effective instruction and be held to high standards.

□ 1600

For too long, States and schools have been able to hide behind average test scores and to show they are helping disadvantaged children, merely by spending more money in the right places, and that must come to an end when States participate in Straight A's, if they so choose to participate.

States and school districts must focus on the most effective way of improving achievement, not on just complying with how the Federal Government says they have to spend their money. Schools should be free to focus on improving teacher quality, imple-

menting research-based instruction and operating effective after-school programs.

Federal process requirements have huge amounts of paperwork for people at the local level and distract from improving student learning. Madam Speaker, as I said before, we want to hear about results. We are not interested in process.

I would encourage everyone to listen carefully when people talk about accountability. Are they talking about accountability for process, making sure States and districts meet Federal guidelines and priorities, the checkoff system, or are they talking about accountability for real gains in academic achievement? Will achievement gaps close as a result, or will States just have to fill out a lot of paperwork about numbers of children served without any mention of improvements?

By giving States a choice to do so, the opportunity to build on their successes and improve the achievement of all of their students, the Federal Government can lend a helping hand rather than a stranglehold.

We started the year with Ed-Flex, which passed with overwhelming bipartisan majorities of both houses and is now law. As I said, Ed-Flex provides for flexibility to all 50 States to control how they design Federal programs and help them adapt to their own unique needs.

Next, we followed up with the Teacher Empowerment Act, which passed the House with bipartisan support. And the bill emphasizes the single most important factor in improving education in this Nation, which is the quality of the teaching force.

We then moved to the Student Results Act, a bill to extend Title I and other programs targeted at the disadvantaged, which also passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. That bill emphasized quality, accountability, school choice and increases local control and flexibility.

Finally, the House passed our Straight A's bill, that gives States and localities unprecedented flexibility in return for accountability.

How about the rest of the 106th Congress? Well, we will have to conclude our reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with bills targeted at improving some of the major education programs beyond Title I; school technology, drug free school, impact aid and the Title VI block grant and a bill to improve the literary skills of all Americans.

One of the problems we have had over the years is we have not thought in terms of family literacy. We sort of put an adult literacy over here and a children's literacy over here. I will guarantee you we have learned you cannot break the cycle of illiteracy or functional illiteracy, unless you deal with the entire family. And you see, functional illiteracy today is not what it was 10, 15 years ago. Functional illiteracy today in our society in this 21st

century is if you cannot read, write, comprehend on a 12th grade level, and that is a functional illiterate.

We have to do much more, and we have to do it jointly with the entire family. Family literacy is what we need to talk about. Priority will be given to proposals that increase flexibility and the operation of Federal education programs.

We will attach a higher priority to support local schools in their effort to make their schools safe, drug free and orderly, as we streamline technology needs and applications.

Madam Speaker, we will work to promote literacy for children and their parents. We will expect quality research that will benefit local schools and improve the quality of education for all children. At the end of the reauthorization process, we will have a much improved Elementary Secondary Education Act. The programs we include will be those that ensure that our children will receive a quality education by, again, emphasizing those seven key goals that I originally outlined: Quality, better teaching, local control, accountability, dollars to the classroom, basic academic, parental involvement and responsibility.

Let me take a quick look at the President's budget. I have it up here. We have some real differences. Here on my chart is what we believe. Here is the President's side of this chart. I want to talk very briefly about this.

As I indicated, the Republican-sponsored Teacher Empowerment Act, which got bipartisan support, compared to the President's teaching to a higher standards initiative is the best example of our fundamental difference in philosophy.

We say quality first, highly qualified teachers in every classroom. The administration says quantity before quality, put more teachers in classrooms, no matter whether they are qualified or not.

We say flexibility with accountability. We give you the freedom if you show us that you produce results. The administration says reduce freedom, increase requirements. We say State-design standards and assessments. The administration says federally-designed, one-size-fits-all; the national test as an example.

We say State and local schools design school discipline standards. The administration says, discipline standards determined by Washington bureaucrats who probably were never in a classroom as an adult beyond higher education.

We say increase IDEA funding. As I mentioned before, when the Individuals for Disability Education Act was passed, the local school districts were led to believe that if they participate in that program and make sure that children with disabilities have an equal opportunity for a good education, the Federal Government will supply 40 percent of the excess funds to educate a special needs child.

Madam Speaker, we have to understand if a school district's average per pupil expenditure might be \$7,500, a special needs child may be \$15,000, may be \$20,000, may be \$100,000, the local school district has had to pick up most of that extra expenditure, even though we said we would send 40 percent of the excess costs.

Well, depending where you are, just in a small city, like I represent, in York, Pennsylvania, if we were sending them 40 percent of excess costs, they would get a million dollars extra every year. They could talk about teacher quality. They could talk about pupil-teacher ratio reduction. They could talk about improving their school buildings, because they would be getting what was promised.

And for 20 years I pleaded and pleaded and pleaded and pleaded and got nowhere. Finally, we started making some improvements. But not because of the President's budget, because the last 2 years he sent a budget up that reduced our spending on special education, if we consider the number of new students that come in and we include inflation.

Fortunately, by the time we were finished going through the authorization process and the appropriations process, we have dramatically increased that expenditure so that those local school districts then can get this money and spend it on the special needs children, without totally raising all of that money on the local level and taking it away from every other education program.

Our Teacher Accountability Act supports local decision-making, provides greater flexibility, reforming the tenure system, tests teachers, provides for signing bonuses or differential pay for teachers in high-needs subject areas, provides incentives to teachers with a record of success in helping low-achievement students improve their academic success, helps them recruit fully qualified teachers, rewards schools and local education agencies for reducing the number of unqualified teachers that are teaching in their schools, helps them hire quality teachers and provide quality professional development.

Now, contrast that, again, with what the administration would do. The new Washington control programs address many of the same issues that I just mentioned, but the programs will be directed by bureaucrats in Washington and not based on peculiar needs of each local school district.

Washington will decide who receives the funds. Washington will decide the amount of funds that are needed to address a specific problem. Washington will dictate how the funds must be spent.

We are moving in the right direction, and I am hopeful that by the time we finish reauthorization of the Elementary Secondary Education Act we, in the near future, will begin to see a closing of that academic achievement

gap. Something that was well intentioned with the legislation in 1965; unfortunately, it has not worked.

This is a chart indicating just what we have been able to do, what the President has said in relationship to the funding for special ed and what we were able to do in the House and the Senate in the appropriation process. Here we see 1997, and the yellow is the President's request. The orange is what we were able to do. We got up above \$3 million in 1997 for special ed money going back. In 1998, this was the President's request. This is what we were able to do in the Congress.

In 1999, we can again see we went up. And in the year 2000, the present year that we are in, we are now up to \$5 million that will go back to these local school districts.

IDEA funding is probably the most important thing we can do to help local school districts because it gives them, then, the opportunity to use the hard-earned tax money that they have to go out and get for their entire education program.

As I mentioned, my small city of York would receive a million dollars extra. Let me talk about a couple of the other areas.

Los Angeles, for instance, they actually receive \$23 million. If they got the 40 percent of excess costs, they would get \$118 million. That would free up \$95 million that they must raise locally to meet these Federal mandates.

Chicago, \$41 million. If they got their 40 percent they would get \$212 million. It would give them \$170 million. And they have taken great steps in Chicago to try to improve that school system to make sure that all of those children have an opportunity to achieve and get a piece of the American dream.

New York City, \$41 million. \$212 million, 170 million if they got the 40 percent.

In Miami, they receive \$10 million. With 40 percent, they would get \$55 million. That means a 44 million increase.

Washington, D.C., right where we are, they get \$3 million. If they got the 40 percent, they would get \$15 million. \$12 million locally in order to improve the academic achievement of all their students.

In St. Louis, they get \$2 million. If they got 40 percent, they would get \$10 million, and that is again a dramatic increase for them to use to improve their schools locally.

So large cities across this country would see a dramatic increase; and, therefore, we do not have to go out and tell them we want them to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio, we want them to have a qualified teacher, we want them to improve their school building. They would have the money to do it. We take that money from them with our mandate because we do not send what we promised we would send.

Again, I hope by the time we finish the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the

near future, we will see that gap closed. It is tragic to see as many as 50 percent of our students not receiving the education they will need to compete in the 21st century.

□ 1615

Last year I had to cast one of the worst votes I had to cast. We needed to change our immigration laws so that we could bring qualified people in to do the jobs that exist in this country, in this high-tech 21st Century. What a tragedy. What a tragedy. I hope no one will ever have to cast a vote of that nature in the future, because I hope we will do something about making sure that that 50 percent that are not getting an opportunity to get a part of this 21st Century American dream will get that opportunity.

The answers are at the local level with State efforts. We are here to add assistance. We should not be here to complicate the problems that they have on the State and local level. I think by the time we pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and it becomes law, we will be on the right road to ensure academic achievement for all students no matter where they live, who they are, no matter what their disability may be. All will have an opportunity for a quality education.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

INDIAN TRIBAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CONTRACT ENCOURAGEMENT ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 613.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 613, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie	Dingell	Kasich
Ackerman	Dixon	Kelly
Aderholt	Doggett	Kennedy
Allen	Dooley	Kildee
Andrews	Doolittle	Kind (WI)
Archer	Doyle	King (NY)
Armey	Dreier	Kingston
Baca	Duncan	Kleczka
Bachus	Dunn	Klink
Baird	Edwards	Knollenberg
Baker	Ehlers	Kolbe
Baldacci	Emerson	Kucinich
Baldwin	Engel	Kuykendall
Ballenger	English	LaFalce
Barcia	Eshoo	LaHood
Barr	Etheridge	Lampson
Barrett (NE)	Evans	Lantos
Barrett (WI)	Everett	Largent
Bartlett	Ewing	Larson
Bass	Farr	Latham
Bateman	Fattah	LaTourette
Becerra	Filner	Lazio
Bentsen	Fletcher	Leach
Bereuter	Foley	Lee
Berkley	Forbes	Levin
Berman	Ford	Lewis (CA)
Berry	Fossella	Lewis (GA)
Biggert	Fowler	Lewis (KY)
Bilbray	Frank (MA)	Linder
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Lipinski
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Blagojevich	Frost	LoBiondo
Bliley	Gallegly	Lowey
Blumenauer	Ganske	Lucas (KY)
Blunt	Gejdenson	Lucas (OK)
Boehkert	Gekas	Luther
Boehner	Gephardt	Maloney (CT)
Bonilla	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)
Bonior	Gillmor	Manzullo
Bono	Gilman	Markey
Borski	Gonzalez	Martinez
Boswell	Goode	Mascara
Boucher	Goodlatte	Matsui
Boyd	Goodling	McCarthy (MO)
Brady (PA)	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Brady (TX)	Goss	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Graham	McCrery
Bryant	Granger	McDermott
Burr	Green (TX)	McGovern
Burton	Green (WI)	McHugh
Buyer	Greenwood	McInnis
Callahan	Gutierrez	McIntosh
Calvert	Gutknecht	McIntyre
Camp	Hall (OH)	McKeon
Canady	Hall (TX)	McKinney
Cannon	Hansen	McNulty
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Carson	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)
Castle	Hayes	Meeks (NY)
Chabot	Hayworth	Menendez
Chambliss	Hefley	Metcalf
Clay	Heger	Mica
Clayton	Hill (IN)	Miller (FL)
Clement	Hill (MT)	Miller, George
Clyburn	Hilleary	Minge
Coble	Hilliard	Mink
Coburn	Hinchey	Moakley
Collins	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Combest	Hobson	Moore
Condit	Hoeffel	Moran (KS)
Conyers	Hoekstra	Moran (VA)
Cooksey	Holden	Morella
Costello	Holt	Myrick
Cox	Hooley	Nadler
Coyne	Horn	Napolitano
Cramer	Hostettler	Neal
Crane	Houghton	Nethercutt
Crowley	Hoyer	Ney
Cubin	Hunter	Northup
Cummings	Hutchinson	Norwood
Cunningham	Hyde	Nussle
Danner	Inslee	Oberstar
Davis (FL)	Isakson	Obey
Davis (IL)	Istook	Olver
Davis (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Deal	Jackson-Lee	Ose
DeFazio	(TX)	Packard
DeGette	Jefferson	Pallone
Delahunt	Jenkins	Pascarella
DeLauro	John	Pastor
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Payne
DeMint	Johnson, E. B.	Pease
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
Dickey	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)
Dicks	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)
	Kanjorski	Petri
		Phelps

Pickering	Scott	Thompson (CA)
Pickett	Sensenbrenner	Thompson (MS)
Pitts	Serrano	Thornberry
Pombo	Sessions	Thune
Pomeroy	Shadegg	Thurman
Porter	Shaw	Tiahrt
Price (NC)	Shays	Tierney
Pryce (OH)	Sherman	Toomey
Quinn	Sherwood	Towns
Radanovich	Shuster	Trafficant
Rahall	Simpson	Turner
Ramstad	Sisisky	Udall (CO)
Rangel	Skeen	Udall (NM)
Regula	Skelton	Upton
Reyes	Slaughter	Velazquez
Reynolds	Smith (MI)	Visclosky
Riley	Smith (NJ)	Vitter
Rivers	Smith (TX)	Walden
Rodriguez	Smith (WA)	Walsh
Roemer	Snyder	Wamp
Rogan	Souder	Watkins
Rogers	Spence	Watt (NC)
Rohrabacher	Spratt	Watts (OK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stabenow	Waxman
Rothman	Stark	Weiner
Roukema	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Royce	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Ryan (WI)	Stump	Weller
Ryun (KS)	Stupak	Weygand
Sabo	Sununu	Whitfield
Salmon	Sweeney	Wickler
Sanchez	Talent	Wilson
Sanders	Tancredo	Wise
Sandlin	Tanner	Wolf
Sanford	Tauscher	Woolsey
Sawyer	Tauzin	Wu
Saxton	Taylor (MS)	Wynn
Scarborough	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Schaffer	Terry	Young (FL)
Schakowsky	Thomas	

NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage Strickland

NOT VOTING—26

Barton	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Lofgren	Rush
Campbell	Millender-	Shimkus
Capps	McDonald	Shows
Cook	Miller, Gary	Vento
Deutsch	Murtha	Waters
Ehrlich	Owens	Wexler
Gibbons	Oxley	
Hulshof	Paul	
Kaptur	Portman	

□ 1825

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

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for rollcall vote No. 26 because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous commitment in my district, I was absent for rollcall vote No. 26.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber today during rollcall vote No. 26 on S. 613. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 16, 2000, I was traveling in my district with Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, examining the devastating impact that high fuel and heating oil prices are having on Maine people. As a result, I missed four

votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following way:

Rollcall vote 22, yea; rollcall vote 23, nay; rollcall vote 24, aye; and rollcall vote 25, no.

GIL HODGES BELONGS IN BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Bay News in Brooklyn had this headline on their newspaper. It says, "Get Gil In. Brooklynites Demand, Put Hodges in the Hall of Fame."

Well, today, the veterans committee of major league baseball announced, once again, that Gil Hodges had been passed over. This is an outrage.

In fact, we all know that Gil Hodges was the first major league player to ever hit four home runs in a game. And those of us who are Met fans know that he was the first Met to ever hit a home run and, of course, the manager of the "Miracle Mets" of 1969.

But even the casual baseball fan knows that Gil Hodges deserves to be in the Hall of Fame. They know that he ranks 38 in home runs, with over 370; six seasons with 30-plus home runs. He hit twice, more than 40 home runs. He had a lifetime slugging percentage of nearly 500, and nine times he exceeded a 500 slugging percentage. He was a Gold Glove winner. He played on seven pennant winners and two World Series champions.

He was a hero to the people of Brooklyn and a baseball player that deserves to be in the Hall of Fame.

The Bay News said, "Get Gil In." All Brooklynites agree. The Committee on Veterans Affairs' should heed that call.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

U.S., INDIA, AND CHINA: TIME FOR NEW RELATIONSHIP

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in the latter part of March, President Clinton is scheduled to travel to India. His trip will mark the first visit by an American President to the world's largest democracy since 1978. I would say that a visit to India by the leader of the free world is long overdue, and I want to express my appreciation to the President for making this historic trip.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose this evening is to suggest that the Presi-

dent devote significant time during the trip to developing closer bilateral cooperation on defense and security issues to respond to common threats and challenges. This is an area where the need for a U.S.-India partnership is growing increasingly urgent. For years we have seen how many of the same forces of international terrorism that threaten American interests also pose a direct threat to India's security.

Another common threat faced by India and the United States emanates from the People's Republic of China. In the last week, we have seen China threatening Taiwan with military force, belying Beijing's claims to favor peaceful reunification. This is, unfortunately, a familiar pattern. U.S. naval officials in the Pacific are currently trying to defuse the situation, and the administration is obviously concerned about the implications that Beijing's saber-rattling will have in a variety of areas. In this House just a few weeks ago, we passed the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, which I supported.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the United States to stop basing so much of our Asia policy on the hope of achieving a strategic partnership with China. Instead, I believe we should recognize the benefits of closer defense ties with India, a country which, unlike China, is a democracy and which, also in contrast to China, does not threaten its neighbors with the kinds of rhetoric and actions that Beijing has most recently demonstrated with regard to Taiwan.

Toward this end, President Clinton's upcoming trip to India offers an opportunity to embark upon a new direction in U.S. policy in Asia. It is an opportunity to confront the threat posed by China to regional and independent national security and to make responses to this threat a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, India faces a very serious threat from China. The two countries share a border of approximately a thousand miles. In the 1960s, China initiated a border war against India and continues to occupy Indian territory. More recently, we have seen China providing missile development and nuclear technology assistance to Pakistan as well as other unstable regimes. Pakistan, a country currently ruled by military dictatorship, launched a border conflict against India last year in Kashmir and continues to threaten India in a number of ways, including by providing support and a base for terrorist movements active in Kashmir. By aiding Pakistan, China is indirectly, but in a very real sense, threatening its neighbor India.

India, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, does not engage in proliferation activities. India has developed its own indigenous nuclear weapon and missile systems, but it does not share the sensitive technology with other nations, much less with unstable regimes that support international terrorism. India does not seek to promote tensions among neighboring countries, as China

has cynically done in the India-Pakistan dispute.

Given Chinese behavior and the common threat it poses to the United States and India, I believe that President Clinton should use his trip to India as the occasion to launch a new Indo-U.S. defense partnership. I will be calling on the President to take this much-needed action.

While this is a bold new step, I believe we can lay the groundwork now for a far-reaching alliance between the United States and India, including greatly expanded International Military Education and Training, joint exercises and other military and political links that the U.S. currently maintains with our key democratic allies around the world. Such a partnership may take some time to fully develop, but now is the time for launching it and also pondering the details.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I maintain my view that the President should not go to Pakistan on his trip to South Asia. It is important that the administration continue to send the message to Islamabad that we are very concerned about Pakistan's role in promoting instability in Kashmir, about the links between Pakistan and terrorist organizations, and the crushing of civilian government by the military junta now in power.

Currently, Pakistan is not on the President's South Asia itinerary. Mr. Speaker, Pakistan has done nothing to deserve a visit by the President of the United States.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, Americans understand that, without campaign finance reform, attempts to restructure our healthcare system, create a prescription drug benefit, improve our communities, protect our environment will all be for naught. The big, important issues will remain trapped by the pressures of special interests and big-money politics.

The fight for campaign finance reform will not go away. I personally pledge to continue to make campaign finance reform one of Congress's most urgent priorities. However, opponents of real reform continue to create a legislative logjam. Deadlines are set and ignored.

June will mark the fifth anniversary of President Clinton and then House

Speaker Newt Gingrich shaking hands before a group of senior citizens and pledging to create a bipartisan campaign finance reform commission. As we all know, nothing ever came of it.

This last session, I was very encouraged when the Shays-Meehan bill passed the House by a large bipartisan vote. This important legislation, while not the ultimate solution, is a significant step forward. It would ban soft money contributions and deal with sham issue ads, which are so prevalent.

Despite the House's action, Shays-Meehan has met its death in the Senate. The other body was unable to terminate debate on this crucial issue. We lost the opportunity to make a real change.

I am fortunate to represent a very historic congressional district in northern New Mexico. During the winter recess, I traveled around my district and spoke to the people. In gathering after gathering, the issue of campaign finance reform kept coming up. I assured them that I would fight to put campaign finance reform on the front burner.

Voters in my State are so concerned that they are pushing for a publicly financed State system, which will be voted on in November. This constitutional amendment has solid grassroots support.

The State senator that introduced this constitutional amendment, Dede Feldman, and her colleagues in the State legislature should be applauded for having the courage to bring this issue to the forefront.

I had the opportunity today to proudly march with Granny D, the campaign finance reform champion who arrived in our Nation's capital. The determination of this 90-year-old woman and her crusade for reform is truly inspiring. I want to thank Granny D for her courageous efforts.

I honestly believe that, if our country's founders were here to witness today's campaigns, they would join us in this endeavor. Indeed, Alexander Hamilton wrote: "It will not be alleged that an election law could have been framed and inserted in the Constitution which would have been applicable to every probable change in the situation of the country; and it will not therefore not be denied that a discretionary power over elections ought to exist somewhere."

We have got to reform this system and preserve our precious democracy.

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

(Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SACAJAWEA GOLDEN DOLLAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the United States Mint has done a tremendous job of accelerating the production and shipment of the new Sacajawea Golden Dollars. The new coin is golden in color, with a smooth edge; and on the face of the coin is a picture of Sacajawea, the Native American woman who helped the Lewis and Clark expedition.

The Sacajawea Golden Dollar has been a huge success with the public since its release on January 26. In fact, there has been so much demand for the new coin that the U.S. Mint has doubled their production to five million Golden Dollars a day. By the end of February, there will be 200 million Golden Dollars in circulation. And by the end of this year, there will be, are you ready for this, one billion in circulation.

This is great news for the taxpayers. For it only costs the U.S. Mint about 12 cents to make a Sacajawea Golden Dollar. Then the Mint sells the coins to banks for one full dollar. This results in a direct profit to the Treasury of 88 cents on each coin issued.

At the end of this year, when one billion Golden Dollars are in circulation, the United States Treasury will have made a profit of over \$800 million. That profit will be eligible to help reduce our \$5.7 trillion national debt. That is right, the Treasury makes its profit from issuing coins, which helps to lower the debt of the Nation. How we have allowed ourselves to accrue such an enormous debt is a story for another time.

What I want to talk about is one of the mechanisms that allowed this monstrosity to happen and to try to ensure that it does not happen again. Many people assume that when the Government runs out of money it just fires up the printing presses and prints more money. This assumption is simply not true.

When the Government runs out of money, it borrows money at interest to feed its insatiable appetite. This is the foundation of our debt money system. Yes, our money system is a debt-based money system. That is why the interest payments on our \$5.7 trillion debt was over \$215 billion last year.

Simply, the Federal Government must stop spending more than it receives in taxes. Except in wartime and dire emergencies, it is unacceptable for the Government to spend beyond its means.

One way to minimize this debt trap would be for the Federal Reserve to buy zero-interest bonds. The process would work by allowing the Federal Reserve, or its surrogate, to buy zero-interest mortgages on needed State and local government infrastructure improvements. These mortgages would be amortized over a period of up to 30 years, depending upon the nature of the improvement.

My bill, H.R. 2777, the Transportation Infrastructure and Local Government

Capital Enhancement Act, would provide the Federal Reserve Board a replacement mechanism to accommodate the needed increases in the money supply without using debt money.

□ 1845

CURBING AMERICA'S DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, almost everyone is understandably upset about the recent rise in the price of gasoline. The really sad thing is that we could easily bring these prices down or at least keep them from going up further.

We have become far too dependent on foreign oil, with slightly over half, in fact some estimates as high as 60 percent, of our oil coming from other countries. This endangers our national security, in addition to hurting us in the pocketbook.

We are sitting on many billions of barrels of oil in Alaska and offshore other States but some extremists do not want us to drill for any oil, cut any trees or dig for any coal. In fact, one environmentalist once told me he hoped the price of gas would go to 3 or \$4 a gallon so more people would be forced to use mass transit and there would be less pollution.

We could drill for oil on less than 1 percent of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge in Alaska and potentially get billions of barrels of oil and billions more offshore from other States.

In 1998, the U.S. geologic survey estimated that the coastal plain of this Arctic Wildlife Refuge, an area set aside by Congress for evaluation of its oil and gas potential, could have up to 16 billion barrels of recoverable oil. This is equivalent to 30 years of Saudi oil imports.

The House Resources Committee web page states that "ANWR consists of 19 million acres in the northeastern corner of the State, of which 8 million has been designated as wilderness. The coastal plain of ANWR, designated as a study area for possible oil development in 1980, comprises 1.5 million acres, or 0.4 percent of the total acreage of Alaska. This debate centers on development which would affect only 2,000 acres within that 1.5 million acres with the potential to produce the largest unexplored onshore geologic structures known in the United States."

The Arctic Wildlife Refuge is almost 19.8 million acres, 1.5 million acres of which is flat, brown tundra without a tree or bush on it and very few animals. Yet the groups opposed to drilling never show pictures of this flat, brown tundra. They almost always show pictures of the Brooks Range which is mountainous with trees and animals, but no one has ever advocated oil exploration there.

The less than 1 percent area where the oil is can be explored without cutting one tree or bush or harming a single animal. Offshore oil can now also be produced in a very environmentally safe way.

I voted several years ago to require double hulls on oil tankers and have voted for many other environmental bills. But you cannot just shut down development of natural resources without destroying jobs, driving up prices, and hurting poor and working people most of all.

Often what is behind much of what happens here is big money. Some of these environmental extremists are some of the best friends extremely big business has.

I wonder if some companies which want us to import a lot of oil, or possibly the OPEC countries themselves, or possibly oil companies with big investments elsewhere simply do not want us drilling in Alaska because they would lose big money.

Are they supporting and funding some of these environmental groups because it is to their monetary advantage to do so?

I mean, if you are talking about drilling on only a couple of thousand or a few thousand acres out of an area many millions of acres in size and you can do so in a completely safe way environmentally, why do these people keep fighting it?

Almost all of these radical environmentalists come from wealthy families. But they will be hurting the poor and working people the most if they keep these oil prices from coming down.

Mr. Speaker, we should open up this less than 1 percent area of ANWR and certain other offshore areas, get many millions barrels of oil and become less dependent on foreign oil in the process.

If we do not, gas prices in the future could go even higher or not come down and millions of poor and working people will be the ones who are hurt the most.

IN MEMORIAM KENNETH L.
MADDY

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a humble attempt on my part to remember the life and contributions of a great leader in California, one Ken L. Maddy.

Mr. Speaker, all of California can be proud of the favorite son Fresno sent to Sacramento three decades ago. A legislator's legislator, Ken Maddy never was far from the Central Valley district and the agricultural industry he represented. He was elected to the assembly in 1970 in a district with a little over 30 percent Republican registration. As the Democrats of Fresno loved him, the Republicans of Sacramento looked to him for leadership. Senate

Republican leader Ken Maddy became known as the "go-to guy" for both Governors Deukmejian and Pete Wilson.

Senator Maddy combined grace with good looks. He loved people, and he loved life. Few men will ever match the positive impact he had on California politics. He believed in governing and the role of compromise in legislative politics. Smart, dedicated, trustworthy, Ken Maddy simply reflected the very best that California has to offer public affairs.

His special passion for horses and racing went back to his teenage years as a groom at Hollywood Park. Among many highlights of his legislative career, which ranged from efforts to strengthen our criminal justice system, to impacting ethics standards for State legislators, to preserving private property rights, are the real highlights, the California Center for Equine Health and Performance and the Equine Analytical Chemistry Laboratory at the University of California at Davis. Senator Maddy's private pride and joy was a horse named Work the Crowd. The California-bred champion filly now grazes in green pastures in the valley. Raising a brood of California champions, Work the Crowd probably wonders where her Ken has gone.

Senator Ken Maddy was a proud graduate of Fresno State and served as a member of the President's Club and the Bulldog Club. In 1999, the Kenneth L. Maddy Institute of Public Policy was dedicated at CSU-Fresno as a vital training ground for the next generation of Valley political leaders. He graduated from UCLA Law School in 1963, and in 1998 he was recognized as one of UCLA's outstanding graduates.

Ken Maddy, one of the most respected legislators to ever grace California's capital. On February 18, 2000, this prince of a leader, who dreamed of the sport of kings, passed on to be remembered forever by those who care about politics, the profession he loved.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to take a few moments along with a couple of my colleagues to talk about a very important issue that comes and goes in this institution of ours and we are hoping to be able to resurrect it again yes, even during this presidential election year, one that we hope will never go away until Congress gets it right, and that is the issue of campaign finance reform and the necessity to enact common sense reform to get the big money and the influence of money out of our political process.

There have been two very important events so far this year, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the campaign finance reform debate that we are having throughout

the Nation. One is a very important Supreme Court decision that was just handed down on January 24 of this year whereby the court basically upheld the constitutional authority of State legislatures and this body to be able to place campaign contribution limitations in the political process.

This is an important holding that the Supreme Court again resolved after the seminal case of Buckley v. Valeo during the 1970s in which the court upheld the ability of legislators to impose contribution limitations because oftentimes in this body during the course of campaign finance reform debates, one of the chief arguments against doing anything in an attempt to get the big money out, is that we have a free speech concern and a first amendment that we would be infringing upon if we start taking the big money out of the political process.

And lo and behold, now the Supreme Court this year basically said no to that argument. I think it gives new life and a breath of fresh air to the whole campaign finance reform debate. Hopefully it will provide more impetus to the cause across the country and more political courage quite frankly here in Washington to do the right thing.

The other event in regards to finance reform occurred today, actually on the steps of this Capitol where Granny D finished her long trek across the country in support of campaign finance reform. It is a marvelous story for my colleagues who have not heard about it yet. It is receiving a lot of attention nationally today since she concluded her long walk.

I brought with me today a picture that I was able to download off her Web site. It shows a picture of Granny D, a 90-year-old grandmother of eight, I believe, and a great grandmother of 12, someone who has arthritis and emphysema but felt strongly enough about the cause of campaign finance reform that she decided to make it a national issue by dedicating herself to walking across the country, starting out in Pasadena during the Rose Bowl of January 1 of 1999 last year and then traversing over 3,100 miles, traveling through 12 different States, receiving a lot of local media attention along her way, encouraging individuals to contact their representatives at the State and national level to impress upon them the urgency of campaign finance reform.

And now today she finally walked into Washington, D.C. and walked right up to the steps of this Capitol and delivered a marvelous, marvelous speech. I think a real inspiration for the cause of citizen advocacy and participation in our democratic process, especially given her own story. I will go into a little bit more detail but recognizing one of my colleagues' time constraints who would like to join in this discussion tonight, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), who I came to Congress with. And we helped form a freshman bipartisan

task force on campaign finance reform that he took a real leadership role in. And he has been a strong advocate for enacting finance reform with Shays-Meehan that did pass this body last year already and then languished in the United States Senate. I am glad he is here to join us this evening.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for putting together this special order. This has been an issue that you and I and others have been working on since we first came to Congress. We started, as you mentioned, with that freshman bipartisan task force, six Republicans and six Democrats; and over a period of several months, we negotiated out a bill that would ban soft money and make other changes in this system. But it would get the biggest of the big money out of politics, those soft money contributions to the national parties from wealthy individuals, corporations and labor unions.

As my colleagues will recall, in 1998, the freshmen on both sides of the aisle helped to drive that issue hard enough so the Republican leadership had to bring it up. And when it finally came up, we had a debate over several weeks and finally at last, the freshman bill did not pass but the Shays-Meehan bill did pass in 1998 and then, of course, we passed it again last year. But in 1998, if you add together those Members who voted for the freshman soft money ban with those Members who voted for the Shays-Meehan bill, some 352 Members, or 81 percent of the House, voted to ban soft money.

Unfortunately, that bill did not make it through the Senate in the 105th Congress; and so last year, in September, we did it again. In the House, we passed the Shays-Meehan bill in strong bipartisan fashion by a margin of 252-177. But to date, the other body, Members in the other body have blocked campaign finance reform from being passed.

Now, today, Granny D, Doris Had-dock, who walked from California to the steps of the Capitol in Washington, arrived in her 14-month campaign to publicize this issue and urge this Congress to act. I went down to Pennsylvania Avenue and walked with her and hundreds of others up the last stretch to get to the Capitol.

You have to admire her. When she made this commitment, made this decision, she was 88 years old. She trained for this activity to make sure that she was going to be able to walk 10 miles a day carrying a 25-pound pack on her back, and she did it. She got publicity all across this country. That kind of public determination, that kind of perseverance is what we need to help create the public energy to pass campaign finance reform in the other body. We need a law. We need a bill that will get rid of soft money once and for all. Let me just say a word about that.

□ 1900

The so-called hard money contributions are the contributions that are

limited, that go directly to campaigns, directly to individual candidates. But that system of limits is completely undermined if wealthy individuals, corporations, and labor unions can give unlimited amounts of money to the national parties, which can then be used to run TV ads in the districts of individual Members. So this system does not work; these rules do not work anymore.

Last year I warned that a failure to pass campaign finance reform would unleash a deluge of soft money contributions in this 2000 cycle, and, unfortunately, it has come true. The national political party committees raised a record \$107 million in soft money contributions during the 1999 calendar year. That is 81 percent more than the \$59 million they raised during the last comparable presidential election period in 1995.

Now, the opponents, the opponents, the big money coalition which tries to call itself the Free Speech Coalition, are always trying to argue that campaign finance reform's reasonable limitations on what individuals can give is a violation of the First Amendment, and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) just pointed out, not true.

The Supreme Court, in *Nixon versus Shrink Missouri Government PAC*, reaffirmed the constitutionality of contribution limits. It reaffirmed its view that the Government has a compelling interest in enacting contribution limits in order to protect the integrity of our democratic system. The Court reaffirmed that large donations can corrupt this process or create the appearance of corruption.

It is time to change this system. We have gone too far, allowing unlimited contributions to the national parties. This has been a position almost universally supported on the Democratic side of the aisle. Fortunately, we have had enough Republicans in the House who will come over and support campaign finance reform to achieve victory here. But victory here is not enough, because victory in the House alone does not make a law. We need to have enough public support, enough public pressure, to get this through the Senate.

I believe that when you look at what Granny D has accomplished, when you look at the Supreme Court opinion in *Nixon versus Shrink Missouri Government PAC*, that we are seeing a crescendo of support for campaign finance reform. It is incumbent upon all of us here to keep working on this issue, to keep talking about this issue, to keep reminding the voters that until we get campaign finance reform, we cannot, we cannot trust this system to produce the kind of results that we expect a democratic system to produce.

There is too much money in politics; there is too much big money in this system, and we have to get the biggest of the big money out of this system so that the people can have some confidence again that we are doing the public's business, and not the business of our largest contributors.

We still have the opportunity, we have most of a year, to enact real campaign finance reform this year and to stop the flow of big money, of soft money, to the national parties. We need bipartisan support in order to do that; we need support on both the House and the Senate side in order to do that. I think this is the year.

This is an important day. Granny D has made it an important day. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership on this issue, for helping to push this issue, and for holding this special order tonight.

Mr. KIND. I wanted to reciprocate that and thank my good friend from Maine for the work and leadership he has brought to this Congress for the cause of campaign finance reform. In fact, the great State of Maine has really led the revolution sweeping across the country right now by passing their own public referendum, going to public financing of State campaigns. It is already being used as a model in the many other State referenda today.

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman would yield for a moment, what we are doing in Maine is interesting and exciting. The 2002 elections will be the first where we have what we call the Clean Elections. The bill has been upheld by the court. Candidates for the State legislature and candidates for Governor can opt, can choose, to be a Clean Elections candidate. If they get the requisite number of signatures and a certain number of \$5 contributions, that is all, \$5 contributions, they will qualify for public financing.

I hope and pray that this system will be one way to reduce the influence of money in politics. I think it is a very interesting experiment, and I hope in time other States will follow Maine's lead.

Mr. KIND. It is an exciting development. It is going to be that type of snowball effect, sweeping across the country, with State legislatures each taking their own approach to financial reform, which will hopefully put more pressure to bear on the United States Congress to act.

It seems every session of Congress we have a discussion and debate about campaign finance reform, trying to get the big money out of the political process; but for one reason or another it has always come up short, most recently in the United States Senate where we ended up eight votes short of being able to break the filibuster over there. It is almost inconceivable that we have a majority of Members in the House and even in the Senate and a President down Pennsylvania Avenue who is more than willing to sign the legislation if it can pass the Congress, but it is being held up by a small vocal minority in the Senate filibustering it. Of course, we need 60 votes in order to break the filibuster and bring the legislation to the floor.

But I am sure my friend from Maine and also my good friend from New Jersey who has joined us for tonight's discussion would concur with me if we

dedicated tonight's special order in honor of Doris Haddock, Granny D, given her marvelous triumph and achievement, what she has accomplished and brought to our doorstep here today.

I would like to recognize the freshman Member from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), who is also serving with me on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, bringing an important perspective on education issues based on his scientific background, but also someone who has taken up the cause and has turned into a real leader in his own right on the need for finance reform.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, my friend, for organizing this special order.

As a freshman Member of Congress, it is fairly recent since I campaigned for election to this august body, and I still vividly remember running for Congress, a challenging experience, but a wonderful experience. It reminds one of what a magnificent place America is, full of hard-working and talented people. It reminds you that the citizens here truly care about the important issues facing each other and that we as a society can work to solve them.

But running for Congress also reminds you, reminds me, of something else, that our campaign finance system is broken and needs to be fixed desperately. We know it; the people know it. The only 38 percent of the voters who turn out to vote are sending a message in that way.

It is a campaign system where wealthy corporations can donate millions of dollars to political parties and drown out the voice of ordinary citizens. It is a campaign system where special interests can spend an unlimited amount of money on attack ads, I know, I have seen it, to smear and distort a candidate's record; and that is wrong. It is a campaign system where we as elected representatives have to spend an inordinate amount of time raising money, instead of addressing the issues.

Campaign expenditures have just gotten out of hand. In primary and general elections combined in the year 1976, all candidates for U.S. Congress spent a total of \$115 million. Twenty-two years later, at the most recent congressional election in 1998, candidates spent \$740 million, more than six times what was spent 22 years earlier. I am sure the amount of money in this year, 2000, will be even higher.

When you look at the low voter turnout and widespread cynicism, you realize that we have to deal with this key issue that has to do with trust in the Government. How can we hope to deal with the big problems that we face, whether it is Social Security, health care, transportation issues, defense issues, international affairs, where these are solutions that we seek as a society, together? How can we hope to have solutions to these problems that the people will have faith in if they feel

that solutions are determined by special interests? People understand that their voices are being drowned out.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) spoke earlier about the recent Supreme Court decisions, and I think there is cause for hope here.

The opponents of campaign finance reform always trot out the First Amendment guarantee of free speech. Well, the Supreme Court back in 1976 under *Buckley v. Valeo* gave them some support for that line of reasoning, that speech as spending could not be restricted. But last month in *Nixon v. Shrink the court* did hold up a statutory cap on gifts and donations to campaigns. That makes sense. But although it did not formally reexamine the issue of spending, the comments of the Justices give us cause for hope that they will allow some changes in the way campaign spending is regulated.

Recently in an article in the *Washington Post*, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Newton Minow, and Craig LaMay, Northwestern University journalism professor, wrote a very interesting piece, pointing out, they say, that a lawyer arguing a case in the Supreme Court is limited to 30 minutes of oral argument. Members of the House of Representatives, as we well know, are limited in the time we have available to speak. In Illinois, voters are given 5 minutes to complete their ballots. In none of these cases can the individual, no matter how well heeled, buy additional time. The process of governing ourselves is something that requires every citizen and is due to every citizen; and it should not be reapportioned according to the resources of those citizens.

So elections, say LaMay and Minow, are just as susceptible to distortion and destruction as any other institution would be if its rules allotted free speech according to one's ability to pay.

Well, it is a special pleasure to talk about this subject today, because we take some hope not only from the Supreme Court's words of a month ago, but a great deal of hope from the actions of Doris Haddock, Granny D. I, too, walked with Granny D today on her last mile, and stood with her as she gave a rousing and moving and very thoughtful speech on the steps of this Capitol. We applaud her; and I think it is appropriate, as you say, that we dedicate tonight's discussion to her.

She reminds us that we need to overhaul the current system and that it may be difficult; but step by step, we can do it. One of the best ways to do it is to start right now with what is in front of us, which is the ban on soft money. It is one of the essential steps and one of the first steps to begin restoring people's faith in government.

I would like to point out that on the day I was sworn in, the first thing I did was seek out my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), Republican cosponsor of the Shays-

Meehan campaign finance bill, seek out the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), and sit down with them and let them know that I take that to be the most important step we can take to restoring trust in government. So I joined with a large majority, a bipartisan majority of people here, in supporting the Shays-Meehan Campaign Finance Reform Act.

It now appears that this legislation is going to have trouble getting out of Congress this year, but we who care about government, and that is millions of people, and care that we have a government that is responsive to the people, rather than special interests, should not let up.

Granny D did not let up; and she made it clear she was not walking for Republicans; she was not walking for Democrats. She was walking for her children and her grandchildren and all of the other millions of people that they symbolize who want a government of the people.

□ 1915

I am delighted that the gentleman is doing this. I am pleased to join with the gentleman to talk about this great need to take some concrete steps to restore trust in our government. We look to the other body to finish the work that we have begun, but we cannot stop there. There are some other steps we need to take so that we have campaigns financed in a way that give everyone a voice in how they find solutions to the tough problems facing our society.

Mr. KIND. If the gentleman will yield back.

Mr. HOLT. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KIND. I commend the gentleman, again, for the gentleman's work, for the gentleman's contribution to this important issue. I think what we need, and was demonstrated a little bit on the steps of the Capitol, is a Granny D revolution in the country. She started that in no small part by committing herself to a cause that she feels very strongly in.

The gentleman is absolutely right, it was not a partisan issue, the Granny D; it was an American issue. It was an issue about the future of her grandchildren and her great-grandchildren and the stake of her democratic government that she loves so well, that she was willing to, even though she has emphysema and is arthritic, walk over 3,100 miles for this cause. It is such a marvelous story.

I do not know if the gentleman had an opportunity yet to tap into her Web site, but she put together a very good Web site, a lot of neat pictures. I would like to share the Web site address with any colleagues who are listening here tonight. It is www.GrannyD.com. Could not get any easier than that.

I would encourage those who are listening to take a little bit of time, a few minutes, and page through that Web site. It displays the beginning and the

end of her journey. What a great story it has been.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. KIND. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. On that subject, this was not a stunt. She was out there with the American people. She brought with her what she learned along the way. In a particularly moving part of her speech today on the steps, she talked about finishing her walk yesterday and starting her walk today at Arlington Cemetery.

As the gentleman knows, she walked in 10-mile segments approximately all across the country. She said those spirits were with her today as she walked through Washington and as she stood on the steps of the Capitol.

These are people who had fought for American ideals. She wondered, in fact, she was quite sure that they did not fight and die for a government that goes to the highest bidder, for a government where special wealthy interests have more voice than the common people, where we have, as some say, auctions, rather than elections.

It was moving when she put it in that context and when she put it in the context of all that she had heard from people in Arizona and in New Mexico and in Texas and in Tennessee and West Virginia. It was not a stunt. This is an effort to recapture what is great about the American government.

Mr. HOLT. And I had a chance to listen to her speech and also jot down some of the factors that motivated her for embarking upon this cause. Just to recite a few of those tonight: she was concerned that government is being corrupted through campaign contributions made by the big contributors, the big money going into campaigns that results, in her words, in a quid pro quo response from elected officials.

That has been a common theme during her talks or speech today as the growing cynicism and the perception of corruption in the political process. And it is a theme that is reiterated in the recent Supreme Court decision, *Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government*, in which the Justices in a six to three decision basically said legislators have the constitutional authority to limit the amount of money coming into campaigns, not only to combat corruption in the political process, but also to deal with the appearance of corruption in the political process.

That is an important point. Again, the opponents of reform are always quick to come down to the House floor arguing against a piece of legislation by trying to turn the issue around, by pointing to us and saying listen, RUSH HOLT, you have accepted campaign contributions. Do you feel corrupted? Do you feel like you are influenced now because of those contributions? Asking us to specifically cite instances of corruption that might be going on in the halls of this great body.

The Supreme Court says that is really beside the point. It could be one jus-

tification, a constitutional underpinning for why Congress feels the need to limit the amount flowing into campaigns. But there is also another very important reason, and that is the appearance of corruption, that all this money flowing into the campaigns have on the American people, on people like Granny D, who cited it.

It is really giving cause, I feel, to the growing cynicism that is permeating our society and why we are seeing voter participation declining election year after election year. It is because they feel a disempowerment.

A couple of other reasons that she cited, she feels that the politicians today do not give enough concern to people who do not contribute the big money, no matter how important the issue might be. She also saw an opportunity to do something about it, and she did. She felt politically powerless, this is in her words, something that no American should ever feel.

She sees the three most important things that our government must do in regards to financial reform is, A, banning the soft money; B, enacting the public financing of an election, starting at local levels and working up, just as the State of Maine has done, and we will see it play out this year for the first time during an election cycle; and, finally, the right to free political advertising on a controlled scale.

Finally, these are ideas that we have been working with in the context of finance reform, ideas that she again cited in support of her cause for finance reform.

But during the course of her travels, she was interviewed by the national media numerous times. Some of the early morning talk shows had her on, *Eyewitness*. She said she met a lot of wonderful people who would feed and house her at different times in different States. She went through four pairs of sneakers during her 3,100-mile hike.

The people around the country would come up to her and say things such as, you are walking for me, Granny. You are my voice. You are my face. God bless you. And get this, she even caught pneumonia in Arizona, of all places. She needs to come and visit my great State of Wisconsin before she gets some real pneumonia. But she recovered. After she recovered, she kept going with her walk.

Her intent was actually to conclude her walk on the steps of the Capitol on February 24, which was her 90th birthday. Unfortunately, she was a few days late in arriving, but her message was as strong arriving today as it would have been even on the 24th.

Her message focuses on getting people to contact their Federal representatives to get them to support Shays-Meehan on the House side and the McCain-Feingold bill on the Senate side. During her walk she gained increasing support from both public and national leaders.

Granny D's concern is that the government is being corrupted through

money from large contributors. Just to quote a couple of statements that she made during a New Hampshire town hall meeting last October, 1999, she said,

First, we do need to get soft money out of our elections with the Federal law. A minority of Senators did not want to take their medicine last week when they killed the McCain-Feingold bill in Washington, so we will have to make them take their pill when they come home for reelection. If they won't get soft money out of the system, and they have turned down opportunities to do so 4 years in a row, then it is simply time for us to get them out of the system.

That I think is a very important point, because in all issues such as this it ultimately becomes an election issue, and what campaigns and elections are all about: who you support for the issues that you want to see pursued and enacted in the United States Congress.

Until there are enough Americans, I feel, that feel strongly enough about the appearance of corruption or even the corruption itself in the political process and start holding their representatives' feet to the fire and make this an election year issue, I am afraid it is going to continue to languish, and it will continue to meet excuse after excuse for failing to enact it.

That is why I think good policy is making good politics, even in the presidential campaigns today. We have seen Senator McCain talking about this issue. He is the chief cosponsor, along with my Senator, Russ Feingold, from Wisconsin driving this issue in the Senate for many years already. I think that has been resonating with the American people, and why he has been receiving the support that he has during the course of the campaign season.

Vice President Al Gore has also been a champion of McCain-Feingold and Shays-Meehan, and is fully supportive of the reform bill. Senator Bill Bradley, another presidential candidate, is in strong support of campaign finance reform.

I think in this instance, in this election year, good policy is going to make for good politics.

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

Mr. KIND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman commented a few moments ago that Granny D spoke about a feeling of powerlessness. I hope she does not feel powerless now as she sees the thousands of people who joined her on the steps of the Capitol, who are joining her on her web site, who are joining her at every stage here.

It is interesting, many of them carried signs and chanted, "Granny D speaks for me." It is perhaps ironic that a rather diminutive 90-year-old has such a powerful voice. In fact, when she stood up to the microphone she did have a powerful voice, but an even more powerful voice in her actions.

She spoke about this cynicism that people have. I hasten to say that our

colleagues here are honorable people, almost all driven by real altruism. But there is a perception out there in the country, and this is what the gentleman spoke about when he talked about the Supreme Court, a perception that is crippling, crippling our democracy, a perception that anything that comes out of Congress is determined by the wealthy special interests. We need to take action on that. I really commend the gentleman for doing this.

Some States are doing some things. In New Jersey, we have public financing of the gubernatorial campaigns. It works well. It is not a perfect solution. The soft money ban that we have been talking about this evening is not a complete solution, but it certainly is a good first step.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, with the remaining moments that we have in this special order, I would like to get into a little bit of the teeth, the meat of what the Supreme Court ruled last month in upholding the ability of legislators to impose limitations on the amount of money flowing into the campaigns. It was a 6 to 3 decision, which is a very good, decisive decision.

The opinion was written by Justice Souter. I would just like to pull out a few of the quotes that Justice Souter used within his majority opinion.

One is getting at the appearance of corruption, in which he wrote, "The prevention of corruption and the appearance of corruption was found to be a constitutionally sufficient justification". In that he was referring to *Buckley v. Valeo*, the 1970 Supreme Court decision.

He also went on to write,

In speaking of improper influence and opportunities for abuse in addition to quid pro quo arrangements, we recognize the concern, not confined to bribery of public officials, but extending to the broader threat from politicians too compliant with the wishes of large contributors. These were the obvious points behind a recognition that the Congress could constitutionally address the power of money to influence governmental action in ways less blatant and specific than bribery.

Justice Souter also went on to write, Democracy works only if the people have faith in those who govern, and that faith is bound to be shattered when high officials and their appointees engage in activities which arouse suspicions of malfeasance and corruption.

What was also interesting in the decision, Chief Justice Rehnquist joined the majority in the 6-3 decision, but also Justice Stevens' concurring opinion that he wrote. It is relatively short, and I would like to quote liberally from that concurring opinion, because I think what he had to write makes a lot of sense and is the direction that we would like to see the constitutional analysis, at least in finance reform, go in this country.

Justice Stevens wrote, "Justice Kennedy," who wrote a dissenting opinion,

Suggests that the misuse of soft money tolerated by this Court's misguided decision in *Colorado Republican Federal Campaign*

*Comm. v. Federal Election Commission . . . demonstrates the need for a fresh examination of the constitutional issues raised by Congress' enactment of the Federal Election Campaign Acts of 1971 and 1974 and this Court's resolution of those issues in *Buckley v. Valeo*.*

□ 1930

"In response to his call for a new beginning, therefore, I make one simple point." And it is a point I felt was not just simple but really gets to the heart of it, and I decided to blow it up here tonight to emphasize the importance of it in the underlying decision. "I make one simple point. Money is property; it is not speech."

Mr. Speaker, that, I think, has been the main crux of the opposition, or at least the opponents' argument to campaign finance reform, is that we cannot do this. We cannot limit the amount of money coming into campaigns. We cannot ban the soft money contributions, the unlimited unregulated millions of dollars that are flooding the parties' campaign coffers every election season, because it would be an infringement on the First Amendment freedom of speech clause. Here we have a Court basically saying, no, that argument does not hold water.

Justice Stevens got more direct to the point where he says: Money is property. Let us not fool ourselves. It is not speech.

Justice Stevens went on to write in his concurring opinion: "Speech has the power to inspire volunteers to perform a multitude of tasks on a campaign trail, on a battleground, or even on a football field." I think he was referring to Vince Lombardi on that last one.

Money, meanwhile, has the power to pay hired laborers to perform the same tasks. It does not follow, however, that the First Amendment provides the same measure of protection to the use of money to accomplish such goals as it provides to the use of ideas to achieve the same results.

Finally, he wrote,

Reliance on the First Amendment to justify the invalidation of campaign finance regulations is the functional equivalent of the Court's candid reliance on the doctrine of substantive due process as articulated in the two first prevailing opinions in *Moore versus East Cleveland*. The right to use one's own money to hire gladiators or to fund speech by proxy certainly merits significant constitutional protection. These property rights, however, are not entitled to the same protection as the right to say what one pleases.

I think it was such a strong concurring opinion that Justice Stevens wrote that I wanted to share that. But Justice Breyer also in a concurring opinion brought up another valid point. He acknowledges that speech is not money, or money is not speech, but he said, "On the one hand, a decision to contribute money to a campaign is a matter of First Amendment concern. Not because money is speech, it is not, but because it enables speech." And that is why the Court in their holding opinion said that so long as the con-

tribution limits do not get so ridiculously low that it inhibits or prevents an individual being able to communicate or get their message out, it will then withstand constitutional scrutiny by our third branch, the highest Court in the land.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought that was a very important Supreme Court decision that hopefully will have reverberations throughout the context of campaign finance reform. And why is this important? Because the lid has just blown off any type of semblance of control or limitations in the amount of money coming into campaigns.

I brought with me a chart to illustrate what I am talking about. This chart demonstrates the amount of soft money contributions that have been flowing into the parties' campaigns over the last few presidential election years. Notice in 1987-1988 presidential campaign there was roughly \$45 million in soft money contributions. That is when the political parties first started realizing there is a huge gaping loophole that exists in campaign finance reforms, and they started taking advantage of it back in the 1988 presidential campaign.

That soon escalated to \$86 million in the 1992 campaign. It jumped to \$262 million in the 1996 presidential campaign. And according to current estimates of the amount of soft money that is being raised in the current presidential campaign, we are on pace of more than doubling the 1996 soft money contributions; anywhere from \$500 million up to \$750 million in soft money contributions.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I mean by the lid has just been blown off. They are driving truckloads of money through the loophole that exists right now with campaign financing. And if it is not creating the potential for corruption in the political process, it certainly has created already the appearance of corruption in the political process.

That, I think, is a compelling reason enough by itself to fight for campaign finance reform so we can restore a little bit of dignity and integrity to our government and hopefully instill a little bit of faith with the American people that there is not this big "for sale" sign hanging over the United States Congress and we are going to the largest contributor.

That is not what our founders intended this government to mean. It was envisioned to be a process that all Americans could feel they could participate in. But so long as there is the appearance that it is the big money contributors that are gaining access, that are controlling the agenda, and also controlling the outcome of the agenda, I think we are going to only see more and more cynicism growing throughout this country.

I yield to the gentleman, again.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. Talking politically for a moment, the cynics say we will not do

anything, it does not poll. The opinion polls, when we ask people what do they care about, the pollsters come back and say campaign finance reform is way down the list. It does not poll. Let me tell my colleagues that certainly in my district, and certainly in all the districts that Granny D walked through, it is very much on people's minds.

It is not clear in people's minds how to deal with it, but they know we must deal with it. It is not just a political issue on a list of items. It is not just another item for a plank in a political platform. This is fundamental to our democracy. It is fundamental to our system of government and people understand that.

That is why this is of utmost importance. So that we can be able, so that we can deal with these other tough problems that we as a country face. We have got to get on with it.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, again. Again, coming back to what Justice Souter wrote in his majority opinion *Nixon v. Shrink* last month, writing for the majority perhaps he said it best, that countering the perception that politicians are being bought is a proper justification for regulating donations. Directly quoting from his opinion, he said, "Leave the perception of impropriety unanswered and the cynical assumption that large donors call the tune would jeopardize the willingness of voters to take part in democratic government."

That, I think, basically summarizes the crux of what the Supreme Court was getting at saying: Congress, hey, you have the ability under the Constitution to limit contributions. And after this recent Supreme Court decision, the chief obstacle to achieving a less corrupt campaign finance system is not the U.S. Constitution but the people hiding behind it and using that Constitution as an excuse for inaction. And that, I think, is our chief obstacle that we face today.

A willing Congress can now take action to solve the problem of big money and the influence of money in our political process. The political will, not the constitutional authority, is really the only missing ingredient that we have here today. And I feel in my analysis of the Supreme Court decision, and a lot of constitutional experts who looked at it as well, basically view this recent decision as giving us the green light for the ban on soft money contributions. All the underlying justifications for upholding spending limits in the State of Missouri I feel has the same constitutional application to what we were trying to accomplish in this session of Congress, and that is just an out-and-out ban on soft money contributions before it becomes unmanageable and before, what I think, decent people do indecent things for the sake of the money race that has come to dominate and become all-important in these type of political campaigns.

So that, I think, is really the challenge that we face today. I cannot emphasize this enough, that until the American people really start holding their representatives' feet to the fire on this issue and start making it an election issue, until they are going to go out and support people who are in favor of reform who are no longer going to try to defend the status quo, the status quo that I feel is not working the way it should for the average person back home in my district in western Wisconsin, I do not think we are going to see a strong political push then to overcome the resistance that we still encounter in the United States Senate on this issue. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman's class came to Congress a couple of terms ago, including the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman deserves a lot of credit for this. He has gotten some reinforcement from our class, this freshman class, and this one representative from New Jersey is going to be with them all the way until we can get good sensible campaign finance reform. The people want it. We need it for the sake of our democracy.

And I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin very much for all that he is doing. I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for his efforts. And, of course, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) who have carried the banner for this here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his participation tonight and also for the work that he is doing for the sake of getting finance reform finally passed and signed and enacted into law in this country.

What I would like to do is with the remaining minutes that we have left is to cite a Time Magazine article that came out on February 7, 2000. It was a special investigation Time Magazine and it is titled "Big Money in Politics: Who Gets Hurt?"

It is very insightful, I think, investigation and review of some of the issues that we have been working on here in Congress and what the authors, at least, the investigators feel is the influence of money with these issues.

The article is entitled "How the Little Guy Gets Crunched" and they cite specific chapter and verse and list specific instances that they feel has a direct correlation between the large money contributors and the influence or outcome of legislation or access and action in Washington and the impact that it has on smaller people who do not write the big checks throughout the country.

The case that they cite, they reviewed, is the issue of the banana wars that is going on between the United States and the European Union right now. I believe it is an important WTO issue, however, where the EU has been found in violation of World Trade Orga-

nization rules by prohibiting the importation of bananas from certain areas in Central and South America. But the authors of this article point as one of the underlying causes of why the United States was quick to react and to condemn the European Union and even apply trade sanctions, which we are allowed to do when we have a violation of WTO, is because of the family ownership of the Chiquita company and their role in the political process.

In fact, they tracked the amount of contributions that the owner of Chiquita has made in the course of campaigns starting back in 1991 and continuing through 1999, and the amount of sums that have been given, which really are extraordinary from one family in this country. Just to cite a couple of years, in 1996, the owners of Chiquita contributed \$736,000 to the Republican Party, \$114,000 to the Democrats. 1997, they contributed \$460,000 to the Republican Party, \$116,000 to Democrats. 1998, they contributed \$1.1 million to the Republican Party, \$217,000 to the Democratic Party. 1999, \$555,000 to the Republican Party and \$260,000 to the Democratic Party.

Again, I think the point the authors are making in this Time Magazine article is that if this is not buying influence and access to government decision-making, the appearance sure stinks and it is giving this appearance of corruption and that the United States is not moral holy ground when it comes to our dispute with the European Union over this banana fight. And then they cite specific examples of individual entrepreneurs, small business owners in the country who have been adversely affected because of the sanctions that are now applied against the European Union because of their violation of import quotas on bananas.

One individual in particular, Timothy Dove, has a small business in Somerset, Wisconsin, Action Battery, whereby he has to import batteries from Germany in order to service his business and to keep him in business. It just so happened that the Trade Representative's designation of certain items now that we are going to be hitting with sanctions because of this banana war applies to those batteries that he needs to import in order to keep his business vibrant and strong and to keep it coming.

□ 1945

Now, here is a little guy who is trying to provide for his family with a small business back in Wisconsin, and all of a sudden he gets caught up in this gargantuan trade war between the United States and the European Union over bananas. If he would have woke up one morning and someone said that bananas were going to have a devastating and adverse impact on his health and his life, he would have thought they were crazy. But because of these effects of the sanctions now that are being applied and the designation of items that are being hit with sanctions coming

from the European Union, his business now is in jeopardy of surviving.

And Mr. Dove is not a big contributor to either of the political parties. The authors, again, in this article insinuate that the reason why he is the one getting hurt in this big banana war more than someone else is because he is not a big contributor to the political parties.

This is just a very interesting article that Time magazine reported on that the authors had investigated. Again, it gets back to what the Supreme Court in their decision in Nixon was basically saying, that if there is not reason enough not to prevent corruption from occurring in the political process to justify campaign finance reform, there is certainly enough reason because of the appearance of corruption that other people sitting back in Wisconsin, for instance, the Mr. Doves throughout the country have towards the political process that adds to the cynicism and I think disenchantment and eventually disenfranchisement of their participation in the political process.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from characterizing the Senate action or inaction.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON MARCH 8, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS (during special order of Mr. KIND), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-505) on the resolution (H. Res. 425) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1827, GOVERNMENT WASTE CORRECTIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SESSIONS (during special order of Mr. KIND), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-506) on the resolution (H. Res. 426) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) to improve the economy and efficiency of government operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NIGHT-SIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening during the next hour I would

like to have a night-side chat with my colleagues in regards to a number of different issues.

The first issue that I would like to start out with is the death tax or the estate tax. Then I would like to move on and cover a few points on the marriage penalty tax, move from there to an issue that I think has become fundamentally important to the defense of this country, and that is the missile defense. In fact, tonight I intend to spend a good deal of time discussing the missile defense of the United States of America.

Then if we have an opportunity, I would like to move on to the Social Security earnings limitation repeal. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has stepped forward. And I think tomorrow we will see a very close to a unanimous vote to lift the earnings cap for those people between 65 and 70 years old who are being unfairly penalized by the tax law.

So I do publicly want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), and I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON). Both of those gentlemen have worked very hard.

I also want to congratulate the Democrats who have finally come on board with the Republican bill to help us get rid of this unfair taxation. Then if we have a little time after that, I would like to talk about the Internet, a taxation on the Internet. So there are a number of issues tonight on our night-side chat that we can discuss.

But let us first start with the death tax. What is the death tax, number one? Number two, what property does this tax tax that has not already been taxed? In this country, there is a tax called the estate tax. If one's accumulation of property during one's lifetime, property, by the way, of which one already has paid taxes upon at least once, if that property accumulates over a certain amount of money, the Government comes in after one's death and mandates upon one's surviving members, one's family, that an additional tax be levied on this property that has already been taxed.

It is probably in our Tax Code the most unfair, punitive tax that we have got. There is no basis of justification to go and tax somebody upon their death, their estate upon their death, on property that throughout their entire lifetime they have paid taxes after taxes after taxes. It is as if the Government just did not get enough.

Now, one would ask, why is something like that in our Tax Code? Why is it not easy just to take it out? Well, I can tell you. The Clinton administration, and, frankly, most of the Democrats in the House, have opposed taking or getting rid of the estate tax. They say it is a tax for the rich.

Well, what I invite those people to do is come out, for example, to the State of Colorado or go to any State in the Union and take a look at small businesses that are now being impacted by

the death tax. Take a look at what happens to families from the personal level when the Government comes into their life after having taxed their property throughout their life and says we have got to take one more hit at the deceased. We need to go in and assess a tax simply based on the reason that they died.

This tax has devastating impacts. I will give my colleagues an example. I have a good friend of mine who is now deceased. But this friend, we will call him Mr. Joe, Mr. Joe years and years ago started out as a bookkeeper in a local construction company. He worked very, very hard in that construction company. After a while, he got an opportunity through years of hard work to buy some stock in the construction company. He was not a wealthy man. But he and his family, his wife, they scraped together a few pennies here, a few pennies there. They watched their expenses, and they invested in stock.

Well, 5 or 6 years ago, in some of his investments, he sold some of those investments, and he was hit with a tax called capital gains.

Now, most of the citizens of this country will be assessed a capital gains taxation. If one's mutual funds, if one bought property, if one owns stock outside of mutual funds, it is a gain upon property that one has made, and they give a capital tax on it.

So that is what they did when Mr. Joe sold his property. He was hit with a capital gains taxation at that time, which was around the rate of 28 percent.

So take out a pencil, figure out that Mr. Joe, who had worked throughout his entire life, had accumulated property, sold a portion of that property, and on the profit on that property, 28 percent taxation.

Unfortunately, my friend Mr. Joe became terminally ill within a month or so after the sale of this property. Even more unfortunate was that he passed away 2 or 3 months after that. The Government then came in to that family and said we realize that your father in this case has paid on time as a responsible citizen of this country taxes on the property that now belongs to the estate. But we are here for a second dip in the pot. The Government has come back, and we think it is necessary to tax the estate of the deceased person. What did they do to that estate? Exactly what they did to that estate, they hit it with taxes which, when you add it to the capital gains tax, gives it an effective tax rate of about 72 percent. Seventy-two percent on that estate is what was paid in taxation.

Now, let me tell you where the hardship comes in. Number one, 72 percent, imagine, you kind of figure out in your own mind what property you have in your home, what property you and your family has in your home that you own. Then try to determine 72 percent of it that you would like to cut out of it to give to the Government, even though you already paid taxes on it.

What happened to the estate is, of course they did not have the cash to pay for the 72 percent. They had to sell assets. They had to go out and sell more of the property to pay the 72 percent tax rate that was imposed upon them.

What happens? What happens to the death tax money? Where does it go? I will tell you exactly where it goes. It goes to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. That money is transferred from your communities. In this particular case, it was transferred out of a small community in Colorado in my district, the mountains of Colorado; and it was sent, transferred to Washington D.C. to be distributed amongst the bureaucrats and the agencies in Washington, D.C.

Where would that money have gone had it not been transferred to Washington, D.C. through that death tax? That is a legitimate question. Where would it have gone? Do you know where it would have gone and where it did go? Prior to the tax, prior to the Federal Government stepping into that community, prior to the Federal Government stepping into that estate and taking that money, that money stayed in the community of that small town in the mountains of Colorado.

That was the money that helped fund the local church. That was the money that helped fund the jobs for many, many people in that community. That was the money that bought property and made rental units available in that community.

Now what has happened to that money? It is no longer in that community. It has gone on to Washington, D.C. Because Washington, D.C. is here in the East, they seem to think they know better. They seem to think they need to take one more punch at you, one more punch on the estate tax.

Now we have heard a lot of rhetoric lately. In fact we have even heard some of the rhetoric from the Democrats. Let me make a note here. I compliment the Democrats tomorrow for coming over and assisting us in passing and getting rid of the earnings limitation on Social Security. I wished they would have joined us earlier, but they are joining us, and they should deserve credit for that.

I am not attempting to be partisan here, but I want to make a clear distinction on what is happening on this death tax; and that is, we are not getting help to eliminate this death tax from the Democratic leadership or from the Democratic administration. In fact, let me tell my colleagues exactly what has happened in the last couple of weeks.

I sit on the Committee on Ways and Means; and on this committee, we do all the taxation. We deal with all the taxation issues. It is probably the most powerful committee in the House of Representatives. In looking at that, we get the President's budget. We just got the President's budget a couple of weeks ago.

Do my colleagues know what the Democrats have done with the death

tax? I was in hopes that the Democrats, while I did not really expect them, their leadership to move the party to get rid of the death tax, which is the most unfair tax we have in the system. That was too good to be true to expect them to join us, the Republicans, in our effort to eliminate the tax. I expected them probably to stay neutral.

We hear a little rhetoric about how it is unfair, but they really would not change. I was very surprised. More than surprised, I was extremely disappointed that the President in his budget, the Democrats through the President in that budget, not only did not stay neutral on the death tax, they are actually increasing the death tax. That is right.

For any of you people out there that own a small farm or a ranch or a business or a home in an area where you have seen vast depreciation, hold on to your britches because the Clinton budget increases your taxes by almost \$10 billion, a \$10 billion increase in the death tax in this country.

Come on. How much more can one beat out of a person? Let us be fair to the citizens of this country. I know the bureaucracy in Washington is hungry. I know it is constantly looking for some more money to eat up, some more money to take out of our local communities and transfer out of our States to Washington, D.C. But a \$10 billion increase in the death tax, it is unfair. It is not right.

You are being unfair to the American people. You do not need that additional taxation. You do not need to go out there and seek 10 billion more dollars off the grieving families and off the estates of these families.

Let us be fair. Let us support things like eliminating that death tax. It is unfair. I can give my colleagues example after example after example. In fact, my colleagues here on the House floor can think of it in their own mind, think about their own communities. Ask the question: Is SCOTT MCINNIS in his night-side chat correct? Where is that money? Is the money in my community really going to Washington, D.C. because one of our citizens died and happened to leave an estate that the Government decided it should tax? Of course he is right. Of course that is where the money goes.

We need to have the American people be fully aware of the facts. The facts are these: Republicans will continue their fight to eliminate the death tax in this country. But the Democratic administration that we have right now will continue its efforts to increase the death tax.

For some of my colleagues on the Democratic side, if they do not believe me, look it up in the budget. It is right there: \$10 billion. \$10 billion.

Tonight is a good night to talk about some of these taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, as we go back to our districts, as most of us do every weekend, I certainly do every weekend, there is tax relief out there that I as a Republican am proud

that the Republican Party put into place.

□ 2000

Most American citizens do not realize that probably the largest tax break they have gotten in years just happened a couple of years ago thanks to the efforts of the Republicans. And, frankly, we had some conservative Democrats who came across the aisle and supported us on it as well. That is the tax on the sale of a principal residence, on a home.

Under the old law, if a person bought a home for, say, \$10, and then that home was sold for \$15 and there was a \$5 profit, that person had to pay taxes on that \$5 capital gain. That word capital gain comes back. There was an assessed tax on that capital gain unless an individual was, one, over 55 years of age; two, the amount of the gain did not exceed \$150,000; and, three, an individual only got one exemption. Once a lifetime.

Everybody out there who is a homeowner should listen up because it is important. We have seen appreciation of real property values, of homes. We have seen appreciation in this country, and we have great news, thanks to the Republican efforts on this side. And I keep coming back to this because I am proud of it and I like boasting about it. I do not mind saying it is the Republicans that did this because we did. Now, a person owning a home that sells that home for a profit, and that is the principal residence that they have lived in for the last 3 of 5 years, they get to take that amount of money, up to \$250,000 per person, \$500,000 per couple, and it is exempted from any taxes. It is exempt. That person gets to take that money and put it into their pocket.

Now, under the old law, the taxes could be deferred by buying a house of equal or greater value. That is not a requirement under the law we passed here a couple of years ago. We simply said that when an individual makes the profit, up to \$250,000 per person, they can put it in their pocket. And by the way, there is no age limitation. And by the way, we allow that individual to renew this effort. This can be done every couple of years. A person can go and get this tax break.

This is significant. And every homeowner in this country should know about it because at some point or another they will have a big smile on their face because they are going to be able to put a lot of cash, if their property has appreciated, right into their pocket without sending that money to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C.

I want to talk about one other tax issue that I think is important and that is unfair. Marriage couples. I represent the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. That is the mountains. Essentially the mountains in the State of Colorado. Out there I have almost 70,000 people, in fact, 69,766 people, who live in the Third Congressional District of Colorado that have

an additional penalty on their taxes simply because they are married. Simply because they are married. I could not believe it.

This bill that we passed, that we put together on the Republican side, said, hey, Democrats, Republicans, unaffiliated, whatever, let us stand up and get rid of the marriage tax penalty in our Tax Code. We are a country whose foundation is family. We encourage family. We want our young people to have families. We want them to be married. We want to go back to the cycle of family's right; family's number one. We say that, but on the other hand our Tax Code taxes them, taxes them for being married.

Well, the Republicans in this House, with some Democrats, 40 or so Democrats, passed a bill a couple of weeks ago to eliminate the marriage penalty. Now, I think the President is probably going to veto it. I cannot imagine that he would, but he is probably going to do it. And I was frankly really surprised that some of the Democrats would vote against this. Come on, how do they go back to their districts and look somebody in the eye and say, "You're getting married? Congratulations. Time to take a little more money out of your pocket and transfer it to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C."

It is an unfair tax. We ought to do something about it. We ought to eliminate it. And to the Democrats that voted no, they will probably have another chance this session to vote on that bill again when it comes back out of conference, and I hope they support us. I hope they stand up and vote and I hope they have the courage to say, look, it is an unfair tax.

Politics aside, election year aside, let us be fair to the taxpayers. Let us let married couples not be penalized for being married. Let us let families who have had a death in their family not get an additional death tax. We can do something. We showed that we could do something on the capital gains when a home is sold and it has not brought the government to its knees. That money has not been buried in the ground somewhere. It is recirculated in the communities. We have helped the homeowner, now we can help the married couple and now we can help the families of the deceased by revisiting these tax codes and by eliminating these unfair penalties on these people.

Now, let me cap off, before I get into something that I think is extremely serious, extremely serious, by once again to publicly commend my fine colleague, the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. SHAW), and my fine upstanding colleague, the gentleman from the State of Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), on their efforts today in the Committee on Ways and Means, which passed unanimously, unanimously, the Democrats joined us, in eliminating the earnings cap for those on Social Security between the ages of 65 and 70.

Over 70 that cap was lifted, but between 65 and 70 citizens were actually

penalized if they had worked all their lives and decided they wanted to continue to work between the ages of 65 and 70. They were penalized under the Social Security System. Today, that bill passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas. Tomorrow we will have it on the House floor, and I would expect that tomorrow we will have a strong vote.

It is not assured. I was surprised on the marriage penalty and doing away with that. I thought everybody would vote for that, but some of our colleagues on the Democratic side voted against it. But tomorrow I hope my colleagues on the Democratic side will join us and get rid of that earnings cap. I hope they will join us, put aside the election year, put aside the partisanship and join us and let us get rid of it. Let us make the Tax Code fair for everybody.

So a recap real carefully on these tax issues. Number one, we need to eliminate the death tax. It is unfair, it is unjustified, it is punitive, meaning it is a penalty. It is a penalty on the taxpayers of this country to be taxed on property they have already paid taxes on simply because they die.

Number two, we need to recognize that the Congress under the Republican leadership passed successfully for every homeowner in this country an opportunity for them to take the profit from their home and put it right into their pocket.

Number three, we need to eliminate the marriage penalty. It is unfair, fundamentally unfair, for us, as the government of this country, for the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., to penalize a couple because they are married. It should be the policy of this Congress and every other Congress to follow that we encourage marriage in this country; that we tell people to go out and focus on that family and not worry about being penalized by the government.

And, finally, let me wrap this portion of the comments up by saying that I hope tomorrow we have uniform support on this House floor to eliminate the earnings cap on Social Security. And any of my colleagues out there who have constituents out there between the ages of 65 and 70, they know exactly what we are talking about. Tomorrow's debate should be short, it should be to the point, because the issue is right.

Let us move on. I want to visit this evening in some depth here for the next half-hour or so about missile defense. And I think really the best way to get into this, and I do not like reading a script when I speak on my night-side chats, but I think it is probably an appropriate entry or a lead or a path to follow when we talk about the missile defense of this country.

First, let me precede the reading of these articles with a very strong statement. Every other country in the

world, every nation in the world understands this message: The United States of America has the fundamental right, the fiduciary responsibility, and the obligation to defend its citizens. And we will defend our citizens. And as a part of that defense, they should not dare criticize this country for putting together a missile defense system to take down an incoming missile into this country. Not offensive, defensive.

We have an obligation. My colleagues on this floor, each and every one of us, share that responsibility to be sure that our generation, the next generation, and the generations to follow have the weapons and the tools to defend themselves from aggressors of freedom and against freedom. It is our fundamental obligation as Congressmen of the United States of America.

Let me begin. An article in the Dallas Morning News, that is where I pulled it down from, written by William Safire. Think about this, because this article is really pertinent tonight. As my colleagues know, we have several primaries going on across the country as I now speak. We have three of them, Washington, North Dakota, and Virginia. We know that in the next few months we are going to pick the next President of the United States. So this article kind of plays into that.

For a moment I want my colleagues here to imagine that they are going to be the President of the United States. Just try to put in our minds that we are going to be the President of the United States. Let us start the article.

"Imagine that you are the next United States President and this crisis arises: The starving army of North Korea launches an attack on South Korea imperilling other 30,000 troops. You threaten a massive air assault. Pyongyang counter threatens to put a nuclear missile into the State of Hawaii. You say that that would cause you to strike back and destroy North Korea. Its undeterred leaders dare you to make the trade. You decide.

"Or this crisis: Saddam Hussein invades Saudi Arabia. You warn of a Desert Storm II. He says he has a weapon of mass destruction on a ship near the United States and is ready to sacrifice Baghdad if you are ready to lose New York City. You decide.

"Or this: China, not now a rogue State, goes into an internal convulsion and an irrational warlord attacks Taiwan."

Now, let me leave the article for a minute. Did my colleagues read the paper today? In the last 48 hours, China has threatened the United States of America with a missile attack if in fact we go to the defense of Taiwan. So when this article was written it was just an "imagine yourself in that place." But, in fact, in the last 48 hours, China has made that threat to the United States. So it is fairly realistic. Let us go back to the article.

"Or this: China goes into the internal convulsion and an irrational warlord attacks Taiwan. You threaten to intervene. Within 10 minutes you threaten

to intervene. But all of a sudden you discover that China has missiles targeted on several major United States cities. You have a decision to make. Before you make the decision on North Korea, on Saddam Hussein, on China, remember this; that in 1998 the Central Intelligence Agency told your predecessor that it was highly unlikely that any rogue state, except possibly North Korea, would have a nuclear weapon capable of hitting any of the contiguous 48 States within 10 to 12 years."

□ 2015

That is some exception. Apparently, our strategic assessors are untroubled at the prospect of losing Pearl Harbor again. So we are talking about the 48 States that have no missile defense in place, no missile defense in place.

The CIA assured your predecessor you would have 5 years' warning about the other nations' weapons development before you would have to deploy a missile defense system, but the CIA's record of prediction is poor.

President George Bush was assured that Saddam would have no nuclear capability for the next 10 years. When we went in after we invaded Kuwait, we discovered it to be less than a year away. And India, despite our extensive satellite and surveillance, surprised us with its recent nuclear explosion.

Six months ago, the Congress decided to get a second opinion about how vulnerable the United States is. Donald Rumsfeld, a former Secretary of Defense, was named to lead the bipartisan commission to assess the ballistic threat to the United States. Its nine members are former high government officials, military officers, and scientists of unassailable credibility.

Clearly, forever a national secret, these men with command experience had the advantage denied to CIA analysts. The unclassified summary of this T&B's 300-page report was released recently. This report just came out and it was a shocker. The direct threat to America, it concluded, by a ballistic missile attack is broader, more mature, and evolving more rapidly than has been reported in estimates and reports by the intelligence community. Not only Iran and other terrorist states capable of producing a nuclear-tipped missile within 5 years of ordering it up, they are capable of skipping the test and fine-tuning what we have depended on as our cushion to get our defenses up.

That means the Commission concluded that the warning time the United States would have to develop and deploy a missile defense is near zero. That means, I will repeat, that the time the United States of America will have to develop and deploy a missile defense system is not 5 years, not 10 years, it is close to 0.

Let us set aside our preoccupation with executive privileges and hospital lawsuits long enough to consider the consequences of the judgment of this report. The United States no longer

has the luxury of several years to put up a missile defense. We no longer have the luxury of several years to put a missile defense system up. If we do not decide now to deploy a rudimentary shield, we run the risk of Iran or North Korea or Libya building or buying the weapon that will enable it to get them to drop it upon the United States of America.

The Commission was charged only with assessing the new threat and not about what we should do to meet the danger. Nine serious men concluded unanimously that our intelligence agencies, on which we spend \$27 billion a year, have misled us. Smiling, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency responded that we need to keep challenging our assumptions.

Wrong. We need to defend ourselves from the likely prospect of a surprise nuclear blackmail. A first step is egregious, the naval theater defense, but that requires the President to redefine a 1972 treaty with the Soviets, the anti-ballistic missile treaty that he thinks requires us to remain forever naked to all our potential enemies.

The crisis is not likely to occur as Bill Clinton's sands run out. His successor would be the one to pay, the new President will be the one to pay, in the coin of diplomatic paralysis caused by unconscionable lack of preparedness for this President's failure to heed the warning time in 1998.

Let me move on to another article and just summarize a couple parts of it. This article was written by the Columbus Dispatch. The headline was, "No Shield: The U.S. is Subject to the Threat of Missiles." A chilling paradox of U.S. defense strategies suggests that a Columbus sailor on a Navy ship in the Pacific would be safer from a North Korean missile attack than his parents who work in downtown. It talks in this article about the Rumsfeld assessment. But I like the conclusion of it.

This is the conclusion of that article: One thing is sure, while the United States debates the cost of an anti-missile defense, rogue nations are sparing no expense to make the missiles threat a reality.

Finally, let me go to the Wall Street Journal and then I will leave the articles. Tuesday, February 15, just about a couple weeks ago, under the editorial called the November Missile Defense. Let me just read a couple of paragraphs from that article.

"An influential member of the Russian Duma said this month that a compromise on the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty was possible and would probably include steep cuts in the limits on strategic warheads and an end to the ban on MIRVs, missiles that can hit more than one target.

"It's absurd enough that the administration is asking Russia's permission for the United States to build a defense against terrorists or rogue states," a system for its citizens, asking Russia's permission to do this, but, on top of that, for the United States to build a

defense and to pay for it by agreeing with Russia to cut our nuclear arsenal.

What that paragraph said and what it refers to is there is a treaty called the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. Back in the 1970s, the thought for nuclear deterrent was that if the two countries, the two superpowers, which were Russia and the United States, and that is all that that treaty involved and it did not imagine a North Korea or Libya or Saddam Hussein with nuclear weapons, this treaty, when it was drafted in 1972 or so, said, hey, the best way to stop a nuclear attack is for the two superpowers, Russia and the United States, to agree not to build a defense against each other, so that Russia would have the incentive not to fire missiles upon the United States because they could not defend themselves and the United States had the incentive not to fire missiles on Russia because the United States could not defend itself.

I think it was absurd. The fact is it was signed. It has been in effect. But times have changed. Times have changed dramatically. Number one, Russia is no longer the superpower that it was. Number two, China now has the capability to deliver nuclear missiles into many of the cities of the contiguous 48 States in the United States.

We now know that several countries, including India and Pakistan, have nuclear weapons. We know that these weapons can fall into the hands of the wrong people. And yet we continue in this country to have some of our leaders who resist our country's efforts and, frankly, the Republican's efforts, to put into place a missile defense system.

How many of you have ever heard of NORAD or Colorado Springs, Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado Springs? I will give you an example of what could happen today. In Colorado Springs, Colorado, we have NORAD, the defense command system, inside our granite mountain called Cheyenne Mountain; and within that mountain, through our intelligence services, we can detect almost anywhere in the world, well, we can detect anywhere in the world a missile launch.

Within a few seconds, we can advise the military leaders and the President of the United States that, one, a missile has been launched; two, the speed of the missile; three, the direction of the missile; four, the most likely target of the missile; and five, the most likely time of arrival of the missile. We can detect all of that anywhere in the world. The United States knows it.

But then what can they tell the President? When the President says, what do I do, the answer from the military is, there is nothing we can do, Mr. President, because we do not have a missile defense system in this country.

The CIA reported this month, again from the Wall Street Journal article, that the threat of a missile attack is higher than ever as more and more terrorists and rogue states have the ability to build or buy long-range ballistic

missiles. We ought to think about that. We ought to think about the threat to this country.

Now, some people would say to you, well, we do not have the technology to defend ourselves. We do have the technology. We have come a long ways. And we had a shot, we did a test about a month ago, and the test failed. But we have discovered where the fallacies are. We have the technology available. Now remember what we are trying to do. We are trying to intercept a missile. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet, and they are going at a combined speed of several thousand miles an hour, and you have got to bring the two of them together. But we will have the technology in a very short period of time. So we need to determine what kind of missile defense system will work for this country.

Now, my opinion is, although Ronald Reagan got lots of criticism and so on, I think the best missile defense system this country can deploy over a period of time is a space-generated defense. Why? Now listen. Just listen. If we have a land-based missile defense system versus a ship-based system, where you can move the system around, if we have a land-based system, you have to destroy that missile, you cannot destroy it on the launching pad.

Let us say, for example, China launches a missile, as they have threatened to do in the last 24 hours. Let us say they launch a missile. We then have to wait for that missile. We track it as it comes across the ocean; and as it gets close to the United States, we have to start taking shots to try to bring that missile down. If we hit the missile down, it explodes over the top of us.

They may have a missile headed for Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado Springs and we detonate it over the city of Los Angeles. You could have nuclear fallout. There is a danger to that. And if you miss it and you continue to miss it, it is going to hit its target.

Now a space-based system, number one, is mobile. Number two, it could move over the top of China. We could then move it over Iraq. We could move it over North Korea. We have the opportunity to move the defensive system around.

The thing I like the best about it is, with the advancing technology, we could destroy the missile on its launching pad so the missile blows up in China or over China or over the ocean as it arcs over instead of over the lands of the United States.

The facts are very simple in what we face today. Number one, we are subject to a missile attack from our countries. Do not let other people joke to you about it.

I just came back from Europe. I am a member of the parliamentary arm of NATO, and the NATO delegation just came back. I was amazed that our colleagues in NATO who are afraid of Russia who stand there and criticize the United States of America for saying we

have an obligation to build a missile defense system.

Well, let me tell you, Europe, you better get off dead center; and you better put in place a missile defense system because you are going to be subject to the same kind of threats that the United States is; and instead of criticizing the United States, you ought to step forward and say we are going to do what the United States is doing; we are going to defend our countries. And frankly, I think your citizens will feel you have an obligation to defend them from a missile attack.

Second of all, at these NATO meetings, I am surprised how many people think we ought to curry the favor of Russia. Russia does not have the best interest of the United States of America at hand. We should not let Russia drive the decision as to whether or not we will in this country deploy a missile defense system to protect the citizens of the United States. We are not one to pick a fight with Russia. In fact, we ought to tell Russia to step aside. We are not looking for a fight, but what we are saying to Russia is do not attack the United States.

We are also saying to every terrorist organization out there, at least from the ballistic missile point of view, that, if you attack the United States with a ballistic missile, we will have the capability to shoot it down. You want to know what a deterrent is? The deterrent is, if you take a shot at America, it will not work. So why take the shot? If have you got a weapon and you want to shoot your neighbor or take down your neighbor, but you cannot pierce the defense system that your neighbor has, how good is the weapon that you have?

That is what we need to do. We have an obligation to defend this country. So, again, let us come back to it. In this country, we should have no shame for being the strongest military power in the world. We should feel no shame in this country for saying that we might need to build a missile defense system to protect the people of the United States of America.

And, frankly, to our friends in Europe and to the free countries throughout the world, I have no objection whatsoever for the United States to share our technology with you so that you can defend your own countries. Join us in the battle. Join us in the effort.

□ 2030

Nothing is better for this world than peace. But peace does not come free. We have to take steps, preventative steps to preserve the peace. In doing that, the United States should proceed full speed ahead with a missile defense system. Do not buy into the argument that the technology will never be here. The technology is very close. In fact, as many of my colleagues know, two or three of the tests have been successful. The last test about a month ago was not successful but we think we know

why. We think in this country that for a relatively inexpensive price, we can defend the citizens of this country from a missile attack. We ought to do it. We have that obligation. When you talk to most citizens in the United States and you say, hey, if Russia fires an incoming missile, what do we do about it, most of our citizens think we already have a missile defense system. We do not. We need to step forward and do something to protect the borders of this country.

Let me move on and talk again, I mentioned that I have just completed a NATO trip over in the European continent. I also had the opportunity on this trip to go down to the Aviano Air Base in Italy and also to visit our intelligence and our naval base in Rota, Spain. I have got to take a minute to the American people and tell them about our armed services. I could not be more proud of the military of the United States of America. We can enjoy the freedoms we have today because we have got a lot of young men and women out there standing in harm's way, and the taxpayers of this country and the citizens of this country really truly have stepped forward and given these young people the apparatus and the kind of backing that they need to go and stand in that harm's way.

When I was at the Aviano Air Base in Italy, I was so proud of our military men and women. Those people that man those aircraft, that maintain those aircraft, that handle our community relations, that do our maintenance work, all of that team down there is exactly that. It is a team, an Air Force that works with an Army, that works with a Navy, that works with a Marine Corps.

When we went on to Rota, Spain and studied the intelligence, and by the way, the motto of that, "In God we trust, all others we monitor," I am very proud of them. Our Navy sailors out there, our intelligence-gathering operation down there, the soldiers and the sailors, the people we have in these military bases throughout the world, you have got a lot to be proud of.

Without question, the United States of America is by far the most powerful military operation in the history of the world. We are going to have some people who bash us for being strong, who criticize us for having a strong military, who say, you are trying to act like Rambo. Let me give Members an example that I gave to a classroom the other day. I went to a local high school in my district and I was talking about military and the importance for the preservation of freedom, that the best way to maintain peace is to be strong and that you have got to be number one.

I had one of the students question me, so I will use this example. There was a lady in there, I asked the young lady, I said, if you were a black belt in karate and everybody in your class knew that you were a black belt in karate and they knew that if they decided

to take your lunch or if they decided to fight you, that you would break their neck, how many fights do you think you would be in under those circumstances? The answer is pretty easy. Probably none, because you are in shape, you are strong, and they know that if they dare come after you, there will be severe consequences to pay.

Thanks to the hundreds of thousands of dedicated men and women, and thanks to the hundreds of millions of American citizens who think the United States should be militarily strong, I think our military, relatively speaking, is in good shape. And I think we have got a lot to be proud of. I know that all of my colleagues in this room have constituents, many of whom may be serving in these bases, these overseas bases, and I know that many of them on both sides of the aisle join me in patting them on the back and saying thanks for what you do for our country. You are out there on the front lines and we are going to support you, and we need to support these people, and one way we can support them is to let them know that despite the efforts of some countries that want to see the demise, see the destruction of the United States of America, we will prevail.

Freedom will always come out on top. But freedom can never survive if you do not have freedom with strength. Freedom with strength. That is what our young men and women who serve in the military, all men and women who serve in our military throughout the world are doing for this country. You are doing a task of which I could not thank you enough for. I wanted to let you all know how proud I am of you.

Let me talk just for a couple of minutes, move on in my subject here of what I would like to talk to you about in our next night-side chat, and that is, let us talk about the Internet. I want to tell you a little more about my experience with the Internet and what we are seeing in this what I would say the second industrial revolution of the world. It is absolutely incredible, and most all of us on this House floor have experienced it. I want to spend the better part of an hour in the next few nights talking about this new second industrial revolution.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks this evening by simply doing just a summary of what we discussed. Let us go in reverse order. First of all, the missile defense system. It is imperative that the United States of America prepare itself for a missile defense system. We must deploy, in the near future, a missile defense system to protect the citizens of the United States of America, and we should be prepared to share that technology with our friends around the world so that they do not face the threat of terrorists or rogue nations firing a missile into the United States. If you do not think this is serious, take a look at the headline in the Washington Times this morning which

discusses in detail the threat from China to launch a missile attack against the United States, a threat made in the last 48 hours.

We talked before the missile defense about taxes. I have urged my Democrat colleagues to come across the aisle in a nonpartisan fashion tomorrow and support the Republican bill to do away with the cap on Social Security earnings. I urge those Democrat colleagues of mine who voted against the marriage tax penalty, in other words, to go ahead and keep the marriage tax penalty, to drop your opposition, come across the aisle and join us in support of that bill, the Republican bill to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is unfair. It is not right for us under our tax code from the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. to tax people simply because they are married. Help us get rid of that. We can do it this year. Let us do it this year.

We talked about the death tax. It is the most punitive, unfair tax in our system. There is no justification for the government to go to the estate of the deceased and take property over which the taxes have already been paid in several instances over and over again and taxing that property simply because there has been a death. It is ruining family farms, it is ruining ranches and small business in this country. It is transferring money from our small communities in all of our respective States, it is transferring that money to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C.

Let us be a bureaucrat's worst nightmare. Let us cut out some of these taxes, the death tax. Let us get rid of the marriage penalty tax. It is not right. Let us get rid of that cap on Social Security earnings. It is time for us to reform some of these unfair elements of the tax code of this country. We can afford to do it. We have a surplus. Let us be fair to the taxpayers of this country. Let us be fair to every citizen in this country. Do not penalize them for being married. Do not penalize their estate because they died. Be fair to them on the Social Security earnings cap.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the evening with my colleagues and I look forward to further discussions.

ON BOB JONES UNIVERSITY AND HOUSE CHAPLAIN CONTROVERSIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, as an Iowa Republican Congressman who is Catholic and has been supported by Christian conservatives as well as moderates, I feel compelled to comment on the Bob Jones University and the House Chaplain controversies.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Catholic grade school in the 1950s and early 1960s. I remember what a big deal it was when

JFK was elected President. In those days, there were still discriminations against Catholics and terrible stories told about my faith. To be fair, Mr. Speaker, Catholics were not always tolerant, either.

My mother came from an Irish-Catholic Democrat family. Older Catholics today still have vivid memories of anti-Catholicism. Our country's anti-Catholicism history goes way back before the virulent "Know-Nothings" just before the Civil War. In the early days of my party, the GOP did not do much to reassure Catholics that the Republican Party was a place where they could be comfortable.

But times change. Along came the Ecumenical Council, Christians of all creeds became more tolerant, and now even Garrison Keillor can make jokes about the foibles of Catholics and Lutherans in Lake Wobegone.

I certainly believe that my Lutheran mother-in-law and father-in-law have every bit as good a chance to go to heaven as my Catholic relatives do, maybe better in light of all their good works, but do not let us get into good works versus faith.

So when Governor Bush spoke at Bob Jones University and its anti-Catholicism was publicized, Catholics were reminded of past discrimination and were really disappointed that he did not immediately label these views bigoted in no uncertain terms when he found out about those views.

Bob Jones University President is Bob Jones, III, and this is how he describes the one billion-member Roman Catholic Church: "A cult which calls itself Christian."

This is on the official Bob Jones University Web site: "The Roman church is not another Christian denomination. It is a satanic counterfeit, an ecclesiastic tyranny over the souls of men, not to bring them to salvation, but to hold them bound in sin and hurl them into eternal damnation. It is the old harlot in the Book of Revelation, the mother of harlots."

Calling Pope John Paul the "anti-christ," saying that the Eucharist is "cannibalism," calling my church a "harlot," is deeply hurtful and mean and insulting. I must say I find Bob Jones' racism equally offensive. Governor Bush has been rightly criticized for not calling a bigot a bigot. In the spirit of bipartisanship critique, I hasten to add that AL GORE and Bill Bradley should be roundly criticized for not condemning Al Sharpton for his anti-Jewish bigotry as well.

□ 2045

All this brings us to the current "holy war" in this House of the people over the replacement of the House chaplain.

Reverend Ford, the well-liked Lutheran current House chaplain, is retiring. A bipartisan House committee, nine Republicans and nine Democrats, recommended three candidates for chaplain to Speaker HASTERT, Majority

Leader ARMEY and Minority Leader GEPHARDT.

It is well-known that a priest had received the most votes by the bipartisan committee, only three of which on the committee were Catholic. It should be noted that there has never been a Catholic House chaplain in the 211 years there has been a House chaplain, and, for that matter, there has never been a rabbi or a woman chaplain.

The Speaker and Majority Leader rejected the priest and went further down the list and chose Reverend Wright, who is a good man. Now, I want to be very clear about my thoughts on this. I know DENNY HASTERT and DICK ARMEY personally, and they are not anti-Catholic, but there is no question that this is a mess. Coupled with the Bob Jones University fiasco, Catholics in my district and around the country are shaking their heads in dismay.

So, Mr. Speaker, here is my unsolicited advice for ending this "holy war" that belongs in a long-ago past:

First, Reverend Wright should see that to become chaplain under these circumstances would impair his ministry. He should voluntarily remove himself from consideration.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we can do one of two things: We could abolish the position and simply have a rotating voluntary ministry, or we could keep the position but start over completely.

We should start over with an entirely new committee, look at an entirely new slate of candidates, and make the committee decision final. That way, if a Catholic is chosen, no one can say that the Speaker has pandered to the Catholics; if a Catholic is not chosen, no one can say that he is anti-Catholic. But the Speaker should not, I repeat, should not ask for a party line vote.

As for myself, if Reverend Wright comes up for a vote, I will vote "present," not against Reverend Wright per se, but in disgust with the whole way this has been handled on both sides of the aisle.

Before I close, I want to say this: It is not fair to paint evangelicals and Christian conservatives with the broad brush of Bob Jones. My wife and I and our children have worshipped many times at evangelical churches and have been made welcome. The evangelical ministers that I know, like Pastor John Palmer in Des Moines, do not have a racist or bigoted bone in their bodies. To the contrary, they have reached out to minority churches, reached out to Jews and to Catholics in Des Moines.

During the Iowa caucuses I got to know and respect Gary Bauer. What he wrote today in the New York Times is true. I quote Mr. Bauer. He says, "The so-called religious right is not a mindless mob that marches in lockstep at the command of this or that organizational leader. Though some may conjure up imaginary conservative conspiracies in order to frighten voters or divert attention from presidential scandals, social and culturally conservative voters, not all of whom happen to be evangelicals or necessarily even religious, are a diverse, independent-minded bunch."

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party I belong to is tolerant, respecting all people and all religions. I am proud to be a Republican. We are the party of Ronald Reagan and Teddy Roosevelt. We are the party of Abraham Lincoln, and we are not the party of Bob Jones.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and March 1 on account of a family emergency.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

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. BALDACC) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 1.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today and March 1.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, March 1.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, March 1.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 400. An act to provide technical corrections to the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to improve the delivery of housing assistance to Indian tribes in a manner that recognizes the right of tribal self-governance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution commending the people of Iran for their commitment to the democratic process and positive political reform on the occasion of Iran's parliamentary elections; to the Committee on International Relations.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 149. An act to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 and to other laws related to parks and public lands.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 764. To reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the second quarter of 1995, first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 1998 and 1999, by Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as a consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during first quarter of 2000, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, and for miscellaneous groups in connection with official foreign travel during the calendar year 1999 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND MAR. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Caleb McCarray	1/21	1/30	Cuba		729.00						729.00
							969.00				969.00
Grover Joseph Rees	1/18	1/25	Peru		1,414.00						1,414.00
							2,846.00				2,846.00
Hon. Alice Hastings	2/18	2/21	Austria		528.00						528.00
Commercial airfare							3,911.69				3,911.69
Hon. Doug Bereuter	2/17	2/21	Israel		1,154.00						1,154.00
Commercial airfare							2,110.11				2,110.11
Hon. Howard Berman	2/15	2/21	Israel		1,684.00						1,684.00
Commercial airfare							6,265.00				6,265.00
Richard Kessler	2/15	2/21	Israel		1,684.00						1,684.00
Commercial airfare							4,993.00				4,993.00
Hon. Bob Clement	1/4	1/6	Italy		796.00						796.00
	1/6	1/8	Macedonia		372.00						372.00
	1/8	1/9	Azerbaijan		346.00						346.00
	1/9	1/12	Belgium		170.00						170.00
Richard Garon	1/12	1/15	Syria		750.00						750.00
Commercial airfare							3,329.22				3,329.22
Michael Van Dusen	1/12	1/15	Syria		801.00						801.00
Commercial airfare	1/15	1/16	Cyprus		146.00						146.00
							4,789.17				4,789.17
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/7	1/11	South Korea		912.00						912.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/18	Australia		1,655.00						1,655.00
							2,434.00				2,434.00
	1/23	1/25	England		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							583.44				583.44
Mark Gage	1/3	1/7	Kazakhstan		944.00						944.00
Commercial airfare			Uzbekistan		702.00						702.00
			Turkmenistan		944.00						944.00
							6,319.00				6,319.00
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	1/6	1/10	South Korea		912.00						912.00
Commercial airfare							3,269.00				3,269.00
Carol Reynolds	1/5	1/11	South Korea		1,153.00						1,153.00
Commercial airfare							3,825.00				3,825.00
Cliff Kupchan	1/4	1/7	Kazakhstan		1,014.00						1,014.00
Commercial airfare	1/7	1/10	Uzbekistan		772.00						772.00
	1/10	1/13	Turkmenistan		1,014.00						1,014.00
							6,319.00				6,319.00
Grover Joseph Rees	2/17	2/20	Marshall Islands		740.00						740.00
Commercial airfare							4,787.98				4,787.98
Paul Berkowitz	2/17	2/20	Marshall Islands		614.88						614.88
Commercial airfare							4,229.00				4,229.00
Deborah Bodlander	1/3	1/10	Israel		2,149.00						2,149.00
Commercial airfare							4,721.00				4,721.00
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	1/12	1/13	Malaysia		162.00						162.00
Commercial airfare							3,957.56				3,957.56
John Mackey	1/12	1/15	Columbia		352.00						352.00
Commercial airfare							1,752.00				1,752.00
Peter Brookes	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
	1/7	1/12	Vietnam		1,140.00						1,140.00
	1/12	1/15	Cambodia		620.00						620.00
	1/15	1/17	Malaysia		224.00						224.00
	1/17	1/20	Indonesia		591.00						591.00
Commercial airfare							4,888.50				4,888.50
	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
	1/7	1/12	Vietnam		1,140.00						1,140.00
	1/12	1/15	Cambodia		560.00						560.00
	1/15	1/17	Malaysia		224.00						224.00
	1/17	1/20	Indonesia		591.00						591.00
Commercial airfare							4,888.50				4,888.50
Elana Bruitman	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
Commercial airfare	1/7	1/9	Vietnam		382.18						382.18
							3,586.00				3,586.00
John Mackey	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
							6,289.20				6,289.20
Cliff Kupchan	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
							6,289.20				6,289.20
Lester Munson	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
							6,289.20				6,289.20
Vincent Morelli	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
Commercial airfare							1,547.00				1,547.00
Paul Bonicelli	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
Commercial airfare	1/21	1/23	El Salvador		150.00						150.00
							1,538.00				1,538.00
David Adams	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
Commercial airfare	1/21	1/23	El Salvador		150.00						150.00
							1,538.00				1,538.00
Michael Ennis	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		923.00						923.00
	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare							6,939.90				6,939.90
Richard Kessler	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		1,179.004						1,179.00
	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare							6,939.90				6,939.90
Robert Hathaway	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		1,179.00						1,179.00
	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare							6,939.90				6,939.90
John Walker Roberts	1/7	1/12	India		1,202.00						1,202.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
							6,447.90				6,447.90
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		556.00						556.00
Hon. Leana Ros-Lehtinen	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
Commercial airfare	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
							377.20				377.20
Hon. Kevin Brady	1/16	1/18	Belgium		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare							5,069.21				5,069.21
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Clifford Kupchan	4/16	4/19	Jordan		1,200.00						1,200.00
	4/2	4/7	Bosnia		1,505.00		4,161.00				5,666.00
	4/7	4/8	Croatia		301.00						301.00
John Mackey	4/8	4/9	Bosnia		301.00						301.00
	4/10	4/14	Serbia/Montenegro		293.00						293.00
	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
	4/16	4/16	Colombia		243.00						243.00
	4/17	4/20	Chile		999.00						999.00
	5/28	5/30	Italy		516.00						516.00
	5/30	6/1	Ireland		393.30		2,295.00				2,688.30
Caleb McCarry	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Stephen Rademaker	5/7	5/9	Costa Rica		330.00						330.00
	5/24	5/26	China		514.00						514.00
	5/26	5/30	North Korea		1,016.00						1,016.00
	5/30	6/1	Japan		552.00						552.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		262.00						262.00
Grover Joseph Rees	5/25	5/27	Indonesia		494.00		4,549.00				5,043.00
	5/24	5/27	Japan		628.00		5,449.00				6,077.00
Francis Record	5/27	5/31	South Korea		648.00						648.00
	4/5	4/8	Taiwan		805.00		2,968.02				3,773.02
	4/8	4/14	Thailand		1,140.00						1,140.00
	4/14	4/15	Malaysia		102.00						102.00
	4/15	4/17	Philippines		198.00						198.00
Kimberly Roberts	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Hon. Marshall Sanford	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
	5/25	5/27	Indonesia		494.00		4,601.00				5,095.00
	5/25	5/28	Austria		483.00		5,351.84				5,834.84
Hillel Weinberg	5/28	5/30	Belgium		410.00						410.00
Committee total					64,178.06		74,488.73				138,666.79

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Adams	8/10	8/12	Venezuela		265.00		4,162.50				4,427.50
	8/13	8/15	Argentina		966.00						966.00
Paul Bonicelli	8/10	8/12	Venezuela		265.00		4,162.50				4,427.50
	8/13	8/15	Argentina		966.00						966.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	7/1	7/6	Israel		1,719.00		5,544.00				7,263.00
Hillel Weinberg	7/1	7/8	Israel		1,087.00		5,169.99				6,256.99
Kristen Gilley	7/6	7/8	Czech Republic		450.00						450.00
Mark Kirk	7/8	7/11	United Kingdom		1,260.00		6,115.47				7,375.47
	6/30	7/5	Yugoslavia		747.00		5,796.00				6,543.00
	7/6	7/9	Czech Republic		393.88						393.88
	7/9	7/11	United Kingdom		1,190.00						1,190.00
Richard Garon	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		550.00		4,171.18				4,721.18
John Herzberg	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		550.00		4,171.18				4,721.18
Maria Pica	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		500.00		4,171.18				4,671.18
Lester Munson	8/23	8/26	South Africa		532.00		7,532.80				8,064.80
	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		368.00						368.00
Peter Mamacos	8/23	8/26	South Africa		434.00		7,454.93				7,888.93
	8/26	8/29	Zimbabwe		552.00						552.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	6/27	7/3	French Polynesia		105.45		3,163.52				3,268.97
Caleb McCarry	8/11	8/13	Haiti				907.00				907.00
Denis McDonough	8/12	8/16	Cuba		375.00		1,387.39				1,762.39
	8/16	8/20	Mexico		1,027.00						1,027.00
Hon. Jay Kim	8/9	8/15	South Korea		1,484.00		3,999.00				5,483.00
Ronald Crump	8/9	8/15	South Korea		1,484.00		4,087.00				5,571.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	8/9	8/12	Jordan		829.00						829.00
	8/13	8/14	Turkey		452.00						452.00
	8/15	8/16	Kyrgyzstan		558.00						558.00
	8/17	8/18	Mongolia		354.00						354.00
	8/19	8/20	China		552.00						552.00
	8/21	8/23	South Korea		524.00						524.00
	8/9	8/12	Jordan		779.00						779.00
	8/13	8/14	Turkey		422.00						422.00
	8/15	8/16	Kyrgyzstan		478.00						478.00
	8/17	8/18	Mongolia		329.00						329.00
	8/19	8/20	China		261.00						261.00
	8/21	8/23	South Korea		484.00						484.00
	6/28	7/2	Ukraine		613.00		4,736.18				5,349.18
7/2	7/6	Moldova		613.00						613.00	
Elana Broitman	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		700.00		4,509.17				5,209.17
	6/28	7/2	Ukraine		680.00		4,736.18				5,416.18
Clifford Kupchan	7/2	7/6	Moldova		680.00						680.00
	7/18	7/21	Germany		600.00		5,511.11				6,111.11
Paul Berkowitz	8/10	8/18	India		2,201.00		5,850.52				8,051.52
	8/19	8/20	Nepal								
	8/20	8/21	Thailand		190.00						190.00
	7/8	7/10	Panama		334.00		1,323.00				1,657.00
	8/3	8/4	Canada		184.00		293.61				477.61

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
John Mackey	7/8	7/10	Panama		334.00		1,323.00				1,657.00
Thomas Sheehy	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Gregory Simpkins	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Amos Hochstein	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Jodi Christiansen	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	8/12	8/16	Thailand		760.00		4,638.00				5,398.00
Joseph Rees	7/7	7/9	Czech Republic		355.00		4,988.22				5,343.22
	7/9	7/11	Switzerland		440.00						440.00
	8/13	8/18	Thailand		760.00		3,858.00				4,618.00
	8/18	8/21	Philippines		594.00						594.00
Robert King	7/4	7/7	Germany		916.00		1,203.11				2,119.11
	7/7	7/10	Czech Republic		846.00				716.52		1,562.52
	7/10	7/14	Poland		1,112.00						1,112.00
Lester Munson	7/8	7/12	Morocco		447.20		4,834.25				5,281.45
	7/12	7/13	Algeria								
Celes Hughes	7/8	7/12	Morocco		447.20		4,834.25				5,281.45
	7/12	7/13	Algeria								
Maria Pica	8/10	8/13	China		718.00		4,846.00				5,564.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		1,028.00						1,028.00
	8/19	8/24	China		408.00						408.00
Mark Kirk	8/10	8/13	China		828.00		4,846.00				5,674.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		1,428.00						1,428.00
	8/19	8/24	China		408.00						408.00
Peter Brookes	8/10	8/13	China		828.00		4,846.00				5,674.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		1,428.00						1,428.00
	8/19	8/24	China								
Committee total					50,372.73		167,891.32		716.52		218,980.57

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Cass Ballenger	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		74.00						74.00
Paul Berkowitz	12/7	12/10	Taiwan		934.50						934.50
	12/10	12/12	Hong Kong		694.00						694.00
	12/12	12/15	Thailand		720.00						720.00
Commercial airfare							4,266.46				4,266.46
Hon. Cass Ballenger	12/1	12/2	Mexico		188.99						188.99
	12/2	12/4	El Salvador		30.00						30.00
	12/4	12/6	Nicaragua		176.25						176.25
Paul Berkowitz	12/3	12/4	India		365.25						365.25
	12/4	12/7	Nepal		712.00						712.00
	12/8	12/10	Bhutan		312.00						312.00
	12/11	12/13	India		385.00						385.00
Commercial airfare							7,408.70				7,408.70
Deborah Bedlander	11/15	11/19	Qatar		900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							5,697.90				5,697.90
Malik Chaka	12/2	12/6	England		1,416.00						1,416.00
	12/3	12/6	Senegal		687.50						687.50
Commercial airfare							4,220.78				4,220.78
Jodi Christiansen	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		187.50						187.50
Theodros Dagne	11/21	11/25	Cote d'Ivoire		625.00						625.00
	11/25	11/28	Ghana		634.00						634.00
	11/28	12/1	Nigeria		970.00						970.00
	12/1	12/3	Mali		250.00						250.00
	12/3	12/5	Senegal		487.50						487.50
	12/6	12/8	Rwanda		264.00						264.00
Commercial airfare							9,383.49				9,383.49
John Herzberg	11/5	11/9	Serbia-Montenegro		596.00						596.00
	11/9	11/11	Bosnia-Herzegovina		542.00						542.00
	11/11	11/13	Austria		376.00						376.00
Commercial airfare							4,517.76				4,517.76
Amos Hochstein	12/9	12/12	Turkey		443.00						443.00
	12/2	12/13	Qatar		159.00						159.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		72.00						72.00
Commercial airfare							6,332.54				6,332.54
Celes Hughes	12/7	12/9	Jordan		438.00						438.00
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		563.00						563.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.00						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		272.00						272.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Kenneth Katzman	12/7	12/9	Jordan		423.00						423.00
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		513.00						513.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.00						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		272.00						272.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Mark Kirk	11/5	11/9	Serbia-Montenegro		650.00						650.00
Commercial airfare							4,576.76				4,576.76
John Mackey	11/10	11/12	Belgium		498.00						498.00
	11/12	11/13	United Kingdom		315.00						315.00
	11/13	11/17	Ireland		892.00						892.00
Commercial airfare							4,811.48				4,811.48
Commercial airfare	12/5	12/11	Ireland		1,431.00						1,431.00
Caleb McCarty	11/11	11/13	Nicaragua		366.00						366.00
Commercial airfare							1,176.00				1,176.00
Denis McDonough	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		137.50						137.50
Commercial airfare	11/11	11/13	Nicaragua		366.00						366.00
							1,176.00				1,176.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Robert Menendez	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		187.50						187.50
Hon. Donald Payne	11/21	11/25	Cote d'Ivoire		625.00						625.00
	11/25	11/28	Ghana		696.00						696.00
	11/28	12/1	Nigeria		831.00						831.00
	12/1	12/3	Mali		350.00						50.00
	12/3	12/5	Senegal		100.00						100.00
Maria Pica	11/5	11/9	Serbia		596.00						596.00
	11/9	11/11	Bosnia		554.00						554.00
	11/11	11/13	Austria		376.00						376.00
Commercial airfare							4,517.76				4,517.76
Stephen Rademaker	12/7	12/9	Jordan		438.00				66.84		504.84
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		563.00						563.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.00						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		286.00						286.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Francis Record	11/9	11/13	Kazakstan		1,100.00						1,100.00
Commercial airfare							5,443.54				5,443.54
	12/7	12/9	Jordan		388.00						388.00
	12/10	12/11	Turkey		413.00						413.00
	12/11	12/12	Qatar		149.00						149.00
	12/12	12/16	Saudi Arabia		72.00						72.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Grover Joseph Rees	12/7	12/10	Taiwan		589.50						589.50
	12/10	12/12	Hong Kong		584.00						584.00
	12/12	12/15	Thailand		960.00						960.00
Commercial airfare							4,053.46				4,053.46
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	11/30	12/2	Kuwait		676.00						676.00
	12/2	12/5	Taiwan		1,180.00						1,180.00
	12/5	12/11	Philippines		804.00						804.00
Commercial airfare							6,378.89				6,378.89
Committee total					33,152.99		106,507.04		66.84		139,726.87

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Represents refund of unused per diem.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Gary Ackerman	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
Commercial airfare							1,164.00				1,164.00
Hon. Cass Ballenger	2/13	2/14	El Salvador		115.70						115.70
	2/14	2/15	Panama		149.30						149.30
	2/15	2/16	Colombia		123.00						123.00
	2/16	2/18	Venezuela		163.00						163.00
	2/18	2/21	Mexico		389.00						389.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/9	1/11	South Korea		136.00						136.00
	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		699.00						699.00
	1/14	1/16	China		334.00						334.00
Paul Berkowitz	2/14	2/18	India		867.10						867.10
Commercial airfare							6,744.18				6,744.18
Deborah Bodlander	1/9	1/13	Yemen		1,132.00						1,132.00
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		417.00						417.00
	1/15	1/18	Lebanon		190.00						190.00
	1/18	1/23	Israel		1,465.00						1,465.00
Commercial airfare							6,524.00				6,524.00
Commercial airfare	3/7	3/10	Qatar		597.00						597.00
Commercial airfare							6,015.40				6,015.40
Hon. Kevin Brady	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Commercial airfare							3,137.20				3,137.20
Parker Brent	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Peter Brookes	1/10	1/13	Australia		517.00						517.00
	1/14	1/16	New Zealand		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							8,213.70				8,213.70
Hon. John Cooksey	2/12	2/14	United Kingdom		623.28						623.28
	2/14	2/16	Jerusalem		360.50						360.50
	2/16	2/17	Turkey		88.00						88.00
	2/17	2/19	Bahrain		390.64						390.64
	2/19	2/20	Turkey		181.31						181.31
	2/20	2/21	Ireland		264.00						264.00
	2/25	2/28	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare							1,651.40				1,651.40
Michael Ennis	1/10	1/11	South Korea		136.00						136.00
	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		661.00						661.00
	1/14	1/16	Hong Kong		334.00						334.00
	1/16	1/18	Taiwan		667.50						667.50
Richard Garon	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		161.00						161.00
Kristin Gilley	1/9	1/13	Yemen		962.00						962.00
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	1/15	1/18	Lebanon		400.00						400.00
	1/18	1/22	Israel		1,415.00						1,415.00
Commercial airfare							6,524.16				6,524.16
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Charisse Glassman	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		161.00						161.00
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Jason Gross	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
	2/13	2/16	Greece		625.00						625.00
	2/16	2/17	Cyprus		200.00						200.00
	2/17	2/18	Greece		124.00						124.00
	2/18	2/20	Turkey		678.00						678.00
Commercial airfare							2,714.72				2,714.72
Commercial airfare	3/29	3/30	United Kingdom		315.00						315.00
	3/30	4/1	Ireland		412.00						412.00
	4/1	4/3	United Kingdom		520.00						520.00
Commercial airfare							5,824.23				5,824.23
John Herzberg	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/14	1/16	Greece		626.00						626.00
Commercial airfare							2,714.72				2,714.72
Hon. Earl Hilliard	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Robert King	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
Commercial airfare	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/25	2/27	Nigeria		1,255.00						1,255.00
Commercial airfare							3,726.60				3,726.60
John Mackey	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/14	2/18	Colombia		950.00						950.00
Commercial airfare	2/18	2/21	Mexico		455.00						455.00
Commercial airfare							1,439.67				1,439.67
Commercial airfare	3/29	3/30	United Kingdom		315.00						315.00
	3/30	4/3	Ireland		824.00						824.00
Commercial airfare							5,087.68				5,087.68
Caleb McCarr	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		111.00						111.00
Commercial airfare	2/26	2/28	Colombia		331.00						331.00
Commercial airfare							1,662.40				1,662.40
Dennis McDonough	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		91.00						91.00
Commercial airfare	2/26	2/28	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare							702.40				702.40
Hon. Cynthia McKinney	12/27	12/28	United Kingdom		365.00						365.00
Commercial airfare	1/1	1/2	Burundi		197.00						197.00
Commercial airfare							7,700.92				7,700.92
Commercial airfare	2/4	2/7	Netherlands		754.87						754.87
Commercial airfare							4,780.47				4,780.47
Hon. Gregory Meeks	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Lester Munson	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Hon. Donald Payne	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Alfred Prados	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
	1/9	1/13	Yemen		650.14						650.14
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		81.96						81.96
Commercial airfare	1/15	1/18	Lebanon								
	1/18	1/23	Israel		904.92						904.92
								6,524.16			6,524.16
Joseph Rees	1/24	1/25	Taiwan		217.00						217.00
Commercial airfare	1/25	1/30	Vietnam		541.00						541.00
	1/30	1/31	Philippines		198.00						198.00
Commercial airfare							3,931.40				3,931.40
Walker Roberts	1/10	1/13	Australia		517.00						517.00
Commercial airfare	1/14	1/16	New Zealand		300.00						300.00
								8,213.70			8,213.70
Commercial airfare	2/14	2/16	Greece		626.00						626.00
	2/16	2/18	Turkey		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							2,714.72				2,714.72
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	2/20	2/21	Marshall Islands		185.00						185.00
Hon. Edward Royce	2/25	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
Thomas Sheehy	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Linda Solomon	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
Hillel Weinberg	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/10	1/12	Finland		404.00						404.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		319.00						319.00
	1/14	1/16	France		320.00						320.00
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/16	1/18	Austria		288.00						288.00
	1/17	1/21	Czech Republic		928.00						928.00
Commercial airfare							2,201.05				2,201.05
Committee total					64,652.54			97,198.16			161,850.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Cass Ballenger	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		205.00						205.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Paul Berkowitz	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
	3/29	3/30	Italy		273.00						273.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,476.00						1,476.00
	4/3	4/4	Czech Republic		127.00						127.00
Nancy Bloomer	4/4	4/8	Switzerland		1,100.00						1,100.00
	Commercial airfare						1,898.05				1,898.05
	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
Deborah Bodlander	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
	3/27	3/28	Italy		228.00						228.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		578.00						578.00
Paul Bonicelli	3/30	4/1	Egypt		337.00						337.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		448.00						448.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		238.00						238.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		501.00						501.00
	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		360.00						360.00
Peter Brookes	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.00
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/4	Taiwan		955.50						955.50
Malik Chaka	Commercial airfare						2,971.20				2,971.20
	6/2	6/5	Kenya		780.00						780.00
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
Marion Chambers	Commercial airfare						4,951.09				4,951.09
	3/26	3/28	Turkmenistan		382.00						382.00
	3/28	4/1	Uzbekistan		1,063.00						1,063.00
	4/1	4/2	Kazakhstan		783.00						783.00
	4/3	4/5	Kyrgystan		272.00						272.00
Mark Clack	4/5	4/6	Kazakhstan								
	Commercial airfare						6,407.59				6,407.59
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
Michael Ennis	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
	3/26	3/28	Turkmenistan		382.00						382.00
	3/28	4/1	Uzbekistan		1,063.00						1,063.00
	4/1	4/2	Kazakhstan		783.00						783.00
	4/3	4/5	Kyrgystan		272.00						272.00
Hon. Enri Faleomavaega	4/5	4/6	Kazakhstan								
	Commercial airfare						6,407.59				6,407.59
	4/3	4/5	South Korea		576.00						576.00
	4/5	4/8	Australia		354.00						354.00
	4/8	4/11	New Zealand		259.00						259.00
Hon. Sam Gejdenson	Commercial airfare						799.67				799.67
	5/28	5/30	Lithuania		397.00						397.00
	5/30	6/1	Belarus		492.00						492.00
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	Commercial airfare						4,508.58				4,508.58
	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
Charisse Glassman	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
	6/1	6/5	Kenya		900.00						900.00
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
Hon. Alcee Hastings	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
	Commercial airfare						5,960.25				5,960.25
	4/22	4/24	Denmark		720.25						720.25
Hon. Earl Hilliard	Commercial airfare						4,411.01				4,411.01
	6/11	6/14	Haiti		455.50						455.50
	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
Amos Hochstein	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
	3/27	3/28	Italy		300.00						300.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		587.00						587.00
Hon. Amo Houghton	5/28	5/30	Finland		384.00						384.00
	5/30	6/1	Belgium		438.00						438.00
	Commercial airfare						4,369.46				4,369.46
	6/15	6/17	South Africa				5,559.31				5,559.31
	4/1	4/4	South Africa								
Hon. Barbara Lee	4/5	4/7	Ghana								
	4/8	4/10	South Africa								
	Commercial airfare						8,019.20				8,019.20
	5/27	6/1	Spain		1,347.50						1,347.50
	Commercial airfare						2,862.84				2,862.84
Michelle Maynard	5/28	5/30	Lithuania		297.00						297.00
	5/30	6/1	Belarus		342.00						342.00
	Commercial airfare						4,697.58				4,697.58
	5/29	5/30	Ecuador		325.00						325.00
	5/30	5/31	Peru		103.00						103.00
Caleb McCarry	5/31	5/31	Aruba		73.00						73.00
	5/31	6/1	Curacao		177.00						177.00
	6/1	6/3	Panama		323.00						323.00
	Commercial airfare						2,109.62				2,109.62
	5/29	5/30	Ecuador		325.00						325.00
Denis McDonough	5/30	5/31	Peru		103.00						103.00
	5/31	6/2	Colombia		386.00						386.00
	Commercial airfare						856.20				856.20
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/2	China		276.00						276.00
Kathleen Moazed	4/2	4/3	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	4/3	4/5	Vietnam		456.00						456.00
	Commercial airfare						6,625.88				6,625.88
	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Donald Payne	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		350.00						350.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
	6/4	6/6	Kenya		750.00						750.00
	6/6	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
	Commercial airfare							5,752.00			
Stephen Rademaker	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.00
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/2	Taiwan		409.50						409.50
	Commercial airfare							3,132.73			3,132.73
Grover Joseph Rees	6/1	6/3	Panama		348.00						348.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		400.00						400.00
	4/5	4/8	Switzerland		900.00						900.00
	Commercial airfare							4,493.73			4,493.73
John Walker Roberts	5/30	5/31	Singapore		233.00						233.00
	5/31	6/10	Indonesia		1,627.00						1,627.00
	6/10	6/11	Singapore		254.00						254.00
	Commercial airfare							4,344.40			4,344.40
Kimberly Roberts	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.00
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/4	Taiwan		955.50						955.50
	Commercial airfare							3,864.73			3,864.73
Hon. Mark Sanford	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
Hon. Tom Tancredo	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		205.00						205.00
	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
	6/2	6/2	Amsterdam		900.00						900.00
Hillel Weinberg	6/2	6/5	Kenya								
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
	Commercial airfare							6,961.09			6,961.09
	5/28	5/30	Finland		384.00						384.00
Peter Yeo	5/30	6/1	Belgium		438.00						438.00
	Commercial airfare							4,467.73			4,467.73
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/2	China		276.00						276.00
Commercial airfare	4/2	4/3	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	4/3	4/5	Vietnam		456.00						456.00
	Commercial airfare							6,625.88			6,625.88
Committee total				54,434.75			118,048.53			172,483.28	

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Carlos Romero-Barcelo ³	8/28	8/30	Slovakia		589.00		60.00		52.00		701.00
	8/31	9/2	Romania		548.00		55.00		72.00		675.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		593.00		60.00		72.00		725.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		603.00		90.00		52.00		745.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00		30.00		32.00		269.00
	8/7	8/11	Armenia		600.00		(⁵)				600.00
Commercial airfare							3,368.10			3,368.10	
Committee total				3,140.00			3,663.10		280.00		7,083.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ To participate in CODEL Mica.
⁴ To participate in CODEL Morella.
⁵ Military air transportation.

BILL GOODLING, Chairman, Feb. 2, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Adams	8/8	8/10	Japan		522.00						522.00
	8/10	8/11	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/14	China		621.00						621.00
	8/14	8/18	Mongolia		483.00						483.00
Commercial airfare							6,514.68			6,514.68	
Hon. Cass Ballenger	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		103.65						103.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		108.65						108.65
	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		402.65						402.65

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doug Bereuter	8/31	9/3	Australia		664.00		178.02				842.02
Paul Berkowitz	7/3	7/4	Thailand		796.00						796.00
	7/5	7/6	Cambodia		472.00						472.00
	7/7	7/8	Laos								
	7/8	7/10	Thailand								
Commercial airfare						4,753.40				4,753.40	
Nancy Bloomer	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	7/8	7/10	United Kingdom		766.00						766.00
Commercial airfare						534.52				534.52	
Deborah Bodlander	7/3	7/6	Syria		540.00					540.00	
Commercial airfare	7/6	7/10	Lebanon		70.00					70.00	
Paul Bonicelli	8/17	8/19	Venezuela		514.94		6,924.71			6,924.71	
Commercial airfare						1,521.40				1,521.40	
Parker Brent	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
Peter Brookes	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
Thomas Callahan	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		208.50						208.50
	Commercial airfare						7,280.11				7,280.11
	8/17	8/24	Ethiopia		1,421.00						1,421.00
Commercial airfare	8/24	8/25	Saudi Arabia		166.00						166.00
	8/25	8/28	Eritrea		524.00						524.00
							6,641.81				6,641.81
Hon. Tom Campbell	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00					477.00	
Commercial airfare	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00		3,632.11			3,632.11	
Sean Carroll	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		283.65						283.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Malik Chaka	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		427.50						427.50
	8/8	8/9	Guinea		1,450.00						1,450.00
	8/9	8/11	Sierra Leone								
Commercial airfare	8/11	8/16	Guinea				4,379.40			4,379.40	
Mark Clack	8/8	8/9	Guinea		1,450.00					1,450.00	
Commercial airfare	8/9	8/11	Sierra Leone								
Commercial airfare	8/11	8/16	Guinea				4,379.40			4,379.40	
Theodore Dagne	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00					477.00	
Commercial airfare	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00		7,280.11			7,280.11	
Hon. William Delahunt	9/1	9/2	Nicaragua		232.50					232.50	
Commercial airfare							1,127.60			1,127.60	
Michael Ennis	8/21	8/24	Turkey		579.00						579.00
	8/24	8/25	Armenia		300.00						300.00
	8/26	8/30	Georgia		300.00						300.00
	8/30	9/2	Azerbaijan		808.00						808.00
	Commercial airfare						5,926.60				5,926.60
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	8/9	8/10	Taiwan		265.00		2,060.76				2,325.76
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
	8/28	8/31	Slovak Republic		519.50						519.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		492.00						492.00
Rich Garon	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		190.00						190.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		553.00						553.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
Kristen Gilley	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,325.43						1,325.43
	8/17	8/19	New Zealand		641.14						641.14
	Commercial airfare						3,624.41				3,624.41
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	7/8	7/10	United Kingdom		766.00					766.00	
Commercial airfare						534.52				534.52	
Charisse Glassman	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00						477.00
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00						300.00
	Commercial airfare						6,008.17				6,008.17
Jason Gross	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
	8/24	8/25	Macedonia		160.00						160.00
	8/25	8/27	Serbia		494.00						494.00
	8/27	8/28	Montenegro								
	8/28	8/31	Bosnia		602.00						602.00
Commercial airfare						4,638.40				4,638.40	
Hon. Alcee Hastings	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
John Herzberg	8/24	8/25	Macedonia		160.00						160.00
	8/25	8/27	Serbia		238.00						238.00
	8/27	8/28	Montenegro		250.00						250.00
	8/29	8/31	Bosnia		602.00						602.00
	Commercial airfare						4,638.40				4,638.40
Amos Hochstein	7/3	7/6	Syria		612.00					612.00	
Commercial airfare	7/6	7/10	Lebanon		105.00					105.00	

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare											
Mark Kirk	8/24	9/1	Yugoslavia		1,032.35		6,924.71				6,924.71
Commercial airfare							4,638.40				4,638.40
John Mackey	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/12	8/14	Ireland		380.00						380.00
Commercial airfare							2,685.20				2,685.20
	8/30	8/31	Slovak Republic		293.50						293.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		492.00						492.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		250.00						250.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		502.00						502.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
Commercial airfare							2,340.85				2,340.85
Caleb McCary	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		283.65						283.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		386.00						386.00
	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		427.50						427.50
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		118.00						118.00
Hon. Cynthia McKinney	8/26	8/28	Democratic Republic of Congo		579.00		197.21				776.21
Commercial airfare							6,043.40				6,043.40
Kathleen Moazed	8/23	8/26	Armenia		400.00						400.00
	8/26	8/30	Georgia		300.00						300.00
	8/30	9/2	Azerbaijan		950.00						950.00
Commercial airfare							5,924.63				5,924.63
Vince Morelli	8/17	8/19	Venezuela		541.94						541.94
Commercial airfare							1,521.40				1,521.40
Hon. Donald Payne	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00						477.00
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							5,704.17				5,704.17
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
Joseph Rees	8/9	8/11	Switzerland		3,200.00						3,200.00
	8/11	8/14	Macedonia								
	8/14	8/18	Kosovo								
	8/18	8/19	Macedonia								
	8/19	8/24	Italy								
Commercial airfare							5,031.39				5,031.39
Matthew Reynolds	8/8	8/10	Japan		522.00						522.00
	8/10	8/11	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/14	China		621.00						621.00
	8/14	8/18	Mongolia		388.00						388.00
Commercial airfare							6,514.68				6,514.68
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	8/28	8/31	Slovak Republic		589.50						589.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		522.00						522.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		250.00						250.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		502.00						502.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
Linda Solomon	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
Committee total					68,065.29		130,104.57				198,169.86

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

BILL GOODLING, Chairman, Feb. 2, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Amit Sachdev	12/5	12/11	Switzerland		1,400.00		1,882.42				3,282.42
Richard Frandsen	12/7	12/14	Switzerland		1,650.00		4,953.17				6,603.17
Alison Taylor	11/28	12/6	China		2,057.00		3,161.70				5,218.70
Robert Meyers	11/28	11/6	China		2,057.00		2,172.45				4,229.45
Hon. Nathan Deal	11/20	11/21	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	11/21	11/24	Russia		1,143.00						1,143.00
Hon. Joe Barton	11/20	11/21	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	11/21	11/24	Russia		1,125.00						1,125.00
Committee total					9,882.00		12,169.74				22,051.74

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kevin Long	10/14	10/18	Spain		927.00		4,197.26				5,124.26
William O'Neill	10/14	10/18	Spain		927.00		4,197.26				5,124.26
Andrew Su	10/14	10/18	Spain		927.00		1,446.26				2,373.26
Kevin Long	11/4	11/6	Colombia		486.00		1,744.45				2,230.45
Gilbert Macklin	11/4	11/6	Colombia		486.00		1,744.45				2,230.45
Committee total					3,753.00		13,329.68				17,082.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

DAN BURTON, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Abramowitz	12/14	12/17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
Hon. Cass Ballenger	12/2	12/4	Curacao		455.06						455.06
	12/4	12/6	Aruba		353.60						353.60
	12/6	12/8	Ecuador		310.04						310.04
	12/8	12/10	Panama		295.23						295.23
Peter Brookes	12/6	12/9	Philippines		627.00						627.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/12	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Hon. Tom Campbell	11/21	11/22	Thailand		747.00						747.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,390.00						1,390.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							3,053.45				3,053.45
Maik Chaka	12/2	12/8	Cote d'Ivoire		1,027.00						1,027.00
	12/8	12/9	France		283.00						283.00
Commercial airfare							6,385.94				6,385.94
Mark Clack	11/29	12/2	Nigeria		835.00						835.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							5,974.20				5,974.20
David Fite	12/8	12/9	Philippines		209.00						209.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/13	12/16	China		693.00						693.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Mark Gage	11/29	12/3	Russia		1,450.00						1,450.00
Commercial airfare							5,003.61				5,003.61
Sam Gejdenson	11/30	12/2	Nigeria		900.00						900.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							6,054.45				6,054.45
Kristen Gilley	12/14	12/17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
Charisse Glassman	11/19	11/20	Thailand		747.00						747.00
	11/21	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/27	11/29	Vietnam		754.00						754.00
	11/30	12/1	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							5,148.45				5,148.45
Hon. Barbara Lee	11/29	12/2	Nigeria		900.00						900.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							6,274.20				6,274.20
John Mackey	11/4	11/6	Colombia		486.00						486.00
Commercial airfare							1,744.45				1,744.45
	12/14	12/17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		349.00						349.00
	12/3	12/4	Ireland		311.00						311.00
Commercial airfare							5,006.55				5,006.55
Kathleen Moazed	11/13	11/17	England		1,150.00				420.00		1,570.00
Commercial airfare					5,029.66						5,029.66
Larry Nowels	11/21	11/22	Thailand		747.00						747.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,155.00						1,155.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							4,596.45				4,596.45
Hon. Donald Payne	11/20	11/21	Thailand		249.00						249.00
	11/21	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/27	11/28	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							10,469.20				10,469.20
Douglas Rasmussen	11/21	11/22	Thailand		747.00						747.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,135.00						1,135.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							4,937.45				4,937.45
Grover Joseph Rees	11/22	11/25	Switzerland		833.00						833.00
Commercial airfare							4,138.24				4,138.24
	12/12	12/15	Philippines		573.00						573.00
	12/15	12/19	Vietnam		398.00						398.00
	12/20	12/20	Japan		105.00						105.00
Commercial airfare							4,214.76				4,214.76
Francis Record	10/29	10/31	Germany		602.00						602.00
Commercial airfare							5,067.01				5,067.01
John Walker Roberts	12/6	12/9	Philippines		627.00						627.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/14	12/16	China		543.00						543.00
Commercial airfare							7,055.79				7,055.79

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Edward Royce	11/20	11/21	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	11/21	11/24	Russia		797.00						797.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		276.00						276.00
Tanya Shamson	11/29	12/3	Russia		1,450.00						1,450.00
Commercial airfare							5,003.61				5,003.61
Thomas Sheehy	12/2	12/8	Cote d'Ivoire		1,027.00						1,027.00
Commercial airfare							4,355.13				4,355.13
Hon. Christopher Smith	11/22	11/24	Switzerland		536.00						536.00
Commercial airfare							4,138.24				4,138.24
	12/16	12/18	Vietnam		366.00						366.00
	12/19	12/19	Japan		150.00						150.00
Commercial airfare							4,045.20				4,045.20
Hillel Weinberg	10/29	10/31	Germany		434.00						434.00
Commercial airfare							4,417.01				4,417.01
	11/29	11/30	Portugal		166.00						166.00
	11/30	12/3	Belgium		826.00						826.00
Commercial airfare							4,470.00				4,470.00
Peter Yeo	12/8	12/9	Philippines		209.00						209.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/13	12/16	China		693.00						693.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Committee total					46,170.59		143,468.11		420.00		190,058.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

BEN GILMAN, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Robert Howarth	11/12	11/24	Brazil		2,150.00		4,552.45				6,702.45
Kurt Christensen	11/24	12/5	Morocco		1,800.00		1,481.39				3,281.39
John Rishel	11/24	12/5	Morocco		1,800.00		1,481.39				3,281.39
Hon. Richard Pombo ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Hon. James Hansen ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Hon. Neil Abercrombie ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Hon. John Doolittle ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Hon. Calvin Dooley ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Hon. Robert Underwood ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Hon. Barbara Cubin ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Hon. Helen Chenoweth-Hage ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Lloyd Jones ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Christine Kennedy ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Elizabeth Megginson ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Robert Howarth ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Todd Willens ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Jean Flemma ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Joycelyn Johnson ³	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		(⁴)				400.00
Committee total					12,150.00		7,515.23				19,665.23

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

³ Incomplete per diem information. Totals not available from Department of State.

⁴ Not available.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Jan. 25, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

LAMAR SMITH, Jan. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB STUMP, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Pat Murray	11/14	11/22	Europe				1,700.00				1,700.00
Commercial airfare							4,939.84				4,939.84
Jay Jakub	11/14	11/22	Europe				1,700.00				1,700.00
Commercial airfare							4,939.84				4,939.84
John Stopher	11/12	11/20	Asia				1,828.00				1,828.00
Commercial airfare							6,139.85				6,139.85
Timothy Sample	11/29	12/7	Asia				1,650.00				1,650.00
Commercial airfare							5,335.35				5,335.35
Michael Meermans	11/29	12/7	Asia				1,650.00				1,650.00
Commercial airfare							5,335.35				5,335.35
John Millis	12/7	12/15	South America				2,052.00				2,052.00
Commercial airfare							2,424.45				2,424.45
Chris Barton	12/7	12/15	South America				2,052.00				2,052.00
Commercial airfare							2,424.45				2,424.45
Tom Newcomb	12/7	12/11	South America				972.00				972.00
Commercial airfare							1,744.45				1,744.45
Committee total							46,887.58				46,887.58

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL McCOLLUM, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, AND NEW ZEALAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 27 AND DEC. 7, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Hastert	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Boehlert	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Pryce	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Largent	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Coburn	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Wamp	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Doyle	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Sandford	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Stupak	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Cramer	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Blunt	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Isakson	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Scott Palmer	11/28	11/30	Japan								
John Feehery	11/28	11/30	Japan								
David Hobbs	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Bill Inglee	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Sam Lancaster	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Martha Morrison	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Shanti Ochs	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Chris Scheve	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Dwight Comedy	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Bill Livingood	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Dr. John Eisold	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Hastert	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Boehlert	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Pryce	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Largent	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Coburn	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Wamp	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Doyle	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Sandford	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Stupak	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Cramer	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Blunt	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Isakson	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Scott Palmer	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
John Feehery	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, AND NEW ZEALAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 27 AND DEC. 7, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Hobbs	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Bill Inglee	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Sam Lancaster	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Martha Morrison	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Shanti Ochs	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Chris Scheve	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Dwight Comedy	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Bill Livingood	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Dr. John Eisold	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Hastert	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Boehlert	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Pryce	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Largent	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Coburn	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Wamp	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Doyle	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Sandford	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Stupak	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Cramer	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Blunt	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Isakson	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Scott Palmer	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
John Feehery	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
David Hobbs	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Bill Inglee	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Sam Lancaster	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Martha Morrison	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Shanti Ochs	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Chris Scheve	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Dwight Comedy	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Bill Livingood	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Dr. John Eisold	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Committee Total											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Jan. 20, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TRAVEL TO DENMARK, SWITZERLAND, BELGIUM, PORTUGAL, AND SPAIN, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 9 AND JAN. 19, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
James Ford	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						
Total					2,700.00						2,700.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

JAMES FORD, Feb. 3, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY TO SPAIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 15 AND DEC. 18, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doug Bereuter	12/15	12/18	Spain		819.00	(3)					819.00
Hon. Tom Bliley	12/15	12/18	Spain		819.00	(3)					819.00
Hon. Porter Goss	12/15	12/18	Spain		819.00	(3)					819.00
Susan Olson	12/15	12/18	Spain		819.00	(3)					819.00
Committee total					3,276.00						3,276.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

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

³ Military air transportation.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, Feb. 1, 2000.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6249. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-984-3 FIR] received Janu-

ary 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6250. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—N,N-diethyl-2-(4-methylbenzyloxy) ethylamine hydrochloride; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300964; FRL-6486-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6251. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Spinosaad; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300960; FRL-6399-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6252. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental budget request for fiscal year 2000;

(H. Doc. No. 106-198); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6253. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget program revisions for the Commodity Credit Corporation for FY 2000 and FY 2001; (H. Doc. No. 106-199); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6254. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense; (H. Doc. No. 106-201); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6255. A letter from the Chairperson, Joint Committee on Judicial Administration, District of Columbia Courts, transmitting the "Planning and Budgeting Difficulties During Fiscal Year 1998"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6256. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Logistics and Financial Management), Department of Defense, transmitting notification of munitions disposal, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6257. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Strategy and Threat Reduction, transmitting a report providing responses to certain questions having to do with the elimination of Russian SS-18 ICBMs, Russian contributions to the Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination program, and possible support to the elimination of Russian tactical nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6258. A letter from the Captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Director of Legislation, Department of the Navy, transmitting the proposed transfer of the ex-NEW JERSEY; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6259. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Manufacturing Technology Program [DFARS Case 99-D302] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6260. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Paid Advertisements [DFARS Case 99-D029] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6261. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Institutions of Higher Education [DFARS Case 99-D303] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6262. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Authority Relating to Utility Privatization [DFARS Case 99-D309] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6263. A letter from the Director, Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Air Force Privacy Act Program [Air Force Instruction 37-132] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6264. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) Amendments to the PHAS [Docket No. FR-4497-F-05] (RIN: 2577-AC08) received January 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6265. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 1998 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6266. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting reports as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and subsequently amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

6267. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting separate appropriations and pay-as-you-go reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

6268. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

6269. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6270. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 1996 and 1997 reports describing the activities and accomplishments of programs for persons with developmental disabilities and their families, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6006(c); to the Committee on Commerce.

6271. A letter from the Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice of Availability of Funds [Docket No. 981203295-9313-03] (RIN: 0660-ZA06) received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6272. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting notification that Performance Profiles of Major Energy Producers 1998 has been completed; to the Committee on Commerce.

6273. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 99F-2907] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6274. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments for Testing and Monitoring Provisions [FRL-6523-6] (RIN: 2060-AG21) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6275. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory and Management Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Pollution Prevention Grants and Announcement of Financial Assistance Programs Eligible for Review; Notice of Availability [OPPTS-099283; FRL-6398-8] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6276. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware—Minor New Source Review and Federally Enforceable State Operating Permit Program [DE-031-1029; FRL-6522-6] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6277. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the annual report of compliance activities undertaken by the Department for mixed waste streams during FY 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6965; to the Committee on Commerce.

6278. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6279. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Continuation of the National Emergency Relating to CUBA and the Emergency Authority Relating to the Regulation of the Anchorage and Movement of Vessels; (H. Doc. No. 106-202); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

6280. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6281. A letter from the Chairman, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2904(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

6282. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report justifying the reasons for the extension of locality-based comparability payments to categories of positions that are in more than one executive agency, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5304(h)(2)(C); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6283. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Acquisition cost of surplus real or related personal property conveyed to educational institutions during the preceding fiscal year, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(o)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6284. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 1999, through September 30, 1999 and the Semiannual Report on Inspector General Audit Reports for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6285. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting Semiannual report of the Inspector General, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6286. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Transmittal of D.C. ACT 13-247, "Police Recruiting and Retention Enhancement Amendment Act of 1999" received February 25, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6287. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13-225, "Government Employer-Assisted Housing Amendment Act of 1999" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6288. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13-250, "Department of Health Functions Clarification Temporary Act of 1999" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6289. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. Act 13-254, "District of Columbia Housing Authority Act of 1999" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6290. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13-256, "Retail Electric Competition and Consumer Protection of 1999" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6291. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13-262, "Transfer of Jurisdiction over Georgetown Waterfront Park for Public Park and Recreational Purposes, S.O. 84-230, Temporary Act of 2000" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6292. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of his report for FY 1999 on each instance a Federal agency did not fully implement recommendations made by the GAO in connection with a bid protest decided during the fiscal year, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3554(e)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6293. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the report to waive deduction of pay requirement for a reemployed annuitant; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6294. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the report that the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) management control systems provide reasonable assurance that the agency is achieving the objectives of the Federal Managers Integrity Act (FMFIA); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6295. A letter from the Assistant Secretary—Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the inventory of commercial activities prepared in accordance with the Federal Activities Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6296. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Acquisition Circular 97-15; Introduction—received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6297. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6298. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, Department of Transportation, transmitting copies of the inventories of commercial positions in the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6299. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the FY1999 Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) Annual Report for the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6300. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the commercial inventory submission; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6301. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the statement that the Federal Housing Finance Board's (Finance Board) management accountability and controls are adequate and

effective and that there are no material weaknesses; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6302. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting reports released in November 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6303. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the report on GAO employees detailed to congressional committees as of January 21, 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6304. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting reports issued or released in October 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6305. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the 6-month report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6306. A letter from the President, Institute of Peace, transmitting the report pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978 and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6307. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 97-15; Item XI] received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6308. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Small Entity Compliance Guide—received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6309. A letter from the Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (Integrity Act) report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6310. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the annual Integrity Act report for 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6311. A letter from the Chairman and General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Agency's Fiscal Year 1999 report on the adequacy of management controls and conformance of financial systems; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6312. A letter from the Chairwoman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the FY 1999 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6313. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report of meetings in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6314. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Semiannual Report of our activities and accomplishments from April 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6315. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting two Semiannual Reports for the six months ended September 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6316. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the the FY 1999 Annual Statement of Assurance; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6317. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report for the period ending September 30, 1999 in accordance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6318. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the revised performance goals and corporate management strategies for the Department of Transportation's fiscal year (FY) 2000 Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6319. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the report of compliance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6320. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Merit Systems Protection Board's Annual Report to Congress regarding the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6321. A letter from the Chairman, United States Postal Service, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6322. A letter from the the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting Statement of Disbursements of the House as Compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer from October 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 106-200); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

6323. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting detailed boundary maps for the following rivers added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System by the Omnibus Oregon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1988: Upper Deschutes and Metolius Rivers on the Deschutes National Forest; North Folk Malheur and Malheur Rivers on the Malheur National Forest; and Chetco and Elk Rivers on the Siskiyou National Forest; to the Committee on Resources.

6324. A letter from the Chief of Staff, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Issuance of Certificates of Self Regulation to Tribes for Class II Gaming (RIN: 3141-AA04) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6325. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2000 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No. 000211040-0040-01; I.D. 111899B] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6326. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting Operations under the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1622 and 1622a; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6327. A letter from the Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Complaints regarding Invention Promoters [Docket No. 000105007-0007-01] (RIN: 0651-AB12) received January 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6328. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the fifth annual report on the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) of 1994, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6329. A letter from the President and CEO, Little League Baseball Incorporated, transmitting the Annual Report of Little League Baseball, fiscal year ending September 30, 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6330. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a shore erosion plan for the Fire Island Inlet to Moriches Inlet reach of the Fire Island to Montauk Point, New York, project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6331. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D Airspace; Jacksonville Whitehouse NOLF, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-27] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6332. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; El Paso, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-26] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6333. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Hebronville, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-24] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6334. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Carrizo Springs, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-29] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6335. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Lake Jackson, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-27] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6336. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D Airspace; Jacksonville Whitehouse NOLF, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-27] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6337. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Burlington, VT [Airspace Docket No. 99-ANE-92] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6338. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Corpus Christi, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-22] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6339. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Puerto Rico, PR [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-17] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6340. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class D Airspace; Hobbs, NM [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-32] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6341. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Marshall, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-51] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6342. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Brownsville, PA [Airspace Docket No. 99-AEA-16.FR] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6343. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Corsicana, TX [Airspace Docket No. 2000-ASW-01] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6344. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Stigler, OK [Airspace Docket No. 2000-ASW-02] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6345. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Herington, KS; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-41] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6346. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Malden, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-42] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6347. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Sikeston, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-43] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6348. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; HUTCHINSON, KS [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-48] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6349. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Emmetsburg, IA [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-39] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6350. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D Airspace; Eglin AFB, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-19] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6351. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D Airspace; Eastover, SC [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-18] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6352. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D Airspace; Jacksonville NAS Cecil Field, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-20] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6353. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Del Rio, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-31] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6354. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Artesia, NM [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-30] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6355. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-11484; AD 99-27-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6356. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company 170, 172, 175 and 177 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-CE-24-AD; Amendment 39-11483; AD 99-27-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6357. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-209, -217, -217A, -217C, and -219 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-80-AD; Amendment 39-11482; AD 99-27-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6358. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited Dart Series Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-11485; AD 99-27-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6359. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace BAe Model ATP Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-201-AD; Amendment 39-11477; AD 99-26-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6360. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model

CL-600-1A11 (CL-600), CL-600-2A12(CL-601), and CL-600-2B16 (CL-601-3A, CL-601-3R, and CL-604) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-11476; AD 99-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6361. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-80 Series Airplanes and Model MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-05-AD; Amendment 39-11428; AD 99-24-04 C1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6362. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-331-AD; Amendment 39-11454; AD 99-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6363. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319 and A320 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-92-AD; Amendment 39-11481; AD 99-26-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6364. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-302-AD; Amendment 39-11478; AD 99-26-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6365. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-11489; AD 99-27-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6366. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 and A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-222-AD; Amendment 39-11491; AD 99-27-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6367. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAC 1-11 200 and 400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-31-AD; Amendment 39-11492; AD 99-27-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6368. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-241-AD; Amendment 39-11486; AD 99-27-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6369. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Anchorage Area; St. Lucie River, Stuart, Florida [CGD07-99-058] (RIN: 2115-AA98) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6370. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Temporary Drawbridge Regulations; Mississippi River, Iowa and Illinois [CGD 08-99-077] (RIN: 2125-AE47) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6371. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operations Regulations; Willamette River, OR [CGD13-99-008] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6372. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Chelsea River, MA [CGD01-00-001] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6373. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operations Regulations; Columbia River, OR [CGD13-99-011] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6374. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Black River, Wisconsin [CGD08-99-064] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6375. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Passaic River, NJ [CGD01-99-206] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6376. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; New York Harbor and Hudson River Fireworks [CGD01-99-130] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6377. A letter from the Director of Central Intelligence and Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, transmitting CDA Request from the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998/Section 308 re Intelligence Activities of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

6378. A letter from the Secretaries of Defense and Veterans Affairs, Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report on the implementation of the health resources sharing portion of the "Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Health Resources Sharing and Emergency Operations Act," pursuant to 38 U.S.C.

8111(f); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

6379. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report for Fiscal Year 1998 regarding the implementation of the health resources sharing portion of the "Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Health Resources Sharing and Emergency Operations Act"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

6380. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the report on "Unauthorized Appropriations and Expiring Authorizations" by the Congressional Budget Office as of January 7, 2000, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 602(f)(3); jointly to the Committees on the Budget and Appropriations.

6381. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Certification that the Resources Pledged by the United States at the November 17, 1999 Kosovo Donors Conference Shall Not Exceed 15 Percent of the Total Resources Pledged by All Donors; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

6382. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting copy of the annual report for calendar year 1999; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

6383. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Requirements for Economic Adjustment Grants—Revolving Loan Fund Projects under 13 CFR Part 308 and Property under Part 314 [Docket No. 991208327-9327-01] (RIN: 0610-ZA12) received January 13, 2000; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Banking and Financial Services.

6384. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report identifying accounts containing unvouchered expenditures that are potentially subject to audit by the Comptroller General, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3524(b); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1749. A bill to designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; with an amendment (Rept. 106-500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 613. An act to encourage Indian economic development, to provide for the disclosure of Indian tribal sovereign immunity in contracts involving Indian tribes, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2484. A bill to provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States (Rept. 106-502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3222. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve literacy through family literacy projects; with amendments (Rept. 106-503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3616. A bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 425. Resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 106-505). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 426. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) to improve the economy and efficiency of Government operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies (Rept. 106-506). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

(Omitted from the Record of February 16, 2000)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 701. A bill to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than March 17, 2000 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a), rule X; and referred to the Committee on the Budget for a period ending not later than March 31, 2000 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(e), rule X. (Rept. 106-499, Part 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. 1070. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than March 2, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3699. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. ROEBSTAR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued by an intercity passenger rail carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3701. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the "Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. FROST, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 3702. A bill to ensure excellent recruitment and training of math and science teachers at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 3703. A bill to consolidate and improve the regulation of the housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BECERRA:
H.R. 3704. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to certain toys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. FORD, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 3705. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for the urgent repair and renovation of public elementary and secondary schools in high-need areas; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 3706. A bill to amend section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 to revise the requirements for areas to be considered as rural areas for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 3707. A bill to authorize funds for the site selection and construction of a facility in Taipei Taiwan suitable for the mission of the American Institute in Taiwan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 3708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a part-time worker who otherwise meets the eligibility requirements for unemployment compensation not be precluded from receiving such

compensation solely because such individual is seeking only part-time work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 3709. A bill to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KLINK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STARK, Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 3710. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assure preservation of safety net hospitals through maintenance of the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a 1 year moratorium on certain diesel fuel excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself and Mrs. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 3712. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study concerning the preservation and public use of sites in Auburn, New York, associated with Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 3713. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to release a reversionary interest of the United States in certain real property previously conveyed to the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3714. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on DMT; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 3715. A bill to revise the article description for monochrome glass envelopes under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 3716. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain ultraviolet dye; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCRERY:

H.R. 3717. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Vinclozolin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3718. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Tepraloxymid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3719. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pyridaben; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3720. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Acetylnicotinic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3721. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on SAME; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3722. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Procion Crimson H-EXL; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3723. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Dispersol Crimson SF Grains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3724. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Procion Navy H-EXL; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3725. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Procion Yellow H-EXL; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3726. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ortho-phenyl phenol ("OPP"); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3727. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Methoxypropene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3728. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on 3,5-Difluoroaniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3729. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on Quinlorac; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3730. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Dispersol Black XF Grains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTOSH:

H.R. 3731. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on fluroxypyr 1-methylheptyl ester (FME); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 3732. A bill to provide for direct payment by foreign students of the information fee under section 641 of the Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 3733. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on ethylene/tetrafluoroethylene copolymer (ETFE); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 3734. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on monolite green 860; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3735. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on monolite green 952; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3736. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on solspere 17260; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3737. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on solspere 17000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3738. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on solspere 5000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3739. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on monolite blue 3R; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3740. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain TAED chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3741. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on a certain polymer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3742. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on isobornyl acetate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3743. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on sodium petroleum sulfonate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3744. A bill to require conveyance of Governors Island, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 3745. A bill to authorize the addition of certain parcels to the Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 3746. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4-hexylresorcinol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3747. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain sensitizing dyes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3748. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain organic pigments and dyes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily reduce the rates of tax on highway gasoline, diesel fuel, and kerosene by 10 cents per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 3750. A bill to reform the International Monetary Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 3751. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain semi-manufactured forms of gold; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 3752. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 4-Nitro-o-xylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 3753. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain copper foils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3754. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain activated carbon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3755. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain buff brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3756. A bill to establish a standard time zone for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WEYGAND:

H.R. 3757. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on Solvent Blue 124; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3758. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on Solvent Blue 104; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3759. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on Pigment Red 176; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3760. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on benzenesulfonamide, 4-amino-2, 5-dimethoxy-N-phenyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3761. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on certain Reactive Red 180 solutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 3762. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on undecylenic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3763. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on n-Heptaldehyde; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3764. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on n-Heptanoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 3765. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans from seeking to recover more than costs in cases of third party recoveries; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SABO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FROST, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. FORD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr.

THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. KLINK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KIND, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 3766. A bill to ensure that the business of the Federal Government is conducted in the public interest and in a manner that provides for public accountability, efficient delivery of services, reasonable cost savings, and prevention of unwarranted Government expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 88. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make eligible for the Office of President a person who has been a United States citizen for twenty years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EWING (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TERRY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with regard to the use of reformulated gasoline fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOYER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HORN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA):

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i community; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. KUCINICH):

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Republic of Lithuania on the tenth anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence from the rule of the former Soviet Union; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 424. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1753 and the Senate amendments thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H. Res. 425. A resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 426. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) to improve the economy and efficiency of Government

operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH (for himself and Mr. LAHOOD):

H. Res. 427. A resolution waiving clause 2(b) of rule XXII to permit introduction and consideration of a certain bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 428. A resolution condemning the discriminatory practices prevalent at Bob Jones University; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

296. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to Senate Paper Number 926 memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to adequately maintain and preserve the grounds and monuments of Gettysburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Resources.

297. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution H.P. 1794 memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce and the Congress of the United States to reconsider the intent to include the Atlantic salmon on the Endangered Species List as it would benefit neither the Atlantic salmon nor the people of Maine and allow Maine to continue to execute its own comprehensive plan to restore the Atlantic salmon to its waters; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. COOK, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 7: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 40: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 59: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 61: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 65: Mr. MOAKLEY and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 73: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 107: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 218: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 303: Mr. MOAKLEY and Mr. INSOLEE.

H.R. 318: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 329: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 347: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 407: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 534: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 612: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 614: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 664: Mr. MINGE and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 701: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 721: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 740: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 742: Mr. PAUL and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 780: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 783: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 809: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 827: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 829: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 860: Mr. BARCIA, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HILL of Indiana.

H.R. 864: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 865: Mr. HORN and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 872: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 984: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1021: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1032: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1044: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GILCHREST, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 1053: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1055: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1070: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1082: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1095: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1102: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1115: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1139: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1163: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1179: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 1188: Mr. EVANS and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1194: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 1217: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1227: Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1248: Mr. PORTER and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1271: Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1273: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1285: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1304: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1313: Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 1325: Mr. STUMP, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1363: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1367: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LEACH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1371: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1443: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1466: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1494: Mr. WAMP and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 1495: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1515: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1592: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BASS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1594: Mr. FARR of California and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1617: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 1634: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1684: Mr. OLVER and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1732: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1816: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1824: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1839: Mr. METCALF, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1876: Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1899: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1976: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1984: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2025: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2059: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 2107: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 2121: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 2166: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GALLEGLEY, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2175: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2221: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 2228: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2289: Mr. GALLEGLEY.

H.R. 2298: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2308: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. OSE.

H.R. 2340: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2342: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2356: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2380: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2402: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2446: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2457: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2459: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. RILEY.

H.R. 2498: Mr. KIND, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2543: Ms. DANNER and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2548: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2552: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2562: Mr. COBURN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. BALDACCIO.

H.R. 2564: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 2579: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2651: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 2655: Mr. RYAN of Kansas.

H.R. 2691: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2720: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 2738: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2765: Mr. FILNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 2780: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2807: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2814: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2864: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 2865: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 2899: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2915: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2965: Mr. BERMAN.

- H.R. 2966: Mr. COBLE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 2992: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 3093: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. REYES, and Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 3042: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3059: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3115: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3135: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 3160: Mr. CANNON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3174: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3193: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 3195: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. REYES, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 3222: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 3235: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SABO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 3244: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3249: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3250: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FROST, Mr. STARK, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3256: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3300: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 3301: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 3320: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 3439: Mr. EWING, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. FORD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3444: Mr. STUMP, Mr. NEY, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 3514: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HORN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 3519: Mr. FILNER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3535: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. COOK, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 3536: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 3539: Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 3552: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3571: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3573: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOFFEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAUL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 3575: Mr. FORD, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 3580: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. KING, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 3581: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3584: Mr. WALSH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KASICH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. COX, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RILEY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 3600: Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3608: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KLINK, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3609: Mr. SHOWS.
H.R. 3616: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. OSE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. METCALF, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 3628: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PORTER, and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 3634: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3639: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HULSHOF, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 3650: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3665: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 3688: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3690: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 3695: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MCINTOSH.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. QUINN.
H.J. Res. 86: Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COX, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. PELOSI.
H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. HOLT.
H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. MCCREERY.
H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. COOK, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H. Con. Res. 240: Mr. TOWNS.
H. Con. Res. 250: Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 253: Mr. TIAHRT.
H. Res. 346: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 396: Mr. ROEMER.
H. Res. 397: Mr. STABENOW, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. PICKETT.
H. Res. 420: Mr. BOEHLERT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

- H. Res. 396: Mr. BLUMENAUER.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 2000

No. 20

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 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:

Loving Father, we ask for humility to accept leadership from You and from those called to be leaders in this Senate. We realize what a difficult task it is to work through conflicts, to work out compromises, and to work for consensus. Endow our leaders, TRENT LOTT and TOM DASCHLE, DON NICKLES and HARRY REID, with a special measure of wisdom as they seek to foster oneness in the Senate. Help all of the Senators to delight in the diversity that sheds varied shades of light on the truth and in the debate that exposes maximum solutions.

Dear Father, may the Senators never forget that they are brothers and sisters in Your eternal family. May this Senate be distinguished for its civility, courtesy, and compassion. Your spirit flourishes where men and women pray for each other, speak truth as they see it without rancor, and listen attentively to each other. Our prayer is that the bond of mutual love for You and for our beloved Nation will keep us one in the spirit of mutual trust and uncompromised trustworthiness. God, bless America and begin in the Senate. You are our Lord and Savior. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PAUL COVERDELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia, 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Georgia is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately resume consideration of the education savings accounts legislation. The pending amendment is the Collins amendment regarding tax deductibility of teacher development supplies. It is expected that the Collins amendment will be laid aside so that other amendments may be offered and debated. Therefore, Senators may anticipate votes throughout today's session of the Senate. As previously mentioned, Senators who have amendments should work with the bill managers on a time to offer those amendments. As a reminder, the Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. so that the weekly party conferences may meet.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from 11 a.m. to 2:15 p.m. today to accommodate the bipartisan Governors' meeting and the weekly party conference meetings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield the floor.

AFFORDABLE EDUCATION ACT OF 1999—Resumed

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1134) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement

accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Collins amendment No. 2854, to eliminate the 2-percent floor on miscellaneous itemized deductions for qualified professional development expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers and to allow a credit against income tax to elementary and secondary school teachers who provide classroom materials.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2857

(Purpose: To increase funding for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk for Senator DODD, who is in transit, cosponsored by Senator REID of Nevada and Senator DORGAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. DODD, for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. REED, proposes an amendment numbered 2857:

Strike section 101 and insert the following:
SEC. 101. IDEA.

There are appropriated to carry out part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \$1,200,000,000, which amount is equal to the projected revenue increase resulting from striking the amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by section 101 of this Act as reported by the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator DODD has worked on this issue for many years. He will be here shortly.

I am very happy we are finally getting the opportunity to have a serious debate about some of the educational

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S899

problems we face in America today. It doesn't matter which of the 50 States you go to, there are problems dealing with education. I would be very happy if, rather than debating alternatives to public education, we started debating how to improve public education. More than 90 percent of the children in America go to public schools. We should be focused on how best to educate that 90-plus percent of children in America today.

The Federal Government provides 6 percent of the total education spending—roughly \$38 billion. That \$38 billion, by the way, is just 2 percent of the total Federal Government's budget. So we spend in America, the greatest nation in the world, the only superpower, 2 percent of our budget to educate our kids. Most Americans do not realize how little the Federal Government contributes to education.

I repeat that figure. The Federal Government spends about 2 percent of its budget on education. Within these tight budget constraints, we must focus on what works. I hope we will start talking about what works and about some of the things that maybe don't work as well and some new things we need to do in the area of education. I hope we can spend some time talking about and providing money for recruiting and training high-quality teachers, principals, and administrators. I hope we can spend some time talking about creating smaller classes and smaller learning communities in large schools. We have had experiences around the country from which we know that smaller schools work better than larger schools.

Deborah Meyer is an expert in this field. She was a school administrator in New York—a large school that is not doing well. She decided, because they were doing so poorly in all areas, that they had to do something radically different. She spoke to her superiors. They agreed to break the school up into four separate schools, with teachers who would report to separate administrators—four distinct schools. Within a very short period of time, all test scores skyrocketed. Everything about those schools improved. Having four schools instead of one school made it easier to teach the kids. The kids felt like they were part of the community.

We need to talk about how we can create smaller schools and smaller classes generally.

We all agree that we need to spend some time and provide resources so we can have schools, teachers and administrators more accountable. We have to ensure that children learn in modern, safe classrooms and repair schools in urgent need of renovation.

When I was growing up in Southern Nevada, the place we all looked to with great admiration was Boulder City, NV. It was the town that was formed as a result of Boulder Dam, now Hoover Dam. It was a wonderful community. In southern Nevada, it was one of the

few places that had grass. It was a company town. They did not allow gambling. The only kind of alcohol that was allowed to be served was 3.2-percent beer. It was really a unique town in Nevada. Kids did very well on all their tests. Their athletic teams were tremendous, even though it was a small school.

A while ago, I was asked to visit that school. They wanted to show me how that school had deteriorated physically—the plan, which had been the admiration of all Nevada, had gone downhill. The gymnasium was run-down. The track where the kids would participate in athletics was in very bad shape. In some places they did not even have hot water. They could not bring in computers because the wiring was so bad.

A lot of schools are that way. There have been some improvements made to Boulder City High School, but it is still an old, old facility. It is a perfect example of a school that needs renovation. You may ask why isn't it renovated. Well, the Clark County school district, which is the seventh or eighth largest school district in America, is growing very rapidly; it is the fastest growing school district in all of America, with approximately 220,000 kids. In 1 year, to try to meet the demands of the children of Clark County, they dedicated 18 new schools—in one school district. They have to build an elementary school every month to keep up with the growth in Clark County. They need to have the resources to be able to renovate schools. They have been too busy building new schools.

That is why it is important that we do something to help local school districts renovate and build new schools. Of course, we need to expand access to technology. One way of doing that is to have modern schools. We have to ensure universal access to high-quality preschool programs and make college more affordable.

I have talked about Nevada; there is probably no better State than Nevada to see the struggles with which our public schools in this country are dealing. Today, they are having a Governor's conference in Washington. Governors from around the United States are gathered here. In the Nevada papers today, they are reporting a conversation with Governor Guinn, newly elected from Nevada. He was formerly the superintendent of schools of Clark County when it was a relatively small school district. He is saying that one of the problems they are having in Nevada is the Federal Government is not helping enough, that they are running \$75 million to \$80 million short just in the Clark County school district every year in the ability to take care of special ed students.

Well, that is what this amendment is all about. This amendment would provide all or part of that \$75 million for the Clark County school district, so the Federal Government would, in effect, meet the obligation that it has.

When it came to be that, instead of having separate school districts, setting a different standard for children who are handicapped, the Federal Government set standards. Now all school districts have to meet the same standards. Prior to that time, different school districts would have different standards for handicapped children. The agreement, or reasoning, or idea was that it would cost about 40 cents for each dollar extra to educate a handicapped child. But the Federal Government hasn't met that obligation. Now it has even dropped in recent years. Instead of 40 cents, it is 6 cents. This amendment is an effort to raise that, to take money and provide it to the handicapped children—those in need of help, the special needs children.

Clark County, as I have indicated, is exploding in population. In just 10 years, Clark County school district enrollment has more than doubled. We can pick any school to show the growth, but let's take the school called Silverado, a high school in Las Vegas. The school now has about 3,800 students, which is 42, 45 percent over capacity. It is expected to grow. Next year, they think Silverado will have over 4,000 students in it. For children at Silverado, it is not only a difficult learning environment, but just to go to a restroom is a real problem. They have the same number of restrooms that they would have for 40 percent less children. This problem at Silverado is true throughout the Clark County school district. I am sorry to report that it is this way around many parts of the country. We have the need for new schools in Clark County, some need renovations. Around many parts of the country, the need is as bad for renovating schools as for building new ones.

In Clark County, we are struggling to find qualified teachers. Last year, we had to hire almost 2,000 new school-teachers in 1 year. That is a real job. Our university system can't produce nearly enough teachers to meet the demands—almost 2,000 new teachers in one school district. We need help in recruiting and training highly qualified teachers.

Nevada is a State—I am not happy to report—which has the highest dropout rate of any State in the country. But there is no State in the Union that should feel smug about dropout rates. In America today, 3,000 children drop out of school every day. These are children who are going to wind up being less than they could be. They certainly won't be as educated as they should be, or as productive economically as they should be; they won't be able to provide for a family the way they could. So high school dropouts is a problem. About 500,000 children drop out of school in America every year. We need to do something about that. That is a major problem that we need to address. I think and hope that this amendment would relate directly to that and provide school districts with money for

those with special needs so they can use their money for other things such as renovating schools, doing something as it relates to making sure they have high quality teachers.

If we can come up with something that would keep some of those children in school—I am sure there is nothing we can do to keep all 500,000 of them in school every year, but if we can reduce the number of dropouts by 100 a day, 200 a day, 500 a day, so at the end of the year, instead of having 500,000 students dropping out of school, we would have 400,000, or 300,000. The fact is that we have to do something about this problem.

The Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, and I offered amendments in the past two Congresses. The year before last we offered an amendment that passed the Senate and was killed in the House last year, I am sorry to report, on a strictly partisan vote. Our amendment dealing with dropouts was defeated. It was strictly a party-line vote.

What would our amendment have done? It would have created, within the Department of Education, a dropout czar, someone whose job it would be to focus only on high school dropouts in this country. There are programs around the country that work quite well. Many of them are very small, but we need somebody to help each school district, to be available, not to force the will of the Federal Government on local school districts, but to be available with resources to see if they can do something to help kids stay in school. If the school district wanted help, they could come to the dropout czar in the Department of Education and get help.

I hope we can look at that during this debate to see what we can do to keep kids in school. As I said, the underlying amendment that we are debating now certainly would allow us to take some of that money now being used for special education and use it for programs such as high school dropouts.

The Federal Government has no intention of taking away the ability of local school districts to make their decisions, but what we need to be is a resource, to be a resource to help public education in America today. School districts all over America are begging for our help. They recognize there is not a movement in Washington to take over local school districts.

We have to recognize that schools should be controlled at the local level. Resources should be provided by the Federal Government, and, in my opinion, far more resources than 2 percent of the Federal budget. Why? Because we need to recognize that schools all over America are struggling. They are struggling because they cannot meet the high interest payments on the bonds they had to let to borrow money to build these schools. We recognize that around the country they are having trouble passing bond issues to pro-

vide for new schools and for renovating new schools.

We know there is a shortage of teachers. We have to do a better job of making sure teachers, who are educated at teachers colleges and other university systems around the country, are well qualified and meet certain minimum standards. We have to focus on this to make sure we have high-quality teachers and good administrators.

We have to recognize that smaller classes are important. We have to recognize on a Federal level we have a national problem across this country with school construction. We have to have a national program to help local school districts.

We have recognized for years that something has to be done about accountability. Goals 2000 is a step in that direction. We have to move on to that.

We have to make sure that children are allowed to go to school in safer schools—schools where the roofs don't leak. We have to make sure that children have access to computer equipment. That is a standard. When I was going to school, you had to have teeter-totters and swings. Now you need to have computers. Expanding activities in technology is vitally important. We have to make sure there is universal access to high-quality preschool programs.

I see on the floor today my friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, who more than any other person in America has made sure that we have a continuing dialog on preschool programs. Head Start programs and other programs are the brainchild of the Senator from Massachusetts.

We have to continue making sure we have high-quality preschool programs, which have been long established. The better preschool programs we have, the better students we have coming to school.

The way the family situation has developed, both parents are working. Because of the need they have, it is more important than ever that there be good, high-quality preschool programs.

The amendment now before us will allow that because it will free up money that simply isn't available to local school districts. I hope the amendment offered by Senator DODD will receive bipartisan support. The \$1.2 billion set forth in this bill will be used to go directly to school districts. That is what this amendment does. Again, I hope it will receive bipartisan support.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I see Senator KENNEDY from Massachusetts. I wish to respond for a moment or two to the comments of Senator REID. Then I think in the comity of events it would come to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Senator REID's statements dealt with a panoply of issues related to education but not necessarily to the amendment

he just submitted for Senator DODD. In a word, the amendment offered by Senator DODD basically removes the education savings accounts provision. It would make that moot.

It is premised on the statement we have all heard many times that special education which was passed in the mid-1970s was supposed to have been funded in part by the Federal Government, in part by the State governments, and in part by the local governments. But the Federal Government never fulfilled its promise.

Interestingly enough, the Democrats were in the majority until 5 years ago. For the entire time they were there when it became law and was the agreement, they consistently ignored it.

Since a Republican majority has come to the Senate, under the leadership of a number of Members on our side—but particularly I will mention today Senator GREGG of New Hampshire—there has been a consistent attempt on our side to fund this special education funding. I will give you an example.

In fiscal year 1997, the President—that is their view—requested \$2.6 billion for this need that the Senator from Nevada has been describing, but we increased that to \$3.1 billion or almost a new \$1 billion to put into special education. In the next year, the President offered a budget of \$3.2 billion, but we passed, at the prodding of the Senator from New Hampshire, \$3.8 billion or \$700 million more.

In fiscal 1999, the President asked for \$3.8 billion, but we answered with \$4.3 billion, another half billion dollars for special education. In the fiscal year 2000 budget, the President asked for \$4.3 billion, but we made it \$4.9 billion.

The point is that on our side we have consistently been trying to improve this account for special education. That was ignored for almost 35 years on the other side.

I have to be a little suspicious of an amendment that suddenly wraps itself around the interest of special education when they couldn't do it for some 35 years previously. It actually took a new majority to start fulfilling their pledge for special education.

As I said, the effect of the amendment would be to make moot the education savings accounts. This issue came up last week in a discussion between myself and Senator WELLSTONE of Minnesota. This \$1.2 billion or \$1.3 billion that we are talking about being invested in education savings accounts will produce \$12 billion in savings and investments in education. It is a classic situation. If we take the \$1.3 billion and commit it to that which is recommended by Senator DODD, it will be worth \$1.3 billion, and we will forfeit the value of the savings buildup that can go to do all the things about which the Senator from Nevada talked. It allows a family to purchase computers. It allows families to hire tutors. It allows families to aid and abet and assist their children who need or have special

education requirements. The effect of this amendment would be to forfeit and give up the accumulation of \$12 billion in new resources and new assets.

That seems to me to be pretty shortsighted. Why would we forfeit one of the largest infusions of resources—I might add one of the smartest infusions of resources—coming from the families themselves? We are not having to raise taxes to do it. No State, nor Governor, nor local school district is having to do it. People are doing it on their own. They are producing smart, intelligent dollars because those dollars will be invested precisely on the need of the students.

At the appropriate time, of course, I will urge our colleagues on a bipartisan basis to defeat this amendment because the effect of it is designed to make moot the education savings accounts. That is the ultimate goal of this amendment.

As I said, when you look at the history of the failure to deal with special education, I think the Senator from New Hampshire referred to this effort as somewhat hollow in that year after year, no attention was paid to the special accounts. Suddenly, we will use it as a weapon against an education savings account, which would choke out, as I said, \$12 billion in new resources. I am all for and will support in next year's budget additional funding for IDEA but not at the expense of forfeiting a voluntarily accumulated \$12 billion that will come to the aid of public, private, and home schooling education all across the country.

I might add, the legislation we are debating deals with school construction. It does it in the appropriate way because it allows the decisionmaking to occur at the local area. The Senator from Nevada goes to great extent to suggest their plans will not interrupt or in any way constrain local school decisions. But the fact of the matter is, in the last 30 years quite the opposite has occurred. Most of our Federal programs have led to enormous constraints and mandates on local school districts. The education savings account goes in a completely different direction. It empowers parents and students and employers. It has no mandates.

So I remind everybody the legislation deals with education savings accounts empowering parents to help their children. It empowers employers to have programs of continuing education. It helps students who are in State-prepaid tuition plans so those resources are not lost to the tax collector. It contributes to allowing more flexibility so local school districts can be involved in school construction—this idea coming from Senator GRAHAM of Florida, from the other side of the aisle.

With that, I will yield the floor.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Certainly.

Mr. DURBIN. I say to the Senator, though we certainly disagree on ap-

proach, I commend him for his interest in education. One thing I found interesting in the analysis of my colleague's bill is the suggestion that most of the benefits for education will go to the wealthiest people in this country.

Will the Senator comment on that and tell me whether he believes, as I do, that though we want every family to have an opportunity, if we are going to have limited resources applied for incentives in education, we should look to working families and middle-income families—and lower income families, for that matter, who otherwise may not ever be able to send their kids off to college—as our highest priority, as opposed to the approach of the Senator, which apparently takes the wealthiest families as the highest priority.

Mr. COVERDELL. I am pleased the Senator asked the question. I do not know where he is getting the data. Let me respond in this way. The means test is identical to the one both the President and the Congress used for the higher education IRA. There is no difference. We all celebrated that IRA account. You can save up to \$500 a year for your college education. All this says is it should be larger, \$2,000, and it should be available for K-12. But there is no difference in the means testing.

The data I have seen over and over suggested over 70 percent of all these savings, or the use of the savings accounts, would go to families earning \$75,000 or less. So if there is a pox on this means test, then there is the same one on an account which we have all been applauding for the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield.

Mr. DURBIN. My argument or observation was we want all families to consider higher education and educational opportunities, regardless of what they are earning. I will just concede for the sake of this debate that the Senator from Georgia is correct, and the \$500 IRA that was proposed by the administration, supported by all of us, probably does benefit those who can save. Generally, those are people in higher income categories.

My question to the Senator from Georgia is, if he is proposing a new program in addition to this, would it not be better now to focus on those who were not served by that \$500 IRA and really focus on those families who may not have the benefit of it if we are going to expand our investment in education?

The Treasury Department estimates that under the Senator's bill, the wealthiest 20 percent, the upper one-fifth of families in America, will receive nearly 70 percent of the benefits. Wouldn't it be more fair, since the initial IRA, as my colleague noted, really helps those families, that additional money spent should go to working families and those who maybe have been overlooked by both the administration and the Senate to this point? Why do

we want to continue this path of subsidizing families who are the wealthiest in our country?

Mr. COVERDELL. Maybe it is just a disagreement between the two of us about what constitutes wealth. I do not consider families, middle-income, earning \$75,000 or less, as wealthy people. Maybe the Senator from Illinois or some other analysis does, but I do not. I think this is the backbone of the country. They are the people who bear the largest burden of the Tax Code. They are having a hard time. Their income tax is at the highest level since World War II. It is so high now that with the disposable income available to them, to do the things we expect them to do about raising their families, they cannot do any more.

So we may just have a disagreement over who is considered wealthy.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I say to the Senator, my guess is when we are talking about the upper 20 percent of America, we are not talking about those of 75,000 or less; we are probably talking about \$75,000 annual income or more.

Mr. COVERDELL. I said that 30 percent of these accounts, as was the case with the account we have already passed, would inure to their benefit, which is not bad.

Mr. DURBIN. Less than a third?

Mr. COVERDELL. Yes. So two-thirds plus of this, in my judgment—we can disagree—is going exactly where we want it to go.

If I might add one other point, unlike the IRA we have already passed, and unlike any other IRA, this account allows sponsors. We do not know the data on that. It is a benefit to even the lower income. It allows parents, families, unions, benevolent associations, and employers to help open these accounts. From what I have seen of people trying to utilize new tools and resources, it is the struggling families who are most likely to use these accounts.

Mr. DURBIN. I will make one final comment and then I will yield the floor because I see the Senator from Massachusetts waiting. I do not disagree with the Senator from Georgia in his intent on helping families pay for education. That, too, is a concern of my colleague, Senator SCHUMER from New York, who supports the President's plan of deductibility of college expenses on your tax returns. I think that is an excellent way of increasing opportunity in education.

I do believe, if we are going to take our money and our surplus and invest it in education, we should look to those who, frankly, need the most help. I think it would be the working families. I am afraid the Senator's approach, according to the Treasury Department analysis, gives 70 percent of the benefits to families in the upper 20 percent of America. It tips the scales heavily to the wealthiest families. I agree with the Senator's comments, and I hope his

bill will reflect we should direct more help to working families struggling to put their kids through college. I am afraid, as I see it, his bill does not do that.

Mr. COVERDELL. I will be very quick, and then I will yield so the Senator from Massachusetts will have his time.

Let me say, there is apparently some disagreement about the flow of the funds. Joint Tax states 70 percent of all benefits goes to families of \$75,000 or less. Again, I repeat the means test is no different than the one that was established by the President and the Congress on the previous smaller savings accounts that we have implemented and, as I said, applauded.

I do appreciate the question from the Senator from Illinois and his interest, which I think is probably shared by all of us one way or the other, in making a very positive education environment for all in the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding. I, like others, have differences with the Senator, but I admire his persistence in this idea and his strong commitment to this proposal. Many of us welcome the opportunity to debate issues on education policy at this point in the session. We have been in session for a number of weeks, and we have dealt with the issues of the Marianas, bankruptcy, and one or two judges. As we come into the first of March, we are very slow and reluctant in addressing concerns of families. This is one of the issues of education.

There always seems to be some interruption. All of us are looking forward to visiting with our Governors. I am looking forward to visiting with mine. Nonetheless, sometime we ought to be about the Nation's business, and the Nation's business is the whole role of how the Federal, State, and local governments are going to provide assistance to make sure we have the best educational system.

We have a responsibility in the area of health care to ensure a full Patients' Bill of Rights so families know the information they get from the doctor is the doctor's recommendation and not an insurance agent's recommendation who is more interested in the bottom line.

We have a responsibility to debate and act on the question of prescription drugs. There is not a group of seniors in my State of Massachusetts who do not place prescription drugs as their foremost concern, and it is a legitimate concern.

We ought to be about the business of addressing those issues. These are some things on the minds of people.

We have started this debate on education policy, and we will be following up tomorrow in our Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The American people ought to understand that we provide very little out of the Federal budget to education. As my friend and colleague from Nevada has pointed out, it is about 2 percent. Most American families say: Out of \$1.7 trillion, we ought to be providing more than 2 percent.

Most would want us to do it, most believe we should do it, but we have not done it. It has been resisted. I imagine we will see further resistance in the Senate debate, finding there are other priorities.

As we know, 7 to 7.5 cents of every Federal dollar goes to the local communities. We are talking about scarce resources. We have to understand we either appropriate the money or we provide tax breaks or tax incentives. It all basically comes from the budget.

What we are talking about today is \$1.2 billion over the next 5 years and how it will be used. The Dodd amendment says there are public policy issues related to education that have a higher priority. He will insist the Senate vote to decide whether we are going to provide the \$1.2 billion to assist local communities to offset the additional costs that are necessary for needy children, or whether the \$1.2 billion will go to 7 percent of families with children in private schools.

Half the money in the Coverdell proposal, which is represented by one of these little figures on this chart, will go to benefit one of these figures and the other half will go to benefit those who go to private schools. That is not something we have admitted or stated. That is even according to Mr. COVERDELL, as he said on February 23:

The division of the money is 50-50.

At the start of this debate, we have to ask: Where do we want the limited resources to go? Do we want to strengthen the public school systems, or do we want to divert scarce resources to the private schools? Private schools play an enormously important role in our society, but we are talking about scarce resources.

What does the Dodd amendment do? It says if we have \$1.2 billion, we ought to use that \$1.2 billion to help all the families in communities across the country who are burdened, in one sense, but also given an opportunity in another sense, to provide some decent education for children who have special needs. That opportunity developed in the 1970s as a result of Supreme Court cases decisions that said the guarantee by the States of educating their children also applies to special-needs children.

Our friend, Governor Weicker of the State of Connecticut, introduced legislation to help offset those additional needs for those schools. Over time, we have been trying to increase funding for special-needs children.

I take my hat off to our good friend from the State of New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, who insists we put this as the first priority for all Government funding. Many of us believe we should in-

crease funding for special-needs children. Senator DODD's amendment, which is so compelling, says: Look, if we have \$1.2 billion, let's take that \$1.2 billion and help all the communities across the country that are providing assistance to special-needs children. That is more important than taking half of that money and giving it to the private school students. I think a pretty good case can be made for that.

Senator DODD has offered an amendment in the past to do exactly that. On April 23, 1998, he offered that amendment, and it failed by a narrow margin. He was able to marshal almost half of the Senate. We are very hopeful the Dodd amendment will be successful today.

I offered a similar amendment in March of 1999 at the time the Senate was considering the \$792 billion tax break bill. The tax break bill—remember that?

We listened to many of our colleagues talking about the importance of having special education and funding special education. I offered an amendment that said: All right, let's adopt what would have been part of the tax break bill to fund special education needs for the next 10 years. Do you know what that would have meant in terms of a reduction in the tax break bill? It would have reduced the total tax break for fortunate individuals and corporations by only a fifth. Four-fifths would have still gone through the Senate.

That was a pretty good opportunity to say: If we are really serious about trying to do something for special-needs children, let's go ahead and take the opportunity with real money—not authorizations, not on appropriations that may be rejected or vetoed because they have other kinds of proposals; no gimmicks—let's do something that is actually going to go to the President of the United States, something that is going to go on through and at least be considered. Not a single vote—not one vote, not five votes, not four votes, not three votes, not two votes—not a single one came from that side of the aisle.

You can imagine why many of us, when we hear these statements on the other side about the importance of special education and special needs, why we take that with a good deal of doubt.

The fact of the matter is, many of these proposals that we will have an opportunity to debate later on have some important impact on special education. In smaller classes, teachers can help identify those children with some special needs and can be separated out to be given the extra help and assistance they need, instead of the children being thrown into the situation where it makes it much more complicated and expensive.

Early involvement, through the expansion of the Head Start Program, most importantly, can get some help and assistance to those students; and, secondly, save a good deal of resources in funding.

We do not believe you ought to place one group of children against another, but some do. Those of us who have been in support of the President's program, Vice President GORE's excellent program, with an emphasis on early intervention, do not believe in pitting one child against another.

We will have the opportunity to follow Senator DODD's leadership and say: Let's just take this funding—half of the money goes to about 10 percent of the children, and half of it goes to 90 percent of the children—let's say: We find that this is sufficiently important that we are going to provide the funds for all of the special needs.

I do not want to take much time of the Senate, but I do want to review a little bit about education policy in recent times because I believe this is a matter of enormous importance and consequence. We ought to understand whether this is just a policy difference between us or whether this is something that is much more basic and fundamental.

I have here statistics going back for the last 6 years under Republican leadership, showing where the Republican leadership has been on the issue of cuts in education funding.

In the 1995 House rescissions bill, we have \$1.7 billion enacted. It had been appropriated, and the President signed it. The new leadership said: We are going to go right back there under rescissions and take \$1.7 billion. That was done just after the election.

In 1996, House Appropriations cut \$3.9 billion below the previous year. In 1997, it was \$3.1 billion below the President; in 1998, it was \$200 million below the President; in 1999, \$2 billion below the President; for the fiscal year 2000 House bill, \$2.8 billion below the President.

You cannot say: Well, you can do anything with figures around here. That is a pretty consistent record of where the Republican leadership has been over the last 6 or 7 years on the priorities of education.

Those of us who believe in investing in children, who believe we need a partnership at the Federal, State, and local level, are not saying that money, in and of itself, is going to provide all the answers. But what we are saying is: Investing in resources is a pretty clear indication of a nation's priorities and a pretty clear indication of what is believed to be important.

Where you had 3 or 4 years ago the cutting of billions and billions of dollars, and abolishing the Department of Education, now we come out with \$1.2 billion—some \$300 million a year—as their first priority in the areas of education.

I have some difficulty in believing that is really what the American people want. I think the American people want us to say: Let's get the best ideas among Democrats and Republicans to get the best trained teachers and put them in every classroom in America. And let's find out how to make sure

that teacher is going to stay there. Let's find out how we are going to be able to cut back on the size of larger schools so we can get students into smaller classes, which has been demonstrated to show a higher degree of academic performance.

Let's talk about afterschool programs and how they are being tied to performance in universities and how they are being tied to the private sector, where there are job opportunities with help and assistance from tutorials.

Let's talk about programs such as the one I saw just yesterday in my home city of Boston. Intel, one of the great American companies, is doing workshops to try to provide help and assistance to inner-city kids. They are going to open up programs around the country. Let's talk about what they are doing. If those programs are so good, we ought to be able to replicate them. Let's talk about how we are going to provide greater opportunities for kids to continue on into higher education.

It seems to me the American people want this debate and want it out here on the floor of the Senate. But, oh, no, we have this particular proposal.

That is why I think it is so important that we have the opportunity to vote on the Dodd proposal. What we are basically saying is: All right, \$1.2 billion; let's put this in the areas of special needs. Let's go ahead and help them. That is an important area. Let's go on and provide that kind of help and assistance.

Senator DODD knows so well, as others, that before we had the IDEA, we had about 5.5 million children locked in closets who never went to school.

Now we find that children who are going to complete high school, 57 percent of the disabled youth are competitively employed within 5 years after leaving high school, compared to an employment rate of 25 percent for disabled adults who have never benefited from IDEA. When we invest in these children, we get results. The Dodd amendment is what is going to get results for some of the neediest causes for families in this country.

In my own State of Massachusetts, there are small towns where families have these kinds of challenges with regard to a particular individual. The schools have to provide those services. It provides a very significant increased burden on the taxes of those local communities. Let's say, look, wherever they are, if they are in Georgia, if they are in Illinois, if they are in Massachusetts, they are going to get some help and assistance from this particular program.

There is a priority. That has a higher priority than just providing this kind of money that is going to be scattered the way it has been indicated. That is the essence.

I see the good Senator from Connecticut, our leader on this fight time and again. We commend him for stak-

ing out, in the first real order of business, the first real order of debate, the importance and significance of this amendment and helping to provide for families who have special needs children.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his presentation this morning and his leadership throughout his career in the Senate on issues of education. There is no Senator on the floor who can hold a candle to Senator KENNEDY when it comes to issues of education. He not only understands them in a better way than most of us, but he is more articulate, forceful, and committed than any Member of the Senate. It is a pleasure to join him in this debate this morning.

I think he has very convincingly laid out the case of the difference between the two parties. Our Republican friends on the opposite side of the aisle have a different view of education than Democrats do. There have been those on the Republican side who have called for abolishing the Department of Education in Washington. There have been those, as well, who have suggested that if the Federal Government has a role, it should be in supporting private schools with the so-called voucher system.

There have been those who have opposed suggestions from the President and others that if the Federal Government is to have a role, albeit a small role, it should be focused on things that are so important for every school district across America, whether it is modernizing our school buildings so the kids who presently are enrolled have an opportunity and access to the best technology to prepare them for the future, whether it means teacher training so the teachers we respect so much today can continue to develop their skills, so the children coming in the classroom really are, in many cases, taught by teachers who understand the new technology as well or better than the children.

There is a standing joke in my office that if you can't understand how the computer works, look for a teenager. I think most of us understand that young people because they have been raised in this culture and have no fear of this machinery, many times eclipse the skills and talents of even the teachers in the classroom.

Democrats believe on focusing some money on teacher training. A better trained teacher is going to do a better job in the classroom. Of course, the reduction of class size is part of this as well. I have seen school districts in my home State of Illinois and the city of Chicago, in a more Republican area in general, Du Page County, a wealthier area, where teachers tell me, with a smaller class size they can pick out the kids who need special help and make sure they keep up with the class. They can also identify the gifted kids and give them better and tougher assignments so they can improve, too. These

are the issues on which Democrats have said time and again we should focus.

Our colleague, Senator DODD from Connecticut, has joined us. I am happy he is here because he has a very critical amendment. Where Senator COVERDELL's bill suggests we will focus half of the assistance in this new program on private schools where only 10 percent of our kids attend school and where he has said the vast majority of the resources in his bill will go to the wealthiest families in our country, those in the upper 20 percent, Senator DODD comes in with a much more practical and grounded alternative.

I will leave it to the Senator to explain it in detail, the idea that we would provide school districts across America, rich and poor, wherever they are located, assistance in helping to educate kids with special needs. Meet with any school board member, any school superintendent, or many teachers for that matter, and ask them about the challenges of today. They will tell you that kids with special needs, disabled kids, need special attention so they can develop their highest potential. It costs money to do it. It takes extra resources. We have made the commitment in theory. What Senator DODD suggests is we should put our money where our commitment is and say to these school districts that we will help you with these kids. We believe it is worth the investment.

At this point I see Senator DODD is on the floor and prepared to discuss his amendment. I am happy to yield to my colleague from the State of Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding. Let me also thank our good friend, the Senator from Nevada, HARRY REID, for introducing the amendment on my behalf. Unfortunately, I was delayed this morning due to a problem with my flight. I apologize for not getting here earlier and I am grateful to my colleague for stepping in to help.

I see my good friend from Georgia is here. We have gone around on this issue in the past. I have great respect and admiration for him. We disagree on this issue, so I am sure we will have a good healthy debate about it.

In fact, we may not disagree about it at all. What I am trying to do with this amendment, I presume my friend from Georgia and others would also support. Let me briefly outline the amendment for my colleagues. While we only have a few minutes this morning, we will resume debate this afternoon.

It is somewhat ironic, in a way, that we will be meeting in about 22 minutes with the national Governors. We will gather together and have a joint meeting. I commend the leadership for arranging that.

Due to this meeting, I think it is worthy of note that the Governors are headed up by Mike Leavitt, Governor from Utah; Governor Mike Huckabee, vice chair on Human Resources from

Arkansas; Governor Jim Hunt from North Carolina, who is the chair of the Committee on Human Resources; and Governor Tom Carper of Delaware, who is co-chair with Mike Leavitt of the National Governors' Association.

This letter is dated a year ago, but it was about a year ago that we engaged in a similar debate. At that time, a letter was sent to our colleague, PETE DOMENICI, chairman of the Committee on the Budget. The letter specifically addresses the issue my amendment proposes to correct or to at least offer to provide some support for special education funding. The letter says:

As you prepare the budget resolution for the coming fiscal year, the nation's Governors urge Congress to live up to agreements already made to meet current funding commitments to states before funding new initiatives or tax cuts in the federal budget.

The federal government committed to fully fund—defined as 40 percent of the costs—the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) when the law, formerly known as the Education of the Handicapped Act, was passed in 1975. Currently, the federal government's contribution amounts to only 11 percent, and states are funding the balance to assist school districts in providing special education and related services. Although we strongly support providing the necessary services and support to help all students succeed, the costs associated with implementing IDEA are placing an increased burden on states.

We are currently reallocating existing state funds from other programs or committing new funds to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a "free and appropriate public education." In some cases, we are taking funds from existing education programs to pay for the costs of educating our students with disabilities because we believe that all students deserve an equal opportunity to learn. Therefore, Governors urge Congress to honor its original commitment and fully fund 40 percent of Part B services as authorized by IDEA so the goals of the act can be achieved.

Mr. President, I also have a letter, dated February 23, 2000, from the National School Boards Association opposing the underlying bill, the Affordable Education Act, and supporting my amendment. Specifically, I quote from the letter:

NSBA believes that a greater benefit for children and taxpayers alike will occur if this money is spent meeting the unmet federal commitment in special education. Throughout the country, taxpayers are indirectly paying higher school and property taxes in their districts to compensate for the federal funding shortfall in the education of children with disabilities. Rather than create a tax benefit for a select few, applying these funds to special education would benefit more taxpayers and public schools.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters from the Governors, as well as the National School Boards Association, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
March 9, 1999.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you prepare the budget resolution for the coming fiscal year,

the nation's Governors urge Congress to live up to agreements already made to meet current funding commitments to states before funding new initiatives or tax cuts in the federal budget.

The Federal Government committed to fully fund—defined as 40 percent of other costs—the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) when the law, formerly known as Education of the Handicapped Act, was passed in 1975. Currently, The Federal Government's contribution amounts to only 11 percent, and states are funding the balance to assist school districts in providing special education and related services. Although we strongly support providing the necessary services and support to help all students succeed, the costs associated with implementing IDEA are placing an increased burden on states.

We are currently reallocating existing state funds from other programs or committing new funds to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a "free and appropriate public education." In some cases, we are taking funds from existing education programs to pay for the costs of educating our students with disabilities because we believe that all students deserve an equal opportunity to learn. Therefore, Governors urge Congress to honor its original commitment and fully fund 40 percent of Part B services as authorized by IDEA so the goals of the act can be achieved.

This is such a high priority for Governors, that at the recent National Governors' Association Winter Meeting, it was a topic of discussion with the President as well as the subject of an adopted, revised policy attached. Many thanks for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Gov. THOMAS R. CARPER.
Gov. MICHAEL O. LEAVITT.
Gov. JAMES B. HUNT, Jr.,
Chair, Committee on
Human Resources.
Gov. MIKE HUCKABEE,
Vice Chair, Committee
on Human Resources.

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, February 23, 2000.

Re Oppose S. 1134, the Affordable Education Act

MEMBER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the nation's 95,000 local boards members, the National School Boards Association (NSBA) urges you to oppose S. 1134, the Affordable Education Act.

NSBA is opposed to this legislation that would expand education savings accounts to allow tax-free expenditures for K-12 public, private, and religious school tuition. NSBA believes that limited public funds could be better invested in priority areas of K-12 education. Specifically, Congress should focus scarce tax dollars on the federal government's current obligations to our nation's public schools.

The Joint Tax Committee estimated that K-12 education savings accounts come with a price tag of well over \$2 billion over ten years. In addition to the expense of this program, education savings accounts would disproportionately be used by affluent families and provide very little benefits to lower and middle income families. NSBA believes that a greater benefit for children and taxpayers alike will occur if this money is spent meeting the unmet federal commitment in special education. Throughout the country, taxpayers are indirectly paying higher school and property taxes in their districts to compensate for the federal funding shortfall in

the education of children with disabilities. Rather than create a tax benefit for a select few, applying these funds to special education would benefit more taxpayers and public schools.

Providing additional funds for students with disabilities will enable Congress to take a small step forward in eliminating the unfunded mandate on local school districts. This, in turn, will free up funds at the local level to help increase student achievement for all students.

NSBA urges you to oppose the education savings accounts legislation. If you have questions, please contact Dan Fuller, director of federal programs, at 703-838-6763.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. RESNICK,
Associate Executive Director.

Mr. DODD. Let me again make the point I made last week and will make again this afternoon. There are parts of this bill the Senator from Georgia is offering with which I have no disagreement. However, it seems to me that we are talking about relatively scarce resources. While we are in a surplus—and we all applaud this fact—we all know we don't have all the money we would like to spend in educational areas. But to have a tax break of a \$1.2 billion over 5 years, the cumulative benefit, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, would amount to \$20.50—\$20.50 on average.

My amendment would provide a benefit that would go back to our communities where we know from our mayors and county executives how difficult it is for local taxpayers to support the costs of special needs education. In some cases, the cost of a special needs child can be \$50,000 or more per year. Now, on average, it is a lot lower, but there are cases that are not that rare, in fact where the costs are very high, that is borne by the local property taxpayers, or the State taxpayers.

We made a commitment—the Federal Government—and said: we think you ought to provide an education for all children in this country. We think it is important to educate children with disabilities. I will tell you what we will do, communities and States. If you will support this effort and put up 60 percent of the money, we will put up 40 percent of the money.

Despite the fact we made that commitment more than a quarter century ago, we have only gotten up to 12.7 percent. Now, \$1.2 billion doesn't get you

to 40 percent, but it gets you a lot closer. That is real tax relief, what the Governors are asking us to do, what the national school boards are asking us to do, and what our mayors and county executives have asked us to do.

I can't think of a better way to allocate \$1.2 billion if we are going to do it at this juncture, do what the Governors asked us to do and what the mayors asked us to do—that is, be the partner we promised to be on special education.

My mayors in Connecticut tell me it is the most important issue to them. I asked them what we can do to help them out. They say: Help us in this area. You made the promise, so why don't you do it?

Instead, what we do too often is pit people against each other in local communities, where a family, unfortunately, has been hit with a child born with a significant disability and, all of a sudden, the cost of educating that child is high, and there are people who resent that fact locally. It creates tensions in our towns and cities. I don't think that ought to be the case. So with scarce resources, why not pitch in, why not meet the commitments we have made.

This may take a supermajority vote. I suspect there is going to be a point of order raised against this amendment that will require 60 votes. I have listened to my colleagues over and over, going back some 7, 8, 10 years ago when I first offered this amendment in the Budget Committee. I lost the amendment on a tie vote. To the credit of the majority leader, TRENT LOTT, he supported me, as did several other Republicans. However, I lost some Democratic votes on the Budget Committee. Almost every year since then, I have offered some variation of this amendment. We have come close some years, not so close in others. But all of us know when we go back to our States, this is an issue our constituents and their representatives at the local level care about, and they want the Federal Government to live up to the commitments we made so many years ago.

It is important to children with special needs. Again, I am preaching to the choir, I suspect, because all of my colleagues care about education. But if we are going to have the best educated population this country has ever produced—and I think we need to do that

if we are going to succeed in the 21st century—then we have to make intelligent investments of taxpayer money when it comes to achieving that goal.

We have children with special education needs. This is an opportunity now for us to not provide a \$20.50 average tax break, but to get money back to these communities that will allow them to provide the kind of educational opportunity for children with special needs who can be productive, contributing members of our society. But if children with disabilities don't get the educational tools they need, they too often face insurmountable obstacles.

Again, it is not that what the Senator from Georgia has proposed is necessarily a terrible idea; I am not suggesting that. I suggest if you have limited resources, and we have clear choices—I think most Americans when confronted with the choice of getting a \$20.50 tax break over 5 years, or seeing this money go to defray local property taxes or State taxes, to live up to the commitment on special education, I believe most Americans would choose the latter; they would see this as a better investment of their tax money by reducing those costs.

So I also want to add, if I could at this point, a list of what it costs each State, the charts that will spell out in each State the special education costs. They are very high. These are very high costs in terms of what we are contributing. To give you an idea, in the State of California, in special education costs, we come up with 5 percent of the money, the State comes up with 71 percent, and the local government comes up with 24 percent. Going on down this list of various States, to give you some sense of it. In the top State I can find, Indiana, we do 17 percent, the State does 63, and the local does 20. Most of them are in the single-digit area where it is 4, 5, 6, 9 percent coming from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list of education expenditures reported by selective States on special education be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE I-2—SPECIAL EDUCATION EXPENDITURES AS REPORTED BY SELECTED STATES
[19th annual report to Congress: Section I—The costs of special education]

State	Total special education expenditures*	Associated special education student count**	Average State-defined special education expenditure per student	Percentage of support by source			Confidence in data
				Federal	State	Local	
California	^ \$3,070,700,000	^ 550,293	\$5,580	5	71	24	SC
Colorado	^ 260,337,092	^ 76,374	3,409	9	31	60	HC
Connecticut	^ 627,331,211	^ 73,792	8,501	4	37	59	HC
Florida	^ 1,470,186,078	^ 290,630	5,059	6	56	38	C
Indiana	^ 350,430,294	^ 127,079	2,758	17	63	20	NC
Iowa	^ 277,700,000	^ 65,039	4,270	11	70	19	HC
Kansas	^ 326,106,608	^ 47,489	6,867	7	54	39	HC
Louisiana	^ 427,924,416	^ 108,317	3,951	6	94	0	C
Maine	^ 145,000,000	^ 30,565	4,744	8	59	33	HC
Maryland	^ 757,328,777	^ 95,752	7,909	5	26	69	HC
Massachusetts	^ 1,065,523,416	^ 149,431	7,131	6	30	64	HC
Michigan	^ 1,334,000,000	^ 188,703	7,069	6	34	60	HC
Minnesota	^ 689,656,932	^ 96,542	7,144	6	70	24	NC
Missouri	^ 436,778,659	^ 121,419	3,597	10	30	60	C
Montana	^ 54,865,132	^ 17,881	3,068	14	60	26	HC

TABLE I-2—SPECIAL EDUCATION EXPENDITURES AS REPORTED BY SELECTED STATES—Continued

[19th annual report to Congress: Section I—The costs of special education]

State	Total special education expenditures*	Associated special education student count**	Average State-defined special education expenditure per student	Percentage of support by source			Confidence in data
				Federal	State	Local	
Nevada	202,369,114	24,624	8,218	4	40	56	C
New Mexico	^B 250,000,000	45,364	5,511	9	90	1	SC
North Carolina	^C 344,809,332	142,394	2,422	15	76	9	HC
North Dakota	54,560,122	12,180	4,479	10	31	59	SC
Rhode Island	147,300,000	25,143	5,858	5	36	59	HC
South Dakota	61,618,034	15,208	4,052	13	49	38	HC
Vermont	79,155,945	^H 10,131	7,813	5	39	56	HC
Virginia	608,692,266	^D 129,498	4,700	9	23	68	C
Wisconsin	^A 630,000,000	95,552	6,593	6	62	32	C
Total for all reporting States	13,929,607,674	2,581,905	5,395	7	53	40	
Total for highly confident or confident States	9,514,260,326	1,750,477	5,435	7	44	49	

*States reported for the 1993-94 school year except as designated below.
 **Count of students reported by the State associated with the reported total expenditure; includes age range 3-21 except as designated below.
^A 1992-93 ^B 1994-95 ^C 1990-91 ^D Includes age range 0-22 ^E Includes age range 0-21 ^F Includes age range 0-26 ^G Includes age range 3-22 ^H Includes age range 5-22.
 Confidence in Data: HC—Highly confident SC—Somewhat confident C—Confident NC—Not confident.
 Source: CSEF Survey on State Special Education Funding Systems, 1994-95.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is unfortunate, in a sense, to begin this dialog with such a piece of legislation that my friend from Georgia has offered, which I think is not well conceived in terms of the impact it could have, if we chose to dedicate it to special education.

While education may be the issue foremost in the minds of the American public, I highly doubt that the public has this legislation before us this morning in mind when they think of ways the Federal Government could be helping to improve our schools in this country.

Education savings accounts, as proposed in this legislation, represent, in my view, bad education policy, bad tax policy, and a waste of valuable Federal resources that could be so helpful if directed to public schools and special education needs. In fact, the legislation offered by our friend and colleague from Georgia offers very little to public schools.

Remember, there were 55 million kids in this country getting up and going to school a couple of hours ago. They went off to elementary and secondary schools this morning across the country; 5 million went to a private or parochial school; 50 million went to a public school. Even if we try to take every kid out of a public school and put them in a private school, they would not fit. The overwhelming majority of kids who went to school this morning went to a public school. Certainly, while we bear a responsibility to try to improve the quality of education for all children, we certainly have a unique and special responsibility to see to it that public education gets our undivided attention—at least the majority of our attention on this issue, not at the exclusion of the others.

Certainly, we have a very high degree of responsibility to see that these children are going to get the quality education they deserve. According to the Joint Tax Committee, not a partisan committee, the average benefit per child in public school would be approximately \$20.50 over 5 years. I ask the question: How is the family of a public

school student going to improve their child's education environment with an average benefit of \$5 a year? I believe, however, that we can salvage the bill before us and make a real contribution to the work of teachers, parents, and our communities.

My amendment simply does the following: It takes the \$1.2 billion in this proposal and sends it down instead to local schools to help meet the costs of special education. This straightforward proposal offers an alternative to the underlying legislation, which will make a real difference, in my view, in education and in our schools.

Upon the enactment of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act in 1975, the Federal Government committed to our State and local governments around this country—to all 50 States—that it would contribute—we would, the Federal Government would, the Congress would—40 percent of the funds needed to provide special education services. That was 25 years ago we made that commitment.

Presently, the Federal contribution for special education is 12.7 percent of their special education costs. And that varies from State to State. The Federal contribution to special education has never risen above 13 percent. The Federal Government, today, would need to boost its IDEA funding an estimated \$15.8 billion to live up to its original commitment to our Nation's special needs children in our districts and States across the country.

The amendment I offer this morning would redirect the \$1.2 billion over 5 years spent by the Coverdell initiative to IDEA. These funds would directly aid State and local school districts in providing the critically important special education services children with disabilities deserve.

I often hear from school and town officials in my State of Connecticut—as I am sure the Presiding Officer does in Idaho, and my colleague from Georgia does as well—about the high costs associated with providing special education services. Our local school districts are struggling to meet the needs of their students with disabilities which at

times can be overwhelming to smaller rural communities. In Connecticut, the State spends more than \$700 million annually, or 18 percent of the State's overall education budget, to fund special education programs. In Torrington, CT, special education costs recently increased from \$635,000 to \$1.3 million over a two year period. Torrington is a relatively small, midsized, urban community in my State. It is not Hartford, Bridgeport, New Haven, or Stamford. Torrington is a small town. \$1.3 million in that small town's budget goes to provide special education services. However, for my part, I believe the issue is not that special education services may cost too much. They are clearly a good investment, in my view, over the long term. Rather, the issue is that the Federal Government contributes too little.

Congress passed the IDEA legislation. I believe Congress should fulfill its commitment to our Nation's special needs children and our communities by increasing its share, as we committed to do, of special education costs before we enact legislation proposals such as the one before us that do nothing, in my view, to improve the quality of our public schools.

Over the last few years, this body has greatly strengthened the federal commitment to children with disabilities. Since fiscal year 1998, Congress has increased special education funding by 25 percent. However, that money is spread thinly across 50 States.

Despite the Federal Government's recent increases in its support for special education services, the cost of providing these services has risen dramatically in recent years. Our recent increases in funding are not keeping pace with increased costs. Today, providing special education services to a child with a disability costs about 2.3 times that of regular education. Special education spending grew 19 percent of all school spending in 1996 across the country.

Thus, changes in enrollment in special education programs in recent years is also a key factor behind increases in costs for special education

programs. In the last 5 years alone, schools' special education enrollment has increased by 12.6 percent. Today, 1 out of every 10 students in public schools receives special education services under the IDEA legislation.

In my own State of Connecticut, approximately 14 percent of all students are enrolled in special education programs. Our State and local school districts need our help. The amendment I am offering today moves us in the right direction.

According to a 1996 Gallup poll, 47 percent of those surveyed said America is spending too little of its education budget on students with special needs. Only 5 percent of those surveyed reported that too much is being spent on special needs children. The amendment I offer Senator COVERDELL's legislation would address this public concern.

By increasing the Federal contribution to States for special education services, I believe we will greatly aid State and local school districts by allowing them to reduce the disproportionate share of special education services they have had to carry for far too long. When school districts are forced to increase the amount of funds for special education, they are often forced to raise taxes or reduce funding for nonspecial education programs. These school districts need our help. More importantly, though, children with disabilities need our help more.

Demonstrating the importance of special education funding to our States, the National Governors' Association—again, I refer to the letter behind me to the Senate Budget Committee chairman—asks Congress to fulfill its commitment to special education funding before "funding new tax initiatives or tax cuts" such as being proposed by the Coverdell proposal.

Additionally, the National School Boards Association letter dated February 23 to all Senators says, "Rather than create a tax benefit for a select few, applying these funds to special education would benefit more taxpayers and public schools" across the country.

We often like to talk in this body about what the public wants and what they need. Yet here we have the National School Boards Association, those who every day have to make the tough choices deciding how to operate our schools across the Nation, asking us not to enact tax relief that would only benefit a select few and telling us what our children really need—better qualified teachers, smaller class sizes, and more funds for special education.

Today, I hope as we come back later in the afternoon to this amendment that our colleagues will rally behind us. We could accomplish a great deal. It would be a major first step in coming together in a bipartisan way to do something about which all of us have talked to our States about for many years, and that is to be a better partner when it comes to educating children with special needs. We have not been

the full partner we promised to be. The costs are going up, and the local taxpayer is being saddled with that burden.

We have an obligation and I think a responsibility. We can live up to this obligation this afternoon by voting for this amendment and saying that the \$1.2 billion in this proposal we will give back to our States to give to these children, to these mayors, to the county executives, and to our Governors to see to it that these children and our communities will have an opportunity to meet those responsibilities.

I see that the hour for us to recess is about at hand. I will not delay the proceedings of the Senate any longer except to note that I will come back this afternoon to talk about this further and invite my colleagues to come forward on both sides of the aisle to engage in this discussion. We haven't had many votes this year. We haven't had much of an opportunity in this Congress to express what we think the priorities of the American public are and how we can fulfill them. But we all know education is right at the top of American's priorities, indicating that the American public wants this Congress, their Government, to pay attention to the needs of the educational responsibilities in our country. I think we have a chance to do that today with this amendment.

Presently, we only contribute 7 cents out of every dollar to education. Ninety-three cents comes from local and State taxes. Seven cents comes from Washington DC. But here we have a chance, with our 7 cents, if you will, to do something meaningful for our States and meaningful for these families and children with special education needs.

My sincere hope is that when the opportunity arises for us to answer the rollcall on how we stand on this issue, this body will vote overwhelmingly in support of this amendment and do something very meaningful today with a message we can give our Governors as they go back to their States, and say, Congress is a partner when it comes to special education needs.

I yield the floor. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. 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. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I will have a good bit to say about this most recent presentation by the Senator from Connecticut. Now is not the time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. 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. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding by previous order we are to recess at 11.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 11 a.m. having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15.

Thereupon, at 11:01 a.m., the Senate recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

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

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

AFFORDABLE EDUCATION ACT OF 1999—Continued

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 4 p.m. be consumed in an equally divided fashion for debate on the pending Dodd amendment, and at 4 p.m. the Senate vote in relation to the Dodd amendment. I further ask consent that following the vote, the Senate resume consideration of the Collins amendment No. 2854.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the two above-described amendments, Senator ROBB be recognized to call up an amendment regarding school construction.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, in light of this agreement, Members of the Senate should note that the next vote will occur at 4 p.m., and a second vote regarding the Collins amendment will occur shortly thereafter.

AMENDMENT NO. 2857

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, while the other side is preparing further remarks about their amendment, I want to make it very clear that the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut would, one, make moot the principal core of this legislation, the education savings account. It just wipes it out. No. 2, I wish to make the point that he is making moot an issue that has received extensive bipartisan support in the Senate.

The principal coauthor of the education savings accounts is Senator TORRICELLI of New Jersey. When this

was last voted on before the Senate, it received 59, 60 votes—again, a very bipartisan expression in support of the education savings accounts. I want to make it clear that this amendment would have the effect of destroying a core bipartisan component.

The second point I wish to make is that the Senator from Connecticut argues the money used to create this educational IRA should be used to enhance the funding of special education. Special education, he rightfully points out, is important and represents an unfunded mandate of some 25 years.

I find it interesting that for 25 years the other side of the aisle found it acceptable to ignore the Federal responsibilities for special education, and now with a new majority, we on our side of the aisle have doubled funding for IDEA. We have an attempt to empower parents and local communities to deal with educational requirements for children, and we now find this amendment and the great need on the other side of the aisle to deal with IDEA. There is an incongruity of letting it sit there for so many years without paying attention to it and now all of a sudden it is important.

Mr. DODD. Would my colleague yield on that?

Mr. COVERDELL. I will in a moment.

No. 3, let me say to the Senator from Connecticut, first of all, I agree with the attempts to fund special education for all the reasons the Senator enumerates. But I do not find them mutually exclusive. I do not think we have to take this bipartisan education savings account legislation and throw it in the trash heap to do this.

We have increased funding over the President's proposals for special education 5 years in a row. I think we will do so again. I think this Congress will respond to the goals the Senator has enumerated and to the letter the Senator has showed us from the Governors who, indeed, think this pledge that was made a long time ago and ignored for an awfully long time should be fulfilled. So we agree on that premise. But I do not think you have to make this moot in order to do it.

The last thing I would say—and it is the Senator's amendment, so I want him to be able to conclude his debate—is that we disagree on the nature of the policy. The Senator's side of the aisle, those who do not support it—not those who do—somewhat attempts to minimize the significance of it.

I take some issue with that because we are all down here playing the lauda-

tory band for the fact we passed an IRA for higher education that had parameters identical to the means test that applies here, but its value is only one-fourth what the value of this proposal is. I do not think you can make this an insignificant advantage to people on the one hand but say this education savings account was a great accomplishment on the other.

Frankly, I think the education savings account that we passed for \$500 per year for higher education is a good thing. I supported it. I proposed it. But this is four times the value of that.

In conclusion, I think anything that causes American citizens to save is a good thing. That piece gets left out of this debate. We are going to forgive \$1.2 or \$3 billion over 5 years. Actually, I say to the Senator, for 10 years it is about \$2.4 billion. As a result of that, Americans are going to save \$12 billion. All of it is going to go to education—half of it to public education and half of it to private education. And 70 percent of the families are going to be in public education; 30 percent of the families are going to be in private education. This is going to do good things. It is going to help families who do have special education problems. I think that is good policy.

I think simultaneously we are going to address the goal of the Senator and many of us who share that goal of trying to accelerate funding for IDEA. But as I said, I do not think it has to come at the expense of this idea. Senator WELLSTONE and I got into a debate after the Senator spoke the other day, and I said: There are not many Federal expenditures that provide incentives to people to create large sums of resources that come to education. If you take this \$1.2 billion, as you suggest, and move it to IDEA, it is not bad that we have done it for IDEA, but you will leave \$12 billion on the table. It just evaporates. I do not think there is any need to do that.

I think having those resources in 14 million families, for 20 million children, is of enormous good and will help those families do things that are very meaningful for their children.

I have gone through this rather briefly, but it is the essence of my disagreement—not with the idea of funding IDEA or special ed but that you make them mutually exclusive.

With that, I yield the floor so the Senator may continue explaining his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me respond to a couple of points my friend and colleague from Georgia has raised.

First of all, going back over the history of IDEA and where the support has been and not been over the years, I will ask unanimous consent that this chart, dating from 1980 through the year 2000—over 20 years—be made a part of the RECORD. It indicates the years and what the various Presidents have requested, what was actually appropriated—the distinction between what Presidents offered and what Congress agreed to.

From 1981 through 1992, without exception, the Presidential request was lower than what Congress actually appropriated. Then in 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996 Congress actually appropriated a little less than what the Clinton administration requested. In 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000—my colleague is correct—the last 4 years, is where you actually have the Congress doing better than the Presidential request.

But over the 20 years, through the Reagan and Bush administrations, it was Congress that raised the amount. Most of those years in the Senate—not all, but certainly all those years in the House—the Congress was in the hands, if you will, of the Democrats. So there is a strong background of this.

As I mentioned today, in the Budget Committee I offered—and I am certainly not arguing on behalf of my party; in fact, I lost votes of my party in the Budget Committee. I think I pointed out earlier I had the support of TRENT LOTT, who was a member of the Budget Committee at the time. But when I was on the Budget Committee a number of years ago I tried to put into the budget function category a number, over a period of years—I did not care what amount of years the Congress wanted to accept; 5 years, 10 years, 15 years—with the goal in mind we would reach the 40-percent commitment we committed to in 1975. That is, that the Federal Government would be a much better partner in supporting our local communities with special education costs.

I ask unanimous consent this chart that goes from 1980, actually, through the year 2000, indicating Presidential requests and what Congress appropriated, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION GRANTS TO STATES
(Budget authority in billions of dollars)

Year	President's request	Appropriation	Pres. req. vs. appropriation difference	President's proposed increase	Appropriation annual increase
1980		874.50			
1981	691.50	874.50	183.00	(183.00)	
1982	649.09	931.01	281.92	(225.41)	56.51
1983	771.70	1,017.90	246.21	(159.31)	86.89
1984	998.18	1,068.88	70.70	(19.72)	50.98
1985	1,068.88	1,135.15	66.27		66.27
1986	1,135.15	1,163.28	28.14		28.14
1987	1,135.15	1,338.00	202.86	(28.14)	174.72
1988	1,259.38	1,431.74	172.36	(78.62)	93.74

SPECIAL EDUCATION GRANTS TO STATES—Continued

[Budget authority in billions of dollars]

Year	President's request	Appropriation	Pres. req. vs. appropriation difference	President's proposed increase	Appropriation annual increase
1989	1,474.24	1,475.45	1.21	42.50	43.71
1990	1,525.61	1,542.61	17.00	50.17	67.16
1991	1,615.13	1,854.19	239.06	72.52	311.58
1992	1,976.10	1,976.10		121.91	121.91
1993	2,073.30	2,052.73	(20.57)	97.21	76.63
1994	2,163.71	2,149.69	(14.02)	110.98	96.96
1995	2,353.03	2,322.92	(30.12)	203.35	173.23
1996	2,772.46	2,323.84	(448.62)	449.55	0.92
1997	2,603.25	3,109.40	506.15	279.41	785.56
1998	3,248.75	3,801.00	552.25	139.36	691.61
1999	4,020.70	4,310.70	290.00	219.70	509.70
2000	4,314.00				

Note.—Numbers in parentheses are negative.

Mr. DODD. For those who may be interested, there is a strong record of the Congress through all of the 1980s, up until 1992 actually, doing a better job in terms of what we put into special ed than the administration, which did a bit better from 1992 up through 1996; and then the Congress has done better than the President in the last 4 years in these areas.

Secondly, with regard to the point raised, again, I said earlier, there are parts of the bill offered by my friend from Georgia with which I agree. I am not offering this amendment as a substitute to his bill. It is only dealing with one part of it. There are parts of this bill of which I am very much supportive. It is like anything else, you have to make choices. Would we like to do everything? Maybe some people would like to do everything. But we can't do everything. We have all painfully learned that.

We finally have ourselves in a situation where we now have surpluses. We are moving in the right direction. The interest rates and the economy reflect the fact that we are showing much more fiscal discipline than has been the case in the past.

I am suggesting that given the choice between a \$1.2 billion tax proposal, a new program that may or may not produce, even if we take the best estimates, the results that its proponents suggest—that is, \$1.2 billion taken off the table—based on the evidence that has been submitted by the Joint Committee on Taxation, the benefit for people whose children go to public schools is very limited. They say \$20.50 over 5 years. Those are not my numbers. Those aren't out of the Democratic National Committee or some Democratic think tank. It is the Joint Committee on Taxation, a nonpartisan committee that analyzes what the tax implications are. We use it all the time.

They are saying to us: If you are the parents of public school education children, which is where 50 million kids went to school this morning—of the 55 million kids who went to school, 50 million of them went to public schools, elementary and secondary, 5 million went to private and parochial schools—for the parents of those 50 million kids, the average benefits of all of this over 5 years is \$20.50.

I pose the question, Which is the better choice? If you think you could do

everything, then you ought to vote, I guess, against my amendment and hope at some later date you get a chance to vote for it. We will do everything.

I don't think we can do everything. So I am merely posing an alternative that I think would be more meaningful to our mayors, county executives, Governors. In fact, this morning, at the combination meeting of the Governors and the Senators, it was Governor Angus King, independent Governor of Maine, who stood up and said: If you want to do something about education—and, by the way, I never met him before; I still haven't met him. I don't know the man. But he stood up and said: If you guys in the Senate really want to do something about education, why don't you do something about special education and our costs? He got a standing ovation, applause from everybody in the room.

The Governor of Pennsylvania, Tom Ridge, and Governor Tom Carper of Delaware said: This is the priority. Whom can I call? Whom can I get hold of for you to vote for your amendment, to support your amendment this afternoon? Not because they disagree with what their friend and colleague, as he is mine, is proposing here, but because they think this is a better choice, with limited resources, to go to Oklahoma, Connecticut, Florida, to Georgia, to get back to our communities. It doesn't solve the special education problem. We would have to appropriate \$15 billion to get to the 40 percent obligation.

I don't want to create the illusion that I am solving that problem. We are just getting closer to it. We are at 12.7. We were at 7 percent. Then we started to inch up a little bit in terms of getting better. Now we are close to 13 percent, a far cry from 40, the \$1.2 billion, and I don't have the number what it gets you to. I think probably another couple points, 2 or 3 percentage points, maybe 4 in terms of what that \$1.2 billion spread out over 50 States would do. But at least it is tax relief.

My friend says we do it for higher education. There is no property tax that supports higher education. There are State revenues that do it, but on a local basis that is not where it comes from. In the case of public elementary and secondary education, for the most part it is free. There are costs associated with educating a child. I know

that. But I know very few public higher educational institutions that are free. Most of them are pretty expensive today. Some have a limited amount of cost, but for most of them, it is pretty expensive.

Of course, you don't have to go to college. We would like everybody to. The law requires you go to elementary school and requires that you go to high school or at least stay in school until you are 16. For most States, I think that is true. But there is no requirement you go beyond that. So there is a distinction between what our obligations are to elementary and secondary education and what we try to achieve in higher education—obviously, a huge distinction in cost.

Although I have disagreements with the underlying proposal offered by my friend from Georgia, I believe we are trying to be all places at the same time and, as a result of that, not doing much in any.

My fundamental point is not so much to say this is not a good idea he has proposed but to say this is a better one. I don't know of a mayor in my State who hasn't asked me to do something about this issue for the last 10 years. When I go back, as I know all of our colleagues do, when I go back to them and say: What do you want me to work on this year?—I think all of us do that probably in our December-February periods; we go back and talk to the local officials who are close to our constituents in our States. I don't know of a year when this special education issue hasn't been in the top five of the items about which they say: Look, this is a tremendous cost to us. You mandated it, basically, at the Federal level in 1975. We don't disagree with you. We think we ought to provide educational opportunity for children with special needs in this country so they will maximize their potential. But you promised us, Mr. Senator, you were going to come up with 40 percent of the cost of this. You told us we have to do it. We agree with you. Now you are only up to 12 or 13 percent.

Frankly, in a lot of States, it is around 5 percent, 9 percent. I don't have every State here because not every State gives us all the numbers. Looking down this list, as I mentioned earlier, California has a \$3 billion higher education cost. The Federal Government comes up with 5 percent of that.

So 12.7 is a national number, but individual States are very different. In Florida, it is 6 percent; that is the Federal participation. We are way short of the 40 percent.

I don't see Oklahoma on this, for the benefit of the Presiding Officer, and I don't see Georgia. This is not a complete list of all 50 States.

As I mentioned earlier, some States are 13 percent; South Dakota is. Indiana is 17 percent; that is how much the Federal Government contributes to that price tag for special education. But an awful lot of States are at 5, 8, 7, and 4 percent—Nevada. Montana is at 14 percent; Missouri, 10 percent. It varies from State to State as to how much the Federal dollars are getting back.

My point is this: If you can't do everything, you have to make choices. What is the better choice: A new program that may or may not have the benefits its authors suggest, or to do something that every jurisdiction in this country, every taxpayer at the local level would appreciate and would dramatically, in some cases, reduce the cost of their financial obligations?

I suggest the better choice is the amendment that is pending. It would take that \$1.2 billion and send it back to Oklahoma, Connecticut, Georgia, Florida, California and say: This is a downpayment on that long-term commitment. We haven't reached it yet. We are doing better, but we are not there yet.

I mentioned earlier, California has a \$3.72 billion price tag on special ed. Florida has a \$1.47 billion price tag on special ed. My State of Connecticut is \$627 million. I have one small community, Torrington, CT, that has over \$1 million in special education costs because we required it. In 1975, we said: We will educate all kids, including those with disabilities in this country. We want everybody to have at least the potential or the opportunity to maximize their potential. I don't know of a single person who wants us to retreat on that commitment.

The point of my amendment is, don't retreat on it, but also don't renege. Don't renege on the contract. The contract was to our States and our communities and our counties. Your Federal Government will be a far better partner, and we will help you reduce that financial burden we imposed upon you in 1975 and have never gotten close to paying. The \$1.2 billion gets us closer.

What my friend from Georgia has offered is maybe a great idea—maybe—although I have some disagreements, but I know what this does. I know \$1.2 billion going back to the 50 States of this country will categorically and unequivocally provide relief for people.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. First, I commend my friend because life in the Senate is about choices. I think what the Senator from Connecticut has done for this debate, in my opinion, is to have given

us a very clear choice of how we want to proceed. We have known for, let's say, the last 20 years that there is not an endless cookie jar; we are going to have to make the tough choice.

What the Senator from Connecticut is suggesting is this: We have a program that is vital to perhaps the children in this country who need more help than almost any other group, children who have special ed needs. We have not met our commitment; we haven't fulfilled our promise. So I would appreciate it if the Senator from Connecticut can tell me if I am right in sort of summing up where he is coming from. He has taken the floor and has not said everything in the pending bill is bad, not at all. I know personally he agrees strongly with a couple of things.

Mr. DODD. What I have offered is an amendment to the Coverdell proposal, not a substitute. So I only address this particular issue. There are a number of other provisions in the bill that I think are admirable.

Mrs. BOXER. Those provisions would still stand. What the Senator is basically saying is that the billion-plus would go to people who essentially, for the most part, send their kids to private schools, K through 12, and rather than give them this tax writeoff, if you will, we should use the money to fulfill our commitment for special education. That is the bottom line.

I want to ask my friend two questions. I don't know if he spoke about the meeting with the Governors today, but if he has not, I think it would be an important point, since he spoke to many of us about this today—what the message of the Governors is vis-a-vis this special ed and what it would mean. He has already said what it means to my State to get more funding for special ed. We are in the hole now by several billion dollars. So this amendment is very important.

The second question, perhaps, is a more philosophical one but one to which I would be interested in hearing an answer. I think if we are honest with ourselves, we know the people who could afford to set aside \$2,000 a year in our society each and every year are the ones who are living or earning more than, shall we say, most middle-class people because we know the figures. If we are honest with ourselves, to set aside \$2,000—and that is after-tax money—in an account where, by the way, you don't get any real tax benefit, except the buildup is not taxed, so it comes out to roughly a few dollars a year—who are we really helping? Are we helping 95 percent of public school kids? Are we doing one thing or are we giving a nice, sweet tax benefit to people who already can set aside the money? I think there are two questions. One, if my friend can talk about the Governors and how they feel on this issue of reimbursing the States for special ed; and, two, philosophically, what is going to help more families?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I say to my friend from California that I did

mention the Governors. The Governor of Maine stood up and made the point that this was the top priority, and I think it was one of the few moments when there was widespread applause in the room by colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats; there were a lot of nodding heads.

Obviously, Governors have a long shopping list for us. If they could do one thing in the area of education, this was the issue. TOM DASCHLE raised it: "Ironically, the next vote we are likely to have is on the issue you think is your top priority."

I talked with Governor Ridge of Pennsylvania afterwards, a Republican, and Democratic Governor Tom Carper of Delaware. Both said they are going to try to call members of the respective caucuses to urge them to vote for this amendment. They felt this would make a difference immediately for them. So I thank them. I thank the National Governors' Association. I don't have it with me, but I will get it. I have a year-old letter signed by Michael Leavitt, Governor Mike Huckabee of Arkansas, Tom Carper and Jim Hunt. It is a March 9, 1999, letter to PETE DOMENICI. I have blown it up. In part, it says:

Therefore, Governors urge Congress to honor its original commitment and fully fund 40 percent of Part B services as authorized by IDEA so the goals of the act can be achieved.

In the first paragraph, it says:

As you prepare the budget resolution for the coming fiscal year, the nation's Governors urge Congress to live up to agreements already made to be meet current funding commitments to States before funding new initiatives or tax cuts in the Federal budget.

So 50 State Governors say if you want to pick a priority, this is it. So, again, this isn't, as my friend from Georgia said—again, some may think you can do everything and probably will vote that way. If you can't—and hopefully you can do everything—then you have to make choices about where you should do some things.

I am glad the Senator from California raised the issue about the buildup. I think that is important. The buildup is important. Under higher education—and I drew a distinction; I think there are significant distinctions between the choice of going on to higher education and the requirement that you go to grade school and high school, at least until the age of 16—the fact that public education, where 50 million kids go to school every day is free, whereas higher education is not free, whether it is public or private, and that you don't have a property tax supporting higher education as you do elementary and public education.

When people are planning for college—not that they do it as early as they would like—they start putting that money away early, in some cases when the child is born, with full knowledge that a 4-year college education could end up costing \$100,000 at many

institutions in this country. So you end up with a buildup of \$500 to \$1,000 a year, and that is where it has value. You are not talking about a buildup in that regard, about kids who are young and starting out, I presume. What you are talking about is investing in, as I understand it, some tax-free withdrawals from this account for things like tuition fees, academic tutoring, books, room, board, supplies, equipment, and so forth. So it is going to public and private education.

If you make \$150,000 a year on joint returns, this is a pretty good benefit. If you are making \$30,000 or \$40,000, or less, it is not much at all. The Joint Committee on Taxation said this only had a marginal benefit to people. Also, the accounting practices; can you imagine the nightmare? You are going to be taxed if you buy some things and not taxed if you buy others.

What about if it is sporting equipment to go to school; is that part of the education? What about the band outfit you may wear; is that education or not? I don't know. Maybe others feel certain they know what it is. I can see a nightmare of accounting procedures to try to determine what is truly an educational benefit and what is not quite an educational benefit.

I will finish, and then I will yield to my colleague to respond. Of course, when you start getting into this whole point, as I said, benefits to public school children and their parents, at least based on the assessments we have, are marginal at best; \$5 of tax relief a year, each year, for 5 years—or 4½ or 5 years—as opposed to doing something that lowers your property tax by sending the dollars back to reduce the cost of special education and local community—I promise you that is more than \$5 a year; it is significantly more for people.

Again, it is the choice I think we make. We all say we love to listen to our Governors. The Governors are in town. They met with the Senators about 3 hours ago. The Governors have said, virtually unanimously: If you want to do something to help us right away, here is the issue. They specifically said: Do this before you start off on new initiatives that may not benefit even the people you think you are going to benefit.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. As I said earlier, it doesn't substitute the entire bill. It merely offers a substitute to the particular provisions on payment. The other parts of the bill remain. I think this is a much wiser choice to make. I say that with all due respect to my colleague from Georgia, with whom I work jointly on so many issues. I know he is anxious to respond. I think the Senator from Florida wants to be heard as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, as I understand it, the sequence of amendments is such that there will be a Re-

publican amendment after the amendment by Senator DODD, and then there will be a Democratic amendment by Senator ROBB, and then another Republican amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that I might offer the transition teaching amendment immediately after the Republican amendment, which will follow Senator ROBB's amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if my colleague will withhold on that request, I know leadership has worked out a scheduling sequence. I don't want to object, but I would have to object right now without them getting involved. Why not make the comments and then come back?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I could offer this amendment with the understanding that if there is someone who needs to go ahead of me I would yield at that time. I was on the floor this morning and now this afternoon for purposes of trying to get in the queue.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if the Senator will proceed and let me inquire, we will come back. I promise the Senator that I will take care of that right now.

Mr. GRAHAM. I don't have any remarks to make on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires, who is yielding time?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield time off my time to my friend from Florida. I will inquire, if the Senator wants to go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, on our time, I see the Senator from California is still present. I don't know if the issue of who benefits and who doesn't was thoroughly covered. I don't know that this will make a difference in the Senator's vote, but I think it is important that her question be answered.

First of all, the means test—and it is means tested as to who can participate in this, and I probably wouldn't have done it that way, but that is the politics of the day—is identical to the college account we have set, which means 70 percent of the benefits flow to people making \$75,000 or less. It is the middle income and below who are the primary beneficiaries of the account.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, may I say to my friend I understand that completely. But that was for the analysis on the \$500.

Mr. COVERDELL. That is the analysis on this account.

Mrs. BOXER. My understanding on the \$2,000 is there are fewer people in that category who could participate; and therefore, it would not benefit the middle class.

Mr. COVERDELL. The data I quoted is the data on the analysis of this account.

Mrs. BOXER. Then we have some disagreement. But we will check our chart.

I wanted to say on the issue of why this is different than the college ac-

count—I think Senator DODD very eloquently made the point—our side of the aisle has been pushing for a long time to help parents send their children to college, whether it is through Pell grants, loans, or education saving accounts for college. I remember way back during the days I was in the House I was supporting these education IRAs, but the point is that it is quite different now.

To go to a public college in California costs \$5,000, \$6,000, or \$7,000 a year. Fortunately, we have free public schools. What we are looking at here is quite a different situation.

We know on the face of it that 95 percent of our children go to public schools. I know the Senator says this is going to help the public schools, but our research indicates this is disproportionate. We are talking about a couple of dollars in benefits. It comes down to a choice.

If I had a menu of things, I am sure I would rank money higher on the menu of things, but it doesn't compare my money to the substitute, or to the amendment which keeps a lot of good in the Senator's bill. But it just says "revenue lost" instead of being dissipated in the \$7 per family over a period of time—a year—and maybe adds up to \$7. It would be much better to go to our States and help with special education, whereas Senator DODD says it means it is going to result in lower property taxes because our local school districts will benefit.

Mr. COVERDELL. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mrs. BOXER. It is the time of the Senator from Georgia. Sure.

Mr. COVERDELL. No one can certify that this is going to affect property taxes whatsoever. In fact, the doubling of IDEA, if you can find a jurisdiction that took this and lowered the property tax—I think you should listen—isn't what happened. I don't mean that we ought not to be fulfilling this obligation, but I have seen no example of the property tax being affected one way or the other as we fulfill this obligation.

I think what happens is, as we fulfill the Federal obligation, which is rather remarkable—here we are 25 years later and still haven't done it—it theoretically frees up local school districts to do other things that are important in education. I find it interesting.

The other point I was going to make to the Senator from California and to the Senator from Connecticut is they essentially inferred—and I can understand why—that the education savings account is different in a sense from the higher education and K through 12 because I think in the debate we have focused on K through 12. But there are extensive families benefitting from that. They ought to have the opportunity—the "choice"—to use those funds if they so desire. But these accounts are a college account, too.

We have taken the President's proposal and the congressional proposal

and made it four times more powerful. It can be used for college. It can be used for the disabled and for dependent students following college.

My assumption is—we have to make some estimates—that many of these families will not use this in K through 12. Some will. But a large number of them will use the buildup where essentially it is broadening the scope of what people can do as they try to meet the very costs about which the Senator from California talks.

Mrs. BOXER. May I ask my friend a question on this point because this is a good debate.

What the Senator is essentially saying is somebody can open up one of these Coverdell plans.

Mr. COVERDELL. They do not call them Coverdell plans. It sounds like a wonderful idea.

Mrs. BOXER. Doesn't it sound great? I will give the Senator that. It is his idea. Come up with a Coverdell account, and they start it, say, when the child is first born. Then the child is 5. If this is for real, they start using it, but if it isn't for real, they will hold it. Who gets the tax benefit? Because they can afford to, they have another account for \$2,000 for college. Now we are saying this is a family now setting aside \$4,000 every year. I ask my friend.

Mr. COVERDELL. No.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, because the Senator said there could be an addition to—

Mr. COVERDELL. No.

Mrs. BOXER. The college account.

Mr. COVERDELL. No. What I am saying is that we broaden it from \$500 to \$2,000. So an account can be opened for up to \$2,000, whereas now it is limited to \$500. A; and, B, if they chose, they could use a withdrawal somewhere through kindergarten through high school if that was important to them for whatever circumstance. They don't have to hold it for college.

Mrs. BOXER. I don't understand. I am saying to my friend that it is a second bureaucracy, if you will—a new account that can be used for college in addition to the account we are looking at for college that we already have. I think it is getting confusing. I think if we want to let people set aside funds and get a tax break for college, this is crucial.

I think at this point to expand this idea to get to K through 12, as Senator DODD pointed out, if this is on the level and people start spending it when the child is 5, they essentially have 5 years to save, whereas what we are suggesting is that people can do much better. They can take that money and use it, say, long term for 18 years, have more of a buildup and have more of a fund.

What I am fearful of, if we start with all of these, is that only the wealthiest people will be able to do it. They will do it for both. Again, we start rewarding the people in our society—God bless them, and I have nothing but respect for people who manage to make

it. We are rewarding them and we are not doing a thing to help the average person.

That gets me back to where Senator DODD started with his amendment. If this is not going to do much for most of our kids—it is confusing, I agree. I started wondering—if they can get a band outfit, if that is workable, yes. I argue that is part of the school. Or a uniform? But, wait a minute, that is giving a benefit to one child. What about the kid who doesn't make the band? Then the IRS is going to have to confab and figure whether this is a discriminatory benefit. I think we are opening up a can of worms a little bit. I think Senator DODD offers us a cleaner way to spend this \$1.2 billion, which is to ease the burden on the local districts.

I daresay it is only common sense. Our school boards have a certain amount of money. If they cannot meet their budgets, they are going to have to raise your taxes. Maybe this is going to help them. I assume it is going to help them. In California, we have a lid on our property tax, so this is a huge benefit for us because there is just so much we can raise in property taxes.

Since we have a finite amount of money, I think the Senator from Connecticut is offering us a chance to step back and say let's not create a new program, which now I understand you could roll into a college account, which really gets me confused, and keep it simple and use this money for special ed.

I thank my friend for being so generous in yielding to me. I thank my friend from Connecticut for, I think in many ways, bringing us back to what we have to do, and that is to make these hard choices. He is saying: Listen to what the Governors are saying. Let's take care of this problem first.

Mr. COVERDELL. I would like to respond to the Senator from California by calling into play an individual for whom I know she has enormous respect, and that is the Vice President of the United States. He says:

Our current education IRA's simply do not meet the needs of the information age. They are limited to \$500 a year.

He is right.

And it must be used by an age of 30. In a fast moving, fast changing economy, the right skills will often cost more than \$500 a year and learning must last a lifetime.

Then Vice President GORE goes on to say:

Here is my idea. We need to create a new 401(j) account like the 401(k) plans that help you save for retirement. But this account will allow employers and employees to contribute up to \$2,500 a year. . . .

So he is \$500 over what I am saying. . . . in order to pay for college or job training expenses.

Mr. DODD. Is this for elementary and secondary education?

Mr. COVERDELL. He says for college. We are for college. This account applies for college.

Mrs. BOXER. Then scratch the other part of it.

Mr. COVERDELL. Why should we do that? This is a classic example: Let's tell them what is important to them. You think it is important it only be for college. I think it ought to be up to the family to decide where and when they have a special need. Maybe they have a student who is in junior high school who suffers a very serious injury and they need assistance or they have a child who they discover has dyslexia. You do not deal with dyslexia when you are in college. You deal with it in the younger years. There are many problems associated with that.

So let's let them decide. I think the majority of them will utilize these funds at college. But there will be occasions where families have requirements that occur before that. I can think of no reason why we should arbitrarily decide: I am sorry, that is a decision we have made for you.

Mr. DODD. If I can respond to my friend?

Mr. COVERDELL. I have no idea how they are dealing with the division of time. We are doing so well.

Mr. DODD. This much I promise: If you run out of time, I will give you time. We know we have to finish at 4. I don't know if we will have a tremendous number of Senators coming over here. We will accommodate everybody wishing to be heard.

What I have offered as a substitute, with all respect, has more value. Again, I think Governors, mayors, and local taxpayers will tell you right now the cost of special education is a dominant, significant issue we ought to try to take care of. I have not suggested, except peripherally, that there are underlying problems with the Coverdell approach. But I made the case, if you cannot do everything, of the two choices, which is a better one? I think the special ed is a better one. I say that. I realize there is a difference of opinion.

But let me respond, if I can, to the issue, just freestanding, of the Coverdell proposal and why I have difficulty with that as it stands. There are 55 million children who got up this morning, from Maine to California, who went off to an elementary or secondary school in this country—55 million. Fifty million of them walked into a public school—50 million; 5 million walked into a private school or a parochial school. The question is, this bill as it stands is designed to predominantly provide a tax break for those who want to send their kids to private and parochial schools, and it is being cloaked that somehow this is great for education. You do not build a new classroom, you don't pay a teacher more, you don't reduce the size of the class, you don't wire the school with it, none of that stuff. This is all on an individual basis, where the bulk of it, 90 percent of it, goes to those who are in the income category who can afford to send their kids to private schools. We have 50 million kids and their parents who are looking to see whether or not

we are going to take some of their tax money and improve the quality of education.

They do not have the choice. They do not have the choice to say I think I will send my kid to some private boarding school in Connecticut or Georgia or some other place. They do not have that kind of money to do that. Their kids have to go to public school. That is the choice they have. They want to know whether or not their Senators are going to do anything about improving the quality of the educational institution to which they have to send their kids.

That is a big difference. You have limited money. You are going to take \$1.2 billion of this, the bulk of which is going to go to those in the upper income category, and for those parents who do not have that choice, they get zilch out of this thing. My point is that is a bad idea, in my view, with limited resources. But aside from that, I think getting the money back to our communities, providing some real relief on special education is what is necessary.

I have great respect—I am a product of parochial and private education. My parents could afford to do it. They sent me to those schools. That was a choice they made. I respect them for it. But they never thought they ought to get a tax break for doing so. They understood that. They also understood there is a fundamental commitment and relationship between this institution and setting the agenda to accomplish the national purpose in education, a fundamental responsibility to public education.

The public has no other choices. I know people are upset with the quality of some of our public education institutions. I wish the newspapers and media covered good schools as well because there are an awful lot of good schools out there doing a terrific job providing a wonderful educational opportunity in the inner-city and rural America. But our obligation is to see to it that fundamentally we work on the quality of those institutions that are not doing quite as well.

My view is this distracts, it is a distraction from the real business of supporting quality public schooling in this country. Aside from tax policy, which I think is questionable as well, and different choices we could make with it, there is an underlying problem.

I ask unanimous consent the editorial in the Washington Post in its morning edition, its lead editorial today, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, February 29, 2000]

SCHOOL CHOICE FOR THE RICH

The Senate is to take up today a proposal to use the tax code to provide public funds to private schools through the back door. Most Democrats, led by the president, are rightly resisting; the proposal is bad tax and educational policy alike.

The bill whose principal sponsors are Sens. Paul Coverdell (R-Ga.) and Robert Torricelli (D-N.J.), would allow households with annual incomes of as much as \$150,000 to set aside \$2,000 a year per child in educational savings accounts, the earnings on which would be tax-free. Parents can already save this way for college; this would let them do so to help pay elementary and high school expenses as well.

Unlike some other pending tax cut proposals, the cost would be relatively modest, in part because not that many families could afford to take advantage of the measure. Almost all the benefit would accrue to those with well above average incomes and children in private—including sectarian—schools. The revenue forgone would represent an indirect subsidy to such schools.

The president has vetoed similar legislation in the past, and the Office of Management and Budget has indicated he is prepared to do so again. We hope he's spared the need. Some Senate Democrats think the veto threat lets them off the hook. Rather than be the heavies who block an education bill and tax cut, if given the chance to debate some education proposals of their own they'll let the measure pass, secure in the knowledge the president will block it for them down the road. But that's too stogy a way to legislate. If Congress wants to spend money on education, it should be on needier children; if it wants to promote school choice, the debate should center on helping parents who do not, by virtue of their income, have any such choice now. Lawmakers should kill this while they've got the chance.

Mr. DODD. It is entitled, "School Choice for the Rich."

The Senate is to take up today a proposal to use the tax code to provide public funds to private schools through the back door.

Fifty million kids and their parents are asking the question: What are you doing about my kids' school? I understand 5 million kids whose parents would like us to do something about tax relief for them if they go to private schools, but I think we have a higher obligation to the parents of those 50 million who have no choice. Those who made the choice of going to private school made that choice. I respect it, but the parents who send their kids to public schools are not, unfortunately, in the same category.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Senator will yield, I want to say to my friend, his education was very good. I went to public schools from kindergarten all the way through college. Even in college it only cost, in those days, \$12 a semester in the State of New York university system. What an amazing thing.

We had several people wind up going to Congress from that public education system. So in my heart I understand when my friend from Connecticut says we have an obligation to the 50 million children who walk into those public schools every day—5 million go to the parochial school, 55 million in all—but we have an obligation in the public school arena.

It gets down to yet another choice. The Senator from Connecticut has given us a choice between a tax break that is predominantly going to go to the wealthiest, that is going to be very minimal, and special education. That is the choice he has laid out.

My friend also will win my vote, frankly, if he took that \$1.2 billion and put it into school construction or put it into more afterschool slots or early education, early childhood development, preschool, and child care in which my friend has been so involved. We are looking to bring home a very important choice.

The Governors said: Here is the choice, Senators; before you take care of any other new programs and new bureaucracies, take care of special ed. My friend from Connecticut is listening to them and doing that, and he is further saying that before we do any of these newfangled accounts, which will be interpreted and reinterpreted by IRS agents up and down the line and may be very confusing, let's take care of our public schools.

What I am saying is, not only will I support the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, but I will also support amendments to come that will take this money and put it into lower class sizes, to do some new construction, to train our teachers better, to get technology in the schools, to make sure we have room for every child who wants afterschool care which we know is the best crimefighting program around.

I thank my friend for coming today. His voice on this issue is very important, but I think on this one, with his interest in education and his views of concern about it and his success in it, I hope the Senate will listen to the Senator from Connecticut and do first things first: Take care of our public school kids—that is 95 percent of our kids K through 12—before we set up some newfangled ideas on which there is even debate over the facts as to who it helps.

The Senator has a paper that says to me it is only going to help the very wealthy. Senator COVERDELL says it helps if one makes \$75,000. Common sense tells me if we start setting aside \$2,000 a year, it "ain't" going to be my working-class people who are going to do that, I can tell you right now. They tell me they can barely make ends meet. I know what this is about.

I thank my friend for bringing more clarity to the debate. I will be supporting him.

Mr. DODD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I wish to clarify a point, if I can have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut, because I know how these things happen. We have been in touch with Governor Ridge. He does support education savings accounts and would not support an amendment that made that point moot. I know the Senator was at a meeting—he certainly supports the funding of IDEA. I did want to make it clear that he does support the education savings account, so we can clarify that one point.

Mr. DODD. I attended the Governors' meeting earlier today, and Governor

Ridge said he would be glad to help out and try to convince people to vote for the amendment. I say to the Senator, with all due respect, I am also quite confident Vice President GORE does not support the Coverdell legislation, if there is any doubt about that at all.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I yield 15 minutes to my defiant, dedicated, committed cosponsor from the other side of the aisle—I admire his courage on this issue—Senator TORRICELLI of New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I thank Senator COVERDELL for not only yielding me this time but more than that, for, through these last few years, framing this debate and tirelessly bringing this issue forward. This is not the first time, it is not the second time, it may not be the third time Senator COVERDELL and I have come to the Senate floor for A+ savings accounts and, most assuredly, it will not be the last. This is going to happen.

More than simply telling the Senate of the inevitability of these savings accounts, I want us all to recognize what a positive contribution we are making to American education.

I rise in opposition to Senator DODD's amendment. Indeed, on another day, another opportunity, I not only would vote for it, I would fight for it, as I would with Senator ROBB's amendment dealing with the building of new schools, and Senator MURRAY's amendment adding new teachers and reducing class size.

The problems of American education are not such that they require a single idea or one change. This is not a system with which we need to tinker. We have compound problems. The one Senator DODD raises is among the most important. We gave an obligation to local schools without the resources to pay for special education. Senator ROBB's amendment and Senator MURRAY's amendment are important in building schools that are crumbling around us in some communities and adding new teachers. They are good ideas, they are important ideas, but so is this.

For as long as I can remember, the formula for funding American schools has been quite simple: We raise your taxes, and we spend your dollars. That will continue to dominate American education. It is the right formula. We are adding something new, though not a novel idea. Indeed, ironically the source of this idea is President Clinton. In establishing higher education savings accounts of \$500, he laid the foundation for what we debate today because what was a good idea for higher education at \$500 is a great idea for secondary schools at \$2,000. Same idea, same formula with the same end.

This is using private money. It is using a family's own resources. By our estimation, after 5 years, \$12 billion in private money will be used to educate children K through 12. That cannot be a bad thing. Yet the critics argue it is a diversion of money from the public

schools. Not one dime of money that is now going to a public school goes anywhere else but to that same school on that same basis. This is new money, private money, a net increase of \$12 billion.

People argue that maybe it is all new money, but it goes to a privileged few. The Congressional Budget Office argues that 70 percent of this money will be spent by families who earn less than \$70,000. Does this solve the educational problems of a family in poverty who may have no money? Maybe not. Probably not. I challenge any Member of this Senate to come to this floor and tell me one educational idea that solves the educational problems of every family in every regard forever with one bill. This one does not either, but it does help many working families, working poor, middle-class families.

The family who earns \$20,000, \$30,000, \$50,000, even \$70,000 a year but wants to give their child some extra advantage in education, they want to establish a private savings account. Why should the Federal Government be charging taxes on the interest on that account? Every Member of this Senate knows that education is the great test of whether or not we preserve our quality of life, our national security, our way of life.

The Federal Government should be doing everything it can to encourage every parent in America to save every dollar they can muster to educate their child. Taxing that money is the last thing we should be doing. That is the essence of this bill: Eliminate Federal taxes on money saved for education. That cannot be a bad idea. Yet it is argued that maybe it is private money and there is no diversion. Maybe Senators are right about that. Maybe it does go to middle-class and working-class families. Maybe Senators are right about that. It is argued that it is not for a privileged few but it all does go to private schools and we have a public and private school problem. Well, wrong again.

CBO estimates that 70 percent of this money actually will go to public school students. Public school students are over 90 percent of the students in America. If we are going to help everybody, by definition, most of that money will go to public school students. That is what the research has found because this money is not just available for private school tuition. This money is available to hire public school teachers after public school is out in the afternoon to help students in math and science—something desperately needed by many of our families—for afterschool transportation, for afterschool activities of band or athletics or clubs, to buy a home computer, to buy books or, if you do not use money for any of these things, to roll it into your college account after the 12th grade when the student is going into college.

Is some of this money going for private school tuition? Yes, a minority of

it, 30 percent of it. Some does go to private school tuition. I am not here to apologize for that. If, in one piece of legislation, we can add \$12 billion to the national expenditure for schools, help public school students with 70 percent of this money—for computers and books and tutors—I do not rise on this floor to apologize that some of this will go to private schools, yeshivas, or parochial schools for tuition.

In many of our cities, the Catholic school is the only alternative available to many families who want something better for their child. Tuition can be \$800, \$700, \$1,200—out of reach for many families. Who is going to these schools? What is this "idle rich" we hear about who will benefit from this bill? Ninety percent of the students in Camden and Newark and Jersey City going to parochial schools are Protestants; 80 percent of them are African American. This is not a religious opportunity. It is a competitive school, a chance for a parent to give something else to their child.

We do not ask the Federal Government to pay for it—not a dime, no public money. Personally, I do not believe in it. I think it is unconstitutional. I do not think public money can or should go directly to pay for tuitions in religious institutions. That is my belief. That is why I am for this bill because this bill does not do that—no public money. A family takes their own money, earned off the sweat of their own brow, puts it in a private account, and uses that money, which has not been taxed because of this legislation, and pays tuition. That cannot be a bad thing.

Opposition to this legislation has many aspects. In my judgment, clearly, one of them is that we do not recognize the true depths of the problem of American education. Getting more teachers, building more schools, higher standards for public schools are all part of that, but that is not enough. This is a fight that must be fought on every front simultaneously.

Second, I think many people simply do not recognize the state we would be in if we did not have private schools. We are losing a Catholic school in America every week with another school closing its doors. If we lose the parochial education system in America, it will cost \$16 billion immediately to replace the system. The system must survive within constitutional bounds. That is what Senator COVERDELL and I are attempting to do with this legislation.

Third, I think there is a partisan issue. With all respect to my friend, Senator COVERDELL and his colleagues, in my personal judgment, the leadership in America on education for the last generation has been borne by the Democratic Party. We created the programs for grants, for tuition assistance, for aid to secondary schools that built libraries, built schools, and opened opportunities. It is one of the reasons why I am a Democrat. Now we

have a little competition; frankly, not a lot.

The ideas are still overwhelmingly from the Democratic Party. But this idea cannot be bad simply because some Republicans are for it. That is the only argument I have heard against it. If there is going to be a competition between the Democratic and Republican Parties for leadership on education, that is good for America. If we are going to compete to convince the American people that each of us has the best formula for improving our schools, that is good for every child in America.

To the Republican Party, I say: Welcome to the fight. We have been waiting for you for a long time. But I am glad you are here.

This concept of A+ savings accounts has no parentage on a partisan basis. It is borne of Bill Clinton's concept for funding higher education. It has been adjusted by Senator COVERDELL, imaginatively, creatively, and effectively, to deal with the problems of grade schools and high schools, to help public and private schools with millions of American families.

I have been for this concept since I came to the Senate. It is a reflection of my own belief that the American standard of living is not sustainable if we do not dramatically improve the quality of instruction and the performance of our students in this generation. It is not difficult to comprehend, if the United States goes another decade being 16th of the leading 18 industrial nations in the quality of math and science instruction, if 40 percent of 4th graders effectively cannot read to national standards, if a third of our students in the 8th grade cannot meet basic science requirements, this Nation will not continue to maintain our standard of living or even our current level of national security.

Education is the great divider in the world, between the insecure and the poor and the wanting and those who exercise leadership and live behind secure borders with rising standards of living. That is our test. I can think of no more important issue for this Senate to debate.

I genuinely hope that not only will this A+ savings account legislation pass the Senate—and I have no doubt it will pass the Senate—I genuinely hope we will pass it on a bipartisan basis. But in a challenge to Republican leadership, as well, the argument that Senator DODD makes today for funding special education, and the argument that Senator MURRAY and Senator ROBB will make on class size and school construction, are arguments that not only must be heard, it is legislation that must be adopted.

Pass this legislation today and then let us return and complete the debate and meet our obligation to America's schoolchildren.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. How much time remains on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 18 minutes remaining. The Senator from Georgia has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. DODD. There are only two of us here, so I suspect we can manage this in some way if one or the other of us ends up a little short of time.

First of all, my friend from New Jersey has raised, as he always does, some compelling arguments. He is a very persuasive debater. I agree with him on a couple points. I think, first of all, maybe I should have said this at the outset of the debate, that I adhere to the admonition that Thomas Jefferson gave almost 200 years ago: Any nation that expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never possibly can be.

As important as education was to the development of the 19th century, it certainly is just as important now a few days into the 21st century. No issue will be more important for the development and continued success of our own country than to have a very successful educational system in our Nation. So I agree Senator TORRICELLI on that point.

My point is, I do not think we can do everything. That is my point. I would like to do a lot of things, but my concern is we have \$1.2 billion in this program. If I have \$1.2 billion for special ed, it does not even remotely get close to the 40 percent we promised our States we would give them for special education. We need \$15.8 billion to get to 40 percent level.

I have to think, if we are going to do something about the quality of public education—my friend from New Jersey has raised class size, salaries for teachers, luring teachers into rural or urban areas where they are needed, after-school programs that are critical, early childhood education, Head Start—there are a variety of things that all of us would say are absolutely essential if you are going to improve the quality of our public educational system. Why does this idea, why does the idea of providing some tax incentives for people have any real appeal? It is because people are concerned about the quality of public education in too many places.

If they felt there were good public schools, then they wouldn't be asking for the kind of suggestion that is being proposed in this bill. Their desire for that is rooted in the notion, somehow, that our public education is not doing very well in many places.

So what is our choice here? We take limited resources. We take a dollar, and we decide we will divide it up. And so instead of focusing on what needs to be done with the 7 cents we provide in education out of every dollar from the Federal level, instead of saying let's see what we can do to improve the structures themselves, the buildings, how we can wire schools so they are able to connect with the technologies of the 21st century, my concern is that

we are taking \$1.2 billion in effect off the table for a proposal that has marginal benefit.

I say again to my friends, the authors of this legislation, people making \$25,000, \$30,000, \$35,000, \$40,000 a year, if they have two or three kids, they can't put aside \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000 in these accounts. It doesn't work out that way. It is hard enough to make ends meet. The idea that they are going to put \$2,000 per child in an IRA account is not realistic for them. They could put something in there, but the idea that they are going to get this tax benefit because people will maximize, that doesn't add up in my view.

I do think there is a clear distinction between higher education and elementary and secondary education. Again, schools at the elementary and secondary level that are private or parochial select who they want. You may think you have the choice, but ultimately it is theirs whether you go or not. A public school doesn't have that luxury. If you are a child who lives in a community and you show up at the door, they have to take you in whether they like you or not.

You show up at a private school, and the private school can say: You are not a nice family, nice people. I am sorry. We are not going to select you.

So there is a distinction in a sense. Our public schools must take everybody. The 50 million kids this morning who showed up at their doors have to be educated. We know too many children are not getting the quality of education they deserve. They are going to school in buildings that are falling down. They have textbooks and equipment that is antiquated. They have teachers who are not necessarily the best. Further, the salaries are significantly different from community to community in too many States. Maybe we can go around and set up private schools all over the place and say to the 50 million children presently attending public schools: We have a structure you can move into. You can't do that. Fifty million are not going to fit in the places where 5 million students presently are.

It seems to me we are not left with many choices. We have to improve public education. We have no other choice but to do that. We have no alternative. We must do that. With limited resources, is it not wiser to take these scarce resources and put them into special education accounts that would lower the property taxes; or at least allow our school boards at the local level to decide they will take the money that goes to pay for that special needs child for fixing up that school, for afterschool programs; or lower the taxes and allow parents then to have more money in their pocket to do some of the things my friends from Georgia and New Jersey would like to give them the option of doing. Then they could do whatever they want with it.

That seems to provide a greater benefit to all people, not just the ones who

are selected to go to a private or parochial school, but all students. That is a better choice, if there are indeed limited resources.

I say to my good friend from New Jersey, I know he made an appeal to our Republican friends to support the Robb amendment and the Murray amendment. But just as he asserts that this amendment is going to be rejected and this underlying bill passed, I am fairly confident the Robb and the Murray and other offered amendments are going to be defeated when it comes time to do something on school construction and afterschool programs and the like.

Part of the argument will be, we can't afford to do everything. They are right. You can't do everything. So my choice is—I presume I may be in the minority on this—my choice is to take the \$1.2 billion, give it back to the States, give it back to the localities. Give it back to them so they can reduce their costs on special education. One out of every 10 children in this country is a special needs child in our public school system—1 out of every 10. In my State, 14 percent of all students receive special education services.

These problems are growing. The cost is growing. In some of my communities in Connecticut, the cost of providing special education is more than \$50,000 per year. Eighty-two percent of that cost is being borne by the local property taxpayer. We promised that community and that family we would pick up 40 percent of that \$50,000.

I say to my good friends, the authors of this proposal before us, you cannot tell me with certainty what is going to happen if this legislation is passed. This is a new proposal.

With higher education, you have a choice. Higher education doesn't have a property tax base to support it. Higher education costs, at a minimum \$5, \$6, \$7 thousand per year in my State. However, the public schools at the elementary and secondary level are free in Connecticut, as they are across the country.

So here it seems to me, with limited resources, are the choices we have to make, painful as they are, where all the ideas have some merit. I shared earlier today the letter I received 2 days ago from the National School Boards Association begging for us to offer this amendment. These are not Democrats, Republicans, conservatives, liberals. These are people at every school board across the country who are saying: Please do something about this. Please do something about this.

I am offering my colleagues this afternoon a chance to do that when we vote on this amendment.

I have already noted the letter from the National School Boards Association, dated February 23:

Rather than create a tax benefit for a select few, applying these funds to special education would benefit more taxpayers and public schools.

That is not from a think tank. That is from the National School Boards As-

sociation letter of 3 days ago. That is the choice they would like us to make. These are the people who wrestle with education issues, not once in a while on the floor of the Senate, but every single day in every community across this country. They have said, this is our choice.

The question is, are we on their side, or are we on the side of an alternative form of education which, frankly, has some value in some people's minds, but 50 million kids don't have the choice. This is where they have to go to school, and we have to address those problems. We can run, but we can't hide. Either we do it, or it gets worse each year. The costs continue to go up.

If you can't do everything, I think this amendment offers a better idea. The National School Boards thinks it is a better idea. The National Governors' Association, Republicans and Democrats, unanimously think it is a good idea. I hope this afternoon my colleagues will agree with them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I believe, indeed, this debate is helpful in narrowing some of these issues. As I think I have attested, I also believe Senator DODD has a good idea, an idea that should be adopted. It simply is not an alternative to this idea.

Let me suggest to my colleagues where Senator DODD and I have common agreement and where we have differences. Senator DODD has made the point that most families could not afford to put the \$2,000 in a savings account to pay for their public or private school education. I agree. It is critical to this concept that this \$2,000 savings account does not rest solely on the shoulders of the mother or the father. I remember—I am not so young I cannot recall—a time when in an American community, the education of a child was generally an involvement of the larger community. It wasn't just a single mother or the father. These accounts are an opportunity to re-ignite that sense of involvement. We allow the extended family—grandparents, aunts, uncles, churches, labor unions, corporations—to put money into these accounts.

Senator DODD is right that few families will be able to put \$2,000 in these accounts per year. But a lot of labor unions can go to their employers and say: We would like a little raise next year and we want money in the savings account. A lot of churches will be able to go to the parishioners and say: Thanks for giving to the church. We would like to help Johnny or Jane with their education savings accounts. A lot of parents can go to grandparents and say: At Christmas, instead of that toy, would you put \$100 into the education savings accounts?

This is under the concept that educating a child is everybody's business. Even then, can we get \$2,000 a year? Maybe not. But if upon the birth of a

child we can get \$500 or \$700 and compound it, with tax-free interest, year in and year out, by the time that child is going to the eighth or ninth grade and needs a tutor after school because he or she doesn't understand the math assignment, they can afford it. By the time they are in the sixth grade and they can't afford to buy a computer, with this they could afford one. By the time they go to college, if they have spent none of this money and for 18 years they have been saving \$200, \$500, or \$700, at compound interest, it would be significant. Does it pay for a Harvard education? No, but it gets them into the community college or a State school or it pays for part of the education. It helps. It is valuable.

More than just dollars is involved; it creates the concept of the community being involved, having the vehicle of these accounts. It is no coincidence that when Senator COVERDELL and I offered these accounts, the House sponsor was not some conservative Republican from the Deep South, with all due respect to my Southern colleagues from the Republican Party; it was Floyd Flake, a minister, African American, from Queens, NY, who has had the philosophy of the government that: I will take care of my own community; just get out of my way—if I may paraphrase him. He has a charter school; he started it himself. He would like people to be able to have these accounts to pay for some of the extra costs.

That goes to the second point Senator DODD made. We agreed on the first—everybody doesn't have \$2,000. We disagree on the second. Senator DODD said public school is free. It was when Senator DODD and I went to school. It isn't anymore. How many parents tonight face their children who come home and say: I would like to be part of the band or the Latin Club or the French Club and it costs \$500. Can I do that, mom?

What we built in the fifties and sixties in this extraordinary public education, funding all these tremendous activities, we have eroded. I represent communities in New Jersey where you can't get a bus home after school if you don't pay for it. You can't join the football team. Some of the books are so old, parents have to buy them themselves. These education savings accounts go to the heart of that problem. Public school is not free. Sixty percent of the African American students in our public schools don't have access to a computer. It is the new divide in American education. That includes 70 percent of Hispanic students and millions of other students from all backgrounds.

Why? What is so wrong if we allow a parent to take their own hard-earned money and put it in their own account? All we ask the Federal Government to do—my God, the minimum we can ask anybody to do—is not tax them on the interest. Let them keep the interest so a parent can buy their child something, so they can maximize. I visit public

schools throughout New Jersey where children are struggling with math, science, and areas that were never approached when I was in high school. They struggle. It is hard. If you ask them the one thing they can get more out of public school, they will tell you: I wish there was somebody after school to help me with my work—a tutor.

Instead, our public school teachers, who are underpaid and overworked, leave school at 3:30 or 4 o'clock and take second jobs selling clothing, painting houses—anything to support their own families. How about an education savings account, where at the end of the day the public school teacher can work for some extra dollars doing what they do best—teaching, tutoring, helping public school students learn the math and science with which they struggle.

No, public school is not free. And \$2,000 is a lot for most families. We could be wrong. Senator COVERDELL and I could be wrong. We could offer this chance to every labor union, church, and grandparent in America to help with their kids' education by putting money in every birthday, holiday, or Christmas, and maybe nobody will answer. But I don't believe that. That is not the kind of people we are. That is not the kind of communities I represent. I think people will answer. I think Floyd Flake is right. Every Member of the Senate talks about faith-based answers to problems, working hand in hand with the Government. Well, let's see. I bet the grandparents, aunts and uncles, labor unions, churches, and synagogues will come forward and use these accounts as a vehicle. But mostly, I don't want to fail because we didn't ask. This is an invitation to America to get back in your public or private school, get involved and solve the problem.

I believe these are worthwhile. Senator DODD may be right that this institution doesn't have the will or the resources to answer this problem and the special education problem and the school construction problem. If this country doesn't have the will or resources to deal with those problems, we are headed for real trouble. I believe we have the will, and I certainly believe we have the resources—not expenditures, not a dime of it, but investments, every single dollar in every investment for building a school or hiring a teacher. I will fight every day for every one of those things.

Today is the Coverdell-Torricelli legislation for private savings accounts to fund public and private schools. I am proud to be part of it. I yield to Senator COVERDELL.

Mr. COVERDELL. I am most appreciative of the extended effort on the part of the Senator from New Jersey, who brings a very powerful perspective to this debate.

The Senator from Connecticut is correct that we are constantly confronted with choices. I think this is a bad example, though, or choice of that kind

of trade. What I mean is, first of all, I believe IDEA will receive added benefits this year. It has received nearly \$3 billion in the last 4 years over and above the President's request. So there is a body here that agrees with those Governors and with you that this is a high priority.

The problem with the Senator's amendment is when it moves against the savings accounts, it blows away \$12 billion. There are choices. You could say, well, we will spend \$1.2 billion here instead of \$1.2 billion over there. But by the nature of this legislation, this savings account involves 14 million families—20 million of those 55 million you are talking about—3 million or 4 million of them are in private schools, but 11 million of these children are in public schools that will benefit from these accounts.

The Senator's amendment takes that resource, which comes forward as a voluntary action on the part of families and communities, churches, synagogues, labor unions, and employers and shuts it down. That is not a good trade. Trading \$1.2 billion and losing \$12 billion is not a good trade. There may be a place where your choice is appropriate, but I don't believe it is where you blow away all that benefit, which this does.

It has been characterized that private schools are the chief beneficiary, and that is not the case. Several on the floor have characterized parochial schools as a "haven for the wealthy." Listen, the children attending parochial schools today are within 10 percent of the same children attending public schools, and they are from families earning \$40,000 or \$50,000.

These are not a bunch of wealthy folks. The demographics in the New York school system are virtually identical between the public system and the parochial system. So it is not like somebody who happens to be in a parochial school and drives up to school in a long, black limousine and a guy in knickers gets out. These are minorities. They are Hispanic. They are African Americans. They are average folks. I don't know why they are there. The public systems ought to be mighty glad it is there because it works both ways. The Senator is right. That system couldn't accept the public system, and it never will. Conversely, close it down and you make new problems for the public system because those people are paying property taxes even though their children are in the parochial system.

The point I am trying to make is that the public system will be a major benefactor. It is not a minor player. The choice the Senator is asking us to make is not \$1.2 billion here or \$1.2 billion there. It is \$1.2 billion here or no \$12 billion. Of that \$12 billion, \$6 billion is going to go into public schools over the next 10 years and \$6 billion is going to go into private, or home, or whatever. Those are major dollars.

When the Senator from California and others talk about the benefit, they

don't mention the principal. That is the point. That is how you get up to the \$12 billion. The Senator is right. It is not a lot of relief that the Federal Government is giving. What is amazing to me is how little it takes to cause these families to do so much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BUNNING be added as a cosponsor to the Collins amendment No. 2854.

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

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if my colleague from Georgia needs another minute or two to make concluding remarks, I will be happy to yield my time, or if the Senator from New Jersey would care to be heard.

My colleagues conveniently use numbers which, obviously, sound beneficial to their argument. The fact is, according to the Joint Tax Committee, which analyzed this proposal, if you are the family of a child in a public school, the tax benefit to you over 5 years is \$20.50. That is the tax benefit to a family whose child is in a public school. Is it worth taking that much off the table in the name of education and providing tax relief which is so nominal it is hardly worth mentioning?

You can make a case. You have heard it over the years. Businesses say: If you will give me this tax break, it will leverage this much more in private capital. The fact is, you still have to have a tax break. It is revenue lost.

We have come a long way in the last 7 or 8 years. We have a surplus for the first time in the last few years. We are actually on track to eliminating the national debt. The idea that we can just take \$1.2 billion off the table is a flawed idea. Even if you accept the point of my colleagues and leverage private dollars, it may generate some of this activity they are talking about, but the fact is, it is \$1.2 billion. It is rolling the dice, in effect.

I have suggested that there is \$1.2 billion that could be used to defray the cost of special education. I know that amount would ease the burden on our school districts. As my colleagues well know, you take \$1.2 billion and put it in this program, then you will come and say: Let's do something on special education. What about school construction? What about teacher salaries and smaller class sizes? Those are things we know we need to improve the quality of public education in this country. Those dollars become harder and harder to come by as we take more and more dollars off the table.

Unless you accept the notion we are going to accept everybody's idea on how to improve the quality of public education—which we are not and we have limited resources—the people who pay the taxes in this country that come into the general revenue of the Treasury know full well we can't spend their money on everything. Parents of 50 million kids have said to us: Improve the quality of public education and reduce the cost of special education. One

certain way of doing that is by freeing up dollars at the local level, or reducing taxes for that local property taxpayer. I guarantee you that benefit is more than \$20.50. If you are a parent of a public school child, and you get the kind of special education relief I offered, there is more tax relief for that taxpayer and that community than the \$20.50 you are going to get if the Coverdell legislation is adopted.

I respect my colleagues from Georgia and New Jersey, but I come back to the point I made a moment ago. People who have children in public schools recognize that we have no choice but to try to make this system better. We have to do it or we are going to pay an awful price later this century. We are not going to have the kind of well-educated, productive citizens that we need.

I am hopeful my colleagues will recognize that the idea of reducing the cost of special education is something we can do something about today. In a few minutes we will have a chance to vote on this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators REED, HARKIN, DORGAN, REID of Nevada, and KENNEDY be added as cosponsors of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, how much time do we have between us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 40 seconds.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute 40 seconds to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I graciously accept it. I will make a motion in 1 minute 40 seconds calling for a point of order against the amendment. The Senator from Connecticut knows that.

I guess it is all in the eyes of the beholder. An insignificant number of people will be beneficiaries. That insignificant number is 14 million families and 20 million children, and an individual family can expect only \$20 worth of interest-free benefits.

But the point is, that, nevertheless, no matter what it is, if it is a quarter, it causes them to save \$12 billion, whatever it is. It is \$12 billion of new money flowing into both public and private education. That is not insignificant. Everett Dirksen said, "A billion here and a billion there, and before long it is real money." Twelve billion dollars is real money. It would be controlled by America's families to help them with the very special and unique needs that their children have through these education savings accounts.

The pending amendment, No. 2857, offered by the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, increases mandatory spending by \$1.2 billion, and, if adopted, would cause the underlying bill to exceed the committee's section 302(a) allocation. Therefore, I raise a point of order against the amendment pursuant

to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move to waive the relevant portions of the Budget Act.

I ask for the yeas and nays. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFFEE). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act in relation to the Dodd amendment No. 2857. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 15 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bayh	Graham	Lincoln
Bingaman	Harkin	Mikulski
Boxer	Hollings	Moynihhan
Bryan	Inouye	Murray
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Reed
Cleland	Johnson	Reid
Collins	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Schumer
Dorgan	Landrieu	Wellstone
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wyden
Edwards	Leahy	

NAYS—54

Abraham	Enzi	McConnell
Allard	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Ashcroft	Frist	Roberts
Bennett	Gorton	Roth
Biden	Gramm	Santorum
Bond	Grams	Sessions
Breaux	Grassley	Shelby
Brownback	Gregg	Smith (NH)
Bunning	Hagel	Smith (OR)
Burns	Hatch	Snowe
Byrd	Helms	Specter
Campbell	Hutchinson	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Thomas
Coverdell	Inhofe	Thompson
Craig	Kyl	Thurmond
Crapo	Lott	Torricelli
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Murkowski

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 44, the nays are 54.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 2854

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment by the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Maine. What we would like to have on this side—we understand it will be interspersed with Republican amendments, but the order of Senators offering amendments would be ROBB, BINGAMAN, GRAHAM, and

WELLSTONE. The reason I make that announcement is so that Democratic Senators aren't going to be over here wondering when they can offer their amendments. These are the next four to be offered on our side.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, there will be a unanimous consent pro-pounded after the vote on the Collins amendment, but for everybody's purposes, it is anticipated that there would be a vote on Collins shortly, maybe 30, 35 minutes. Then we would take up the Robb amendment but not vote on that until tomorrow morning around 10. I think that is the general agreement we have reached, to at least let everybody understand what we are dealing with.

I yield the floor so we may proceed with the Collins amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator THURMOND be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the pending amendment which I have offered on behalf of myself, Senator KYL, Senator COVERDELL, Senator HATCH, Senator ABRAHAM, and Senator BUNNING. I know the hour is late and I understand if I speak very shortly I will get more votes, so I will be very brief in describing my amendment.

We have worked together to craft an amendment to help our public school teachers when they either pursue professional development at their own expense or purchase supplies for their classroom. Our amendment has two major provisions.

First, it will allow teachers to deduct their professional development expenses without subjecting the deduction to the existing 2-percent floor that is in our Tax Code. Second, it will grant teachers a tax credit of up to \$100 for books, supplies, and other equipment they purchase for their students. As Senator KYL has noted, a study by the National Education Association indicates the average schoolteacher spends more than \$400 a year on supplies and other materials for the classroom.

Our amendment would reward teachers for undertaking these activities that are designed to make them better teachers or to provide better supplies for their students. It is an example of a way that we can say thank you to teachers who do so much for our children.

While our amendment provides financial relief for our dedicated teachers, its real beneficiaries are our Nation's students. Other than involved parents, which we all know to be the most important component, a well-qualified and dedicated teacher is the single most important prerequisite for student success. Educational researchers have repeatedly demonstrated the

close relationship between qualified teachers and successful students.

Moreover, teachers themselves understand how important professional development is to maintaining and expanding their levels of competence. When I meet with teachers from Maine, they always tell me of their need for more professional development and the scarcity of financial support for this very worthy pursuit. The willingness of Maine's teachers to reach deep into their own pockets to fund their own professional development impresses me deeply. For example, an English teacher in Bangor, who serves on my Educational Policy Advisory Committee, told me of spending her own money to attend a curriculum conference. She then came back and shared that information with all of the English teachers in her department. She is not alone. She is typical of teachers who are willing to pay for their own professional development as well as to purchase supplies and materials to enhance their teaching.

I greatly admire the many teachers who have voluntarily financed the additional education they need to improve their schools and to serve their students better. I greatly admire those teachers who reach into their own pockets to buy supplies, paints, books, all sorts of materials that are lacking in their classroom. We should reward those teachers. Let us change the Tax Code to recognize and reward their sacrifice and to encourage more teachers to take the courses they need or to help supplement the supplies in their classroom. I hope those changes in our Tax Code will encourage more teachers to undertake the formal course work in the subject matter they teach, or to complete graduate degrees in either a subject matter or in education, or to attend conferences to give them more ideas for innovative approaches to presenting the course work they teach in perhaps a more challenging manner.

This amendment will reimburse teachers for just a small part of what they invest in our children's future. This money will be money well spent. Investing in education helps us to build one of the most important assets for our country's future; that is, a well-educated population. We need to ensure that our public schools have the very best teachers possible in order to bring out the very best in our students. Adopting this amendment is the first step toward that goal. It will help us in a small way recognize the many sacrifices our teachers make each and every day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine, and I thank her for her leadership in bringing this issue before the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, no debate on tax incentives for education would be complete without a discussion of teachers

and how they are taxed as professionals. In my view, the current law treatment is seriously deficient in this area.

First, let me review the technical points. Like any other professional, elementary and secondary school teachers incur a number of expenses in order to keep themselves current in their fields of knowledge. These include subscriptions to journals and other periodicals. In addition, many teachers invest in their own development by taking courses to improve their knowledge or skills. Under current law, these expenses are deductible, as miscellaneous itemized deductions. However, there are two practical limitations that effectively make these expenses non-deductible for most teachers.

The first limitation is that the total amount of a taxpayer's deductible miscellaneous expenses must exceed 2 percent of adjusted gross income before they begin to be deductible. The second hurdle is that the amount in excess of the 2 percent floor, if any, combined with all other deductions the taxpayer has, must exceed the standard deduction before any of them are deductible.

Let's consider just how difficult these limitations can be, Mr. President. I will use the example of a fifth-year high school science teacher in Utah who I will call Robin Stewart. Robin is single and makes \$35,000 per year. She incurred \$840 of expenses last year for science periodicals and for a course she took over the summer to increase her knowledge of chemistry.

Under current law, Robin's \$840 expenditures are deductible, subject to the limitations I mentioned. The first limitation says that her expenses must exceed 2 percent of her income before they are deductible. Two percent of \$35,000 is \$700. Thus, only \$140 of her \$840 is deductible—that portion which exceeds \$700.

As a single taxpayer, Robin's standard deduction for 2000 is \$4,400. Her total itemized deductions, including the \$140 miscellaneous deduction, fall short of this threshold. Therefore, not even the \$140 is deductible for Robin. What the first limitation did not block, the second one did.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, this is the case for most of the school teachers in our nation. In 1997, the last year for which the Internal Revenue Service has statistics, only 29.9 percent of taxpayers were able to itemize their deductions. So even in the rare case where the 2 percent limitation does allow a significant deduction, chances are very good that it will not help the teacher because he or she cannot itemize.

The amendment before us is a good step in the right direction. It would remove the first limitation—the 2 percent floor on miscellaneous itemized deductions. Ideally, I would like to see the second limitation removed as well and make these kinds of expenses deductible by teachers regardless of whether or not they itemize. I hope

that my colleagues on the Finance Committee will take a close look at the idea of an above-the-line deduction for teachers.

Mr. President, the second part of the amendment before us is also very important. It recognizes that many of our dedicated teachers incur personal expenses for materials for their classrooms. Under current law, these types of expenses are, once again, deductible, but only to the extent they exceed 2 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income.

Many Americans may be unaware that many teachers subsidize their schools out of their own pockets. It is not unusual for teachers to have to pay for copying extra worksheets or articles, purchasing art supplies, or providing tablets and pencils to some students who are without. Many teachers buy library books, educational games, and puzzles for their classes with their own money.

Rather than treating these expenses the same as teacher development expenses, and exempting them from the 2 percent floor, this amendment goes one step further and grants a tax credit of up to \$100 per taxpayer for materials the teacher supplies for his or her class. This means the teacher receives a dollar-for-dollar reduction in tax liability.

Some people may argue that teachers don't have to do this—why should they get a special tax credit?

The fact is that those teachers who love teaching and care about their students have been subsidizing their classrooms for years. They do it because our public schools frequently nickel-and-dime the classroom in order to concentrate resources on required big ticket items.

And, Mr. President, there is one key difference between school teachers and other professionals that, in my mind, justifies this tax change. Teachers—unlike lawyers, accountants, physicians, or others who may take the existing deduction—are engaged in non-profit public service.

This amendment gives proper recognition to the personal sacrifice that many of our teachers make, year after year, toward improving the education of our children.

As in the other part of this amendment, Mr. President, this provision is not perfect. I would like to see this credit also extended to those parents in Utah and throughout the country who choose to teach their children at home. Their expenditures, which likely far exceed \$100, also deserve the tax credit, and I hope the Finance Committee can look for ways in other legislation to extend such a credit to parents to teach at home.

But, the Collins-Kyl-Coverdell-Hatch amendment is a good step toward recognizing the dedication of our elementary and secondary school teachers and in helping them to meet the costs of their profession.

We say that we want our public school teachers to be the best.

We say we want our children and grandchildren taught by teachers who are competent and up-to-date not only in the subject matter they are teaching, but in the pedagogy of teaching it.

We say we want teachers who know how to exploit fully new learning technologies, including the Internet.

We say we want teachers who can recognize the signs of struggling or troubled students.

We say we want teachers who can inspire our kids.

We say we want teachers who are willing to go the extra mile.

Mr. President, this amendment, offered by Senator COLLINS, is not unlike an amendment I introduced myself. This amendment, like my own, is designed to get our tax policy in sync with our goals for education.

This amendment will provide modest tax relief for teachers who, for too long, have been footing the bill for improving the quality of teaching by themselves. It is time we helped out.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I compliment my colleagues for the good work they are doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I compliment Senator HATCH for the great way in which he explained this amendment which Senators COVERDELL, COLLINS, HATCH, and myself have cosponsored.

He points out that we have goals for excellence in teaching, and this is a way to help foster those goals. We ask our teachers to do a great deal. This is one small step we can take to help those who are most willing to help their students.

I thank Senator HATCH for an excellent statement.

I also thank Senator COLLINS for the kind remarks she made last evening. It has been a pleasure to work with her. She is a real leader in education. To be able to join my amendment with her amendment as one approach which provides some relief to the teachers who are willing to take that extra step to help their students is certainly an honor for me.

To recapitulate for our colleagues because I think we are going to be voting soon, I leave it to Senator COLLINS to close the debate unless there is anyone else who would like to speak to it. The old saying of taking an apple to the teacher at school has caused us to stop and think a little bit. It is fine to take an apple to the teacher, but there is a way we can be a little bit more helpful to those teachers who go the extra mile. There may not be a direct relationship between excellence in teaching and providing some assistance to those teachers who will go out of their way to take extra supplies to their students, but I suspect there, in fact, is a connection because these are the most dedicated of all—those teachers who realize their local schools have not been able to provide quite enough in instruc-

tional materials for their kids, and out of their own family budget they are willing to make a contribution for their students' education. As I pointed out last night, the NEA estimates, according to a study, that each teacher annually spends \$408 out of his or her pocket to help kids in school by taking these instructional materials to them.

These two amendments, in a small way but an important way, recognize that dedication and that contribution. In the case of my half of the amendment, it provides dollar for dollar in relief and \$100 in the case of Senator COLLINS' amendment. It relieves 2 percent of the burden for itemizing it, which Senator HATCH just spoke about.

Is this going to solve all of our woes in education? No. But is it an important recognition of the job teachers do, particularly those teachers who are willing to go the extra mile? We think it is. To the degree they are willing to supplement what their schools provide for students, and it comes out of their own pockets, we think we should at least cause them no harm in that process.

That is why we provide these two elements of tax relief basically to encourage them to continue to work with their students in this way.

I conclude again by thanking Senator COVERDELL for his leadership, Senator COLLINS, and Senator HATCH. I hope my colleagues will give this amendment their overwhelming support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to join in support of this amendment. I think it is a brilliant idea and something that is overdue.

I think Senator HATCH has commented quite clearly why the present state of the law is ineffective to assist teachers who are working steadily and giving of themselves sacrificially for their classrooms and why the current tax law benefits them not very much, or almost none at all. I taught one year. I recall that we had expensive readers paid for by the government. I tried to get the disadvantaged children in the classroom to read those readers. They hated it. But there are a bunch of books there on the walls—Daniel Boone, Hardy Boys, Nancy Drew, and those kinds of books. I noticed that if I could get them to read those books, they liked it. Some of them read 30, 40, 50, or 60 books. When I went to the used bookstores, or places such as that, I would pick up books on my own and bring them back to the classroom because there was a lot of satisfaction in seeing those children actually enjoying reading a story.

I think sometimes we need to review the quality of the material we are asking our children to read. It may be scientifically sound, but most of it is boring. They don't like it; it is work to them. If you can make reading a pleasure, I think it helps.

My personal experience with that indicates to me we ought to encourage

teachers to not hesitate. A teacher may bring them to Washington, and they may see prints of historical events or artwork they want to buy right then. The school board isn't going to be available to approve that. They know it will fit right within their classroom and the course they will be studying.

They invest their own money in that. I think that ought to be encouraged.

My wife taught for a number of years in public schools. She was continually buying things for her bulletin board to share with the elementary classes and to help her teach the lessons she had for that class.

There is no way some bureaucrat in Washington or even some school board member or principal is going to be available at the right time to approve that expenditure for a teacher.

We do not appreciate our teachers enough. If you haven't been in a classroom to know how hard it is, how frustrating it can be, and how burdensome the regulations are, adding the fact that the days are long and children may not be so well disposed to behave on a given day, you can't know what it is to be a teacher.

One of the most frustrating aspects is the little things teachers need that they cannot get unless they pay for them out of their own pocket. They do that continuously. But it is a source of irritation to them. They sense we are not supporting them fully in their mission.

I think this is a great amendment, I say to Senator COLLINS and Senator KYL. I think it is right on point. I could not be more pleased with it. I would like to be added as a cosponsor to it. I think it will help us in the classroom. The most important point in the education process is what occurs in a classroom, that magic moment when a teacher and child can come together and learning occurs. This will help enhance that. I am pleased to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank all my colleagues for their excellent statements on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Michigan, Mr. ABRAHAM, and the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be laid aside and Senator ROBB be recognized to offer an amendment; further, that the debate on the Robb amendment re school construction resume at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning, and the time between 9:30 and 10 be equally divided in the usual form, and following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on or in relation to the amendment. Further, I ask there be no amendment in order to the amendment prior to the vote.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, therefore, following the Collins vote, there will be no further votes tonight, and the first vote will occur at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

I also ask unanimous consent—and the Senator from Nevada and I both consulted about this—that Senator CRAPO be recognized in morning business for up to 10 minutes immediately following the Collins vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. And following Senator CRAPO, the Senator from Montana will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. I so amend the unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I believe the order of business then would be for Senator ROBB to offer his amendment. It is my understanding he is only going to talk about it briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2861

(Purpose: To eliminate the use of education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses and to expand the incentives for the construction and renovation of public schools)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 2861.

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

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, it is my intention to make the argument as a proponent of this amendment tomorrow morning. I was prepared to make it at this time, but to accommodate our colleagues I will at this time ask unani-

mous consent this amendment be temporarily laid aside so we may proceed with the pending vote, and we will return to the amendment for argument first thing tomorrow morning.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2854

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, under the previously propounded unanimous consent agreement, I believe it is appropriate we move to a vote on the Collins amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2854. The yeas and nays have already been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 16 Leg.]

YEAS—98

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

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Murkowski

The amendment (No. 2854) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to support the Affordable Education Act, which addresses an important issue facing American families today—the education of their children. It is my long-held belief that we need to make a college education more affordable, and this legislation will do that by providing tax incentives to families who save for their children's future education needs.

While I strongly support this legislative package, I want to focus on a provision which I have championed for the past six years. Section 102 of the bill makes savings in qualified state tuition plans tax free. This provision would reward savings and allow students and families who are partici-

pating in these state-sponsored plans to be exempt from federal income tax when the funds are used for qualified education purposes. This legislation also recognizes the leadership that states have provided in helping families save for college. Nationwide, 44 savings plans will be established in 2000, serving over one million savers who have contributed over \$7 billion in education savings. In my state of Kentucky, over 3,000 families have established accounts, which amount to \$9.3 million in savings.

This legislation will reward long-term saving by making savings for education tax-free. It is important that we not forget that compounded interest cuts both ways. By saving, participants can keep pace with, or even ahead of, tuition increases while putting a little away at a time. By borrowing, students bear added interest costs that add thousands to the total cost of tuition. Savings will have a positive impact, by reducing the need for students to borrow tens of thousands of dollars in student loans. This will help make need-based grants, which target low-income families, go much further.

Anyone with a child in college knows first-hand the expense of higher education. Throughout the 1990s, education costs have continually outstripped the gains in income. Tuition rates have not become the greatest obstacle students face in attending college. In fact, the astronomical increase in college costs has been well documented. According to a study conducted by the College Board, over the ten-year period ending in 1999-00, tuition and fees at both public and private four-year colleges have increased on average more than 110 percent over inflation since 1980-81, with costs at public colleges rising 51 percent compared to the 34 percent for private four-year colleges. While average, inflation-adjusted tuition has more than doubled, median family income has risen only 22 percent since 1981. To compound this problem, room and board charges are between 3.6 and 4.8 percent higher this year than last year.

Due to the high cost of education, more and more families have come to rely on financial aid to meet tuition costs. In fact, a majority of all college students utilize some amount of financial assistance. The College Board estimates that most of the growth in financial aid has been in the form of student borrowing. In 1998-99, \$64.1 billion in financial aid was available to students and their families from federal, state, and institutional sources. However, despite the fact that student aid has increased in value, it has not increased enough to keep pace with the rise in tuition.

Many Kentuckians are drawn to tuition savings plans because they offer a low-cost, disciplined approach to savings. In fact, the average monthly contribution in Kentucky is just \$52—clearly this benefits middle-class savers. By exempting all interest earnings

from federal taxes, this legislation rewards parents who are serious about their children's future and who are committed over the long-term to the education of their children.

I would like to share an article written by Jane Bryant Quinn, a nationally syndicated financial columnist. In this article, Ms. Quinn discusses the unique tax benefit and the stable investment provided by the existing plans. Ms. Quinn noted that these plans are "a great way for parents or grandparents to build a college fund." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I encourage all of my colleagues to read it.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, despite the Administration's objection to expanding the favorable tax treatment of these state plans, I am pleased that Congress has achieved real reform over the past several years.

In 1996, Congress took the first step in providing tax relief to families investing in these programs. In the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, I was able to include a provision that clarified the tax treatment of state-sponsored savings plans and the participants' investment. This measure put an end to the tax uncertainty that has hampered the effectiveness of these state-sponsored programs and helped families who are trying to save for their children's education.

In 1997, the Taxpayer Relief Act made revisions to provide increased flexibility to families saving for their children's college education. The most significant reform was to expand the definition of "qualified education costs" to include room and board, thus doubling the amount families could save tax-free.

As a result of our actions over the last several years, more and more state plans have implemented tuition savings and prepaid plans for their residents. It is projected that there will be 44 states with tuition savings plans by the year 2000. I believe that we have a real opportunity to go even further toward making college affordable to American families. It is in our best interest as a nation to maintain a quality and affordable education system for everyone. By passing this legislation, we can help families help themselves by rewarding savings. This will reduce the cost of education and will not unnecessarily burden future generations with thousands of dollars in loans.

In addition to making savings in qualified State and private college tuition plans completely tax-free, this legislation makes a number of other changes that are essential to helping families afford a quality education. Specifically, this legislation increases the contributions for K-12 education savings accounts to help families meet the expenses of a primary education. This legislation creates incentives for

employer-provided educational assistance so that individuals can continue their education while working. This legislation also changes the rules for interest deductions so that qualified education loans are more affordable for students. Additionally, this legislation revises the National Health Corps Scholarships Exclusion, increases the arbitrage rebate exception on tax-exempt bonds, provides for private activity bonds for qualified education facilities, and allows the Federal Home Loan Bank to guarantee school construction bonds. These important reforms are critical to helping families save for the future.

I urge my colleagues to support this valuable legislation this year to reward those who save in order to provide a college education for their children.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 2000]

SECTION 529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS RATE AN A

(By Jane Bryant Quinn)

If you haven't yet heard about state Section 529 savings plans, listen up. They're a great way for parents or grandparents to build a college fund.

These plans drip with income-tax and estate-tax breaks and offer a potential for gain that older college plans can't touch. Many top plans are open to residents of any state.

Until recently, 529s were marketed by the states themselves or by two no-load mutual-fund groups—Fidelity and TIAA-CREF—that some states have hired to manage their money.

Brokers and financial planners who work for commissions weren't paid to sell 529s, so they steered your college money somewhere else.

But now, two big brokerage firms are also in the game, selling state 529 plans to a national clientele. Merrill Lynch hitched up with Maine's NextGen program. Salomon Smith Barney has Colorado's Scholars Choice plan and will soon offer West Virginia's plan.

This creates an army of brokers prepared to tout this new form of investing to the public. Commercial sales should help get more people talking about 529s.

State 529 plans (the name refers to a section of the IRS Code) were authorized by Congress in 1996. You can invest lump sums or make regular monthly contributions. The plans come in two forms:

A prepaid tuition plan. The conservative choice. These plans guarantee that the money you save today will match the growth in tuition inflation at state-run colleges. Currently, that's an effective 3.4 percent return. You can also use the money for tuition at out-of-state schools.

A college savings plan. Here, you contribute to an investment pool that has the potential of rising faster than the college inflation rate (although there's no guarantee). You can use the money at any accredited school, for any qualified education expense.

Savings plans are currently offered by 23 states, and nine more are starting up this year. If your state doesn't have a savings plan, or has one with unattractive features, you can join one in another state.

A few states keep your money in bonds, but most provide a mix of stocks and bonds. A typical 529 account leans heavily toward stocks when the child is young, then moves automatically toward safer bonds and money-market funds as college draws near.

Some states give you a choice of accounts. Maine, for example, offers four accounts—

one of which is 100 percent invested in stocks.

Under 529 rules, you can't switch your money from one account to another within the plan. To diversify, you'd contribute to more than one account, says Maine's treasurer, Dale McCormick.

Here's the beauty of 529 plans. All the earnings accumulate tax-deferred. When you take out the money for higher education, it's taxed in your child's bracket, not yours.

Some states let you deduct your contribution on your state tax return. Other states let your earnings pass tax-free.

The value of the plan is not included in your taxable estate. But you still control the money, says certified public accountant and 529 expert Joseph Hurley of Bonadio & Co. in Pittsford, N.Y.

You can change the plan's beneficiary from one family member to another (including an adult seeking further education). You can even drop the plan and take your money back.

If you spend 529 money on something other than higher education, that withdrawal will be taxed in your bracket. You'll also pay a penalty—typically 10 percent of earnings (sometimes more).

"A 10 percent penalty on earnings isn't bad," Hurley says. "If your account yielded 10 percent, you'd still net 9 percent, pretax."

Surprisingly, 529 savings plans detract little or nothing from your child's potential financial-aid award. The money is treated as belonging to the donor, not the student.

Hurley gives top marks to the plans in the following states: Arkansas (1-877-422-6553), Colorado (1-800-478-5651), Maine (1-877-563-9843), Missouri (1-888-414-6678), New Hampshire (1-800-544-1722), Utah (1-800-418-2551) and Virginia (888-567-0540). For his opinion of all the state plans, visit savingforcollege.com.

The new edition of Hurley's book, "The Best Way to Save for College," is due at the end of this month (\$25.95 including shipping; order from savingforcollege.com or call 1-800-487-7624). It contains plan comparisons plus tax tips that financial salespeople aren't likely to know.

For extended information on all the state plans, call the National Association of State Treasurers at 1-877-277-6496 or visit its Web site (www.collegesavings.org).

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I stand before you today to support S. 1134, the Affordable Education Act. I have been a long time supporter of the Education Savings Account. I believe that ESA's can be a very effective tool in helping parents have an impact on their child's education. The key to a child's education is parent involvement. As well intentioned as we may be here in Washington, no amount of money or regulation can accomplish what a child's parents can. I have worked and will continue to work to help provide parents the opportunity to have an increasing say in their child's education. I believe this bill will help to accomplish just that.

The changes this bill will make to the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 will provide flexibility and choice to parents. Parents who earn less than \$95,000 a year can pay up to \$2,000 a year per child into a tax exempt Education Savings Account. This is an increase of 400% from the current limit. Under current law, money that is payed into ESA's is only available to pay for higher education. This bill will make

money payed into an ESA available for parents during the K-12 years of education. This legislation gives parents the flexibility to use their money on anything from college tuition to books or computers if these supplies are utilized in their child's education.

If parents would like to send their child to a private school this money will be available. Some will say that Education Savings Accounts will just benefit the rich. I strongly disagree. This bill would move all parents who want to send their child to a private school \$2,000 closer to that goal. If parents want to keep their child in public school they have their ESA available to pay for any additional fees or supplies that would help educate their child.

Education is a crucial issue. In January and February I held 63 town meetings in the state of Colorado where parents spoke with me first hand about their concerns with the education system. I receive many letters from parents sharing similar sentiments every week. They tell me they are having a difficult time paying extra fees to allow their child to participate in extra curricular activities. Education Savings Accounts can help those parents set aside money to pay for activities that help build character for students. They tell me that they are having to pay for school books that they cannot afford. Education Savings Accounts can help those parents set aside money to pay for the books that their child needs. They tell me that college is becoming too expensive. Education Savings Accounts help parents set aside money to pay for their child's college tuition so that they can graduate without worrying about having to pay off loans.

This bill also addresses other needs in the area of education. Local communities that pass tax-exempt bonds must pay the government the arbitrage, or interest, that accrues on those bonds. The Affordable Education Act increases the ceiling of eligibility for retaining bond arbitrage from \$10 million to \$15 million. This provides more money for school construction. Relief for graduate students is also included in this bill. The sixty month limit on loan interest tax deduction for graduate students is eliminated. This helps students who are unable to pay off their loans in five years. Employers are also allowed to provide up to \$5,250 a year in tax exempt income to an employee attending college or graduate school for tuition assistance. Education Savings Accounts can be extended past the age of 18 for special education students who may not start college at the age of 18 like traditional students.

This bill will also provide a positive impact in other important areas. It provides tax relief which is very important to me and my constituents by reducing taxable income for families with children. I believe it can also reduce juvenile crime by allowing par-

ents to pay for after school care for their child. This would allow children to be involved in activities during the time of day in which children are at the greatest risk of misbehaving, the time between the end of the school day and the end of the work day when many children are unsupervised.

We have an opportunity today to begin to work towards important reform of our education system. We have passed provisions similar to this bill in the past only to see the President veto them. I hope we can overcome this "one-size-fits-all" attitude towards education and pass the Affordable Education Act. Lets put the control back in the hands of parents instead of bureaucrats. I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Affordable Education Act is an important step toward returning to parents and communities the resources and responsibility to provide for their children's education, and expanding educational opportunities for millions of Americans of all ages.

As an original cosponsor of S. 14, the "Education Savings Account and School Excellence Act", portions of which are contained in this bill, I am strongly committed to strengthening and expanding education savings accounts for American families. Families should be encouraged and given incentives to save more of their money for their children's college education, but also to set aside money to meet the unique needs of the children throughout their school years.

The Affordable Education Act expands the existing tax-preferred Education Savings Accounts, which allow families to save for college expenses, to include elementary and secondary educational costs. The bill also allows corporations and other entities, in addition to individuals, to contribute to a child's ESA.

Under this bill, money saved in ESAs could be withdrawn tax-free to pay for a child's educational expenses from kindergarten through high school, not just college. Expanded ESA's could be used to hire a tutor for a child who is struggling with math, or foreign language lessons to help a child become bilingual or multilingual. ESA savings could be used to purchase a home computer or give a child with dyslexia access to a special education teacher. Expanded ESA's will help parents address their children's unique needs and concerns, and encourage their particular abilities. Expanded ESA's can help ensure each child is prepared to succeed in higher education or employment.

This bill also contains several important initiatives to provide greater access to higher education. It supports employer initiatives offering educational assistance to their employees by extending the tax exclusion for employer-paid undergraduate tuition and expanding the tax exclusion to also cover graduate-level courses. The bill helps make college more affordable by

allowing private institutions to establish qualified pre-paid college tuition plans and allows certain tax-free withdrawals from qualified State tuition plans.

Unfortunately, expansion of ESA's and the other provisions noted above are only temporary in the bill before the Senate. Because these programs are important tools for families struggling to pay for the children's college and other educational expenses, I believe these initiatives should be made permanent.

Another important aspect of the bill is the new tax exclusion of certain amounts received from the National Health Corps and Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship programs. Those who receive these scholarships will go on to provide medical and dental services in our nation's underserved areas as well as in military service.

The bill also authorizes the tax-exempt financing rules for school construction. Local communities can determine how to best use their educational resources—whether hiring new teachers, providing additional classroom services, or constructing new schools. This bill gives communities a financial break if they choose to use some of their resources for new school construction, making it possible to accomplish more with limited resources.

Finally, I note with approval that the bill contains several provisions to close existing tax loopholes for special interests in order to balance the costs of these important education initiatives. I would encourage the Senate to consider adding several more of these inequitable tax loopholes to the bill in order to make permanent the expanded ESA's and other important education incentives in this bill.

Again, I reiterate my strong support for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it. More important, I urge the President to consider the importance of this legislation for expanding the educational opportunities of all Americans, and I urge him to sign this bill when it reaches his desk. •

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Idaho is recognized for 10 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. CRAPO pertaining to the introduction of S. 2118, S. 2119, S. 2120, S. 2121, and S. 2122 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CRAPO. I thank the Chair and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

 WHEN WILL THE CYCLE OF SCHOOL VIOLENCE END?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the nightmare of violence in our nation's schools has grabbed our attention once more. This morning, a first-grade student was shot and killed by another first-grader at a Michigan elementary school. Our thoughts and prayers are with the young girl's family, with the young person who pulled the trigger, and with the twenty other students in the classroom. Tragically, once again, the notion of schools as a safe haven was shattered by the sound of gunfire, and we must now begin to face the formidable challenge of rebuilding that serene and tranquil school environment that each and every student and teacher deserves.

This tragedy begs some very basic questions of our society.

First, and perhaps most importantly, what is a first-grader doing with a loaded gun? A first-grader is six years old, maybe even seven. These are merely babes with sweet young faces who have barely begun their lives. They are still putting baby teeth under their pillows awaiting a visit from the tooth fairy. How did this child get the weapon? And what on Earth possessed the child to bring it to school?

What has gone so wrong in our nation that students feel the need to bring weapons to the public school classroom? Do they think they have to show off for their friends? Do they feel the need for power? Surely not a child in the first grade. Do they think that carrying a weapon to school gives them greater stature? I know that we, as a nation, have been struggling with these questions for many, many months, but it is time we started to reach some conclusions.

In the 315 days since the tragedy at Columbine High School, the violence has not stopped. We have seen the same tragic scene of students and teachers pouring out of schools in fear in Atlanta. In the District of Columbia, since this school year began in September, 15 public school students have been killed. According to police, eight of the fifteen slayings were precipitated by an argument in school and ended in gunfire on a neighborhood street. For some reason that we cannot seem to get our arms around, our children continue to injure and kill one another.

Why in the world are we not concentrating on this? Why is the Juvenile

Justice bill, which passed this Senate in May with common-sense weapons controls, still stalled? How many children have to die before this Congress sits up and takes notice? How many lives, so full of potential, have to be snuffed out: 15, 30, 50, 100?

We need to find out why these tragedies continue to occur, and we need to find ways to stop it.

There will be a supplemental bill coming before this Senate soon which is intended to provide close to a billion dollars in aid for Colombia. The White House calls this funding an emergency. I think we have more than enough emergencies here on our home soil that demand urgent attention. It is time to get our priorities straight.

I understand that this is not something that Congress can do on its own, nor is it something that a local school board can accomplish by itself. Putting an end to school violence will take a concerted effort—from lawmakers to parents to students to clergy to community leaders. No one can be given a pass. We all share a responsibility to come together, to look past any historical differences, and to work to find real solutions that will put an end to these tragedies.

I only pray that we can.

My heart goes out to the family who must be stunned at the loss of their little girl. I can only imagine their suffering. All the potential in one tiny, small, little innocent life has been stolen in the flash of a gun. I hope that this Congress, and I hope that the electronic media, the Hollywood movie stars, the movie industry, and the whole Nation, will finally commit to taking the difficult steps that are needed to make sure something positive can come from such an incredible tragedy.

I yield the floor.

 KEEP OUR PROMISE TO AMERICA'S MILITARY RETIREES

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in sponsoring, S. 2003, the Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees Act of 2000. I am sponsoring this legislation because I believe it is necessary if we are to fulfill our moral obligation to those who devoted their careers to safeguarding our nation's people, our homes, and our way of life.

The brave men and women of our armed forces literally put their lives on the line for this country. We owe them a debt we can never repay. But one thing we cannot do, in my opinion, is fail to live up to our explicit promise that those who made military life their career would receive, in return lifetime medical care. That is a promise we have made; and it is a promise we must keep.

There has already been a great deal of discussion on this topic in the Administration and the Congress. In the 1998 National Defense Authorization Act, Congress expressed its sense that many retired military personnel rea-

sonably believed that they had been promised lifetime health care in exchange for 20 or more years of service. Recruiters for the uniformed services, as agents of the United States government, had used recruiting tactics promising enrollees entering the Armed Forces prior to June 7, 1956, that they would be entitled to fully paid lifetime health care upon retirement.

Unfortunately, prior to 1956, a statutory health care plan did not exist for our military personnel. Since the establishment of CHAMPUS, and its successor, Tricare, we have seen the erosion of space-available health care at military treatment facilities for military retirees. Additionally, military health care has become increasingly difficult to obtain for military retirees as the Department of Defense reduces its health care infrastructure. As a result, military retiree's health care situation is woefully inadequate compared to health care afforded to other federal employees. Today, military retirees remain the only Federal Government personnel who have been prevented from using their employer-provided health care at or after 65 years of age. Military retirees deserve to have a health care program that is at least comparable with that of retirees from civilian employment in the Federal Government.

In statements before this Congress, our distinguished Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs have reiterated the importance of seeing to military retirees' health needs. According to Secretary Cohen, the loudest complaints he hears while traveling concern the military health care system.

I believe General Hugh Shelton expressed the correct response to these complaints when he stated, "I think that the first thing we need to do is make sure that we acknowledge our commitment to the retirees for their years of service and for what we basically committed to at the time they were recruited into the armed forces." It is morally imperative, that we keep our promise to the brave men and women who devoted their careers to protecting our country.

But we should also keep in mind that health care is not only a top issue for retirees; it is also a major source of dissatisfaction for active duty personnel. As such it affects readiness, recruiting and retention. The availability of quality, lifetime health care is a critical recruiting incentive for the all volunteer Armed Forces.

That incentive has been undermined by the declining services provided to military retirees. In its self-proclaimed "Year of Health Care," the Department of Defense had a major opportunity to take the lead in keeping commitments to service members and start erasing the skepticism and distrust that years of broken health care promises have engendered among the retired population. Putting these initiatives in the

President's budget would have made them much easier to enact. But, once again, the Administration has chosen to pass its moral responsibilities to the Congress.

For too long, this Administration has ignored the needs of the brave men and women who have defended our interests and our shores. This is unfair. What is more, in my view it is unwise to ignore the well-being of military retirees.

Well-trained, properly motivated troops have been and continue to be the single most important factor in protecting our national security. Without them we will not be able to achieve and maintain military readiness. We will not be able, as a nation, to fight and win. Under current conditions we cannot expect to maintain the levels of re-enlistment, expertise and morale we need to maintain an effective military force.

Last year this Congress took it upon itself to address the critical issue of unconscionably low military pay. I hope and believe that this year we will address the no-less critical issue of unconscionably inadequate health care services for military retirees.

This Congress and the President must take action to address the problems associated with the availability of health care for military retirees. Keeping this nation's promise and providing adequate health care for military retirees is an issue whose time has come. Every day, in hundreds of locations all over the world, our soldiers, sailors and airmen willingly serve in defense of our national interest, promoting peace and prosperity around the globe.

We have asked for the greatest sacrifice from our military retirees and today's men and women in uniform—to give one's life in defense of their nation. When people put themselves in harm's way for their country, they should not have to worry about their families' access to proper health care.

We must act upon the sense of this Congress that the United States has incurred a moral obligation to provide health care to former members of the Armed Forces who are entitled to retired or retainer pay (or its equivalent); and it is, therefore, necessary to provide quality, affordable health to such retirees.

For these reasons I am happy to join with Senators COVERDELL, JOHNSON, and 13 fellow Senators in co-sponsoring the bipartisan Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees Act (S. 2003). This legislation is key to re-establishing the morale, confidence and trust of our military retirees.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, during the Civil Rights movement, Dr. Carter G. Woodson's idea of a Negro History Week honoring the achievements of African Americans was extended to the entire month of February.

I rise today as a Senator from the state with the largest population of African Americans in the United States to speak on behalf of this year's Black History Month theme "Heritage and Horizons." Harlem, New York was the center of a 1930's Renaissance period. It attracted aspiring individuals from across the country and the world. It is also the birthplace of renowned African Americans who have excelled in the areas of politics and business, arts and entertainment, athletics and activism.

Since the expansion of the Negro History Week to Black History Month, countless African Americans continue to amass accomplishments and shatter barriers worthy of multiple months of tribute. Many of us know of the great strides made by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Frederick Douglas, Booker T. Washington, W. E. B. DuBois, Ida B. Wells, and Rosa Parks. Many of the Members in this chamber have worked alongside Shirley Chisholm, Thurgood Marshall Sr., Charles Rangel, Clifford Alexander, Jr., and Colin Powell.

African Americans from New York have been pioneers in many different fields. In 1981, Pam McAllister Johnson was named publisher of Gannett's Ithaca (NY) Journal, making her the first African American woman to head a general circulation newspaper in the United States. In June 1995, Dr. Lonnie Bristow, a Harlem native, became the first African American appointed as president of the American Medical Association. American Express announced in February 1997 that Kenneth Chenault was named president and heir apparent to the position of CEO, making the Long Island native the highest-ranking African American executive in corporate America.

Art Hardwick, husband of Shirley Chisholm, won the 1962 State Assembly race becoming the first African American to represent Western New York. In 1971, Carmel C. Marr became the first woman of any race to serve as Commissioner of the New York State Public Service Commission. Harry Belafonte, a Harlem native, was recently honored at the Grammy's for his lifetime contributions as an actor and entertainer. Denzel Washington, born and raised in Mount Vernon, recently won a Golden Globe for his role in the movie Hurricane. The critically acclaimed author of *The Women of Brewster Place*, Gloria Naylor, hails from Queens, New York.

In 1957, New York City native Althea Gibson was the first African American woman to compete and win at the Wimbledon and Forest Hills. The following year, she repeated as the Wimbledon and U.S. National Tennis Champion. Former NBA coach and Brooklyn native, Lenny Wilkins, was voted into the Basketball Hall of Fame for holding the NBA record for the most regular season victories by a coach.

Almost 70 years after the Renaissance began, New York continues to be the place where African American

innovators and pioneers distinguish themselves, thereby continuing the Renaissance and enhancing our country.

NOMINATION OF GEORGE DANIELS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to rise today to speak about George Daniels, who has just been confirmed as a Federal Judge in the Southern District of New York.

George Daniels is uniquely qualified to serve in this position. His work experience is as diverse and impressive as it gets: He has been a Legal Aid Defense Attorney and a prosecutor; he has worked at a top New York Law firm and served as a Law Professor; he worked in politics as Counsel to the Mayor of New York, and, of course, he has been a Judge—first on the Criminal Court of the City of New York and then as a Justice on the Supreme Court of the State of New York. I know he has the respect and the admiration from individuals on both sides of the aisle.

I am extremely pleased to see him confirmed as a Federal Judge. I know he will be an extraordinary addition to the Southern District of New York bench.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, February 28, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,747,333,809,275.61 (Five trillion, seven hundred forty-seven billion, three hundred thirty-three million, eight hundred nine thousand, two hundred seventy-five dollars and sixty-one cents).

Five years ago, February 28, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,854,298,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred fifty-four billion, two hundred ninety-eight million).

Ten years ago, February 28, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$2,994,354,000,000 (Two trillion, nine hundred ninety-four billion, three hundred fifty-four million).

Fifteen years ago, February 28, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,698,358,000,000 (One trillion, six hundred ninety-eight billion, three hundred fifty-eight million).

Twenty-five years ago, February 28, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$499,711,000,000 (Four hundred ninety-nine billion, seven hundred eleven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,247,622,809,275.61 (Five trillion, two hundred forty-seven billion, six hundred twenty-two million, eight hundred nine thousand, two hundred seventy-five dollars and sixty-one cents) during the past 25 years.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by

Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 149. An act to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 and to other laws related to parks and public lands.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill, previously received from the House of Representatives for the concurrence of the Senate, was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated on February 24, 2000:

H.R. 3642. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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-7754. A communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relative to Vieques, PR; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7755. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, a report relative to certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more to France; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7756. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7757. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Childhood Blood-Lead Screening and Lead Awareness (Educational Outreach for Indian Tribes; Notice of Funds Availability (OPPTS))" (FRL # 6491-2), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7758. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2001 budget request; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-7759. A communication from the President of the United States of America, relative to the continuation of the emergency with respect to the Government of Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7760. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to HUD's Mortgage Review Board and Civil Money Penalty Regulations" (RIN2501-AC44) (FR-4308-I-01),

received February 25, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7761. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pink Bollworm Regulated Areas" (Docket # 00-009-1), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7762. A communication from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Individual Development Accounts" (RIN0970-AC02), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7763. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Automatic Waiver of Certain Excise Tax" (Rev. Proc. 2000-17), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7764. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 13-247, "Police Recruiting and Retention Enhancement Amendment Act of 1999"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7765. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank transmitting, pursuant to law, the Management report as of September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7766. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7767. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-7768. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Regulation for Public Water Systems; Analytical Methods for Perchlorated and Acetochlor; Announcement of Laboratory Approval and Performance Testing (TP) Program for the Analysis of Perchlorate (OW)" (FRL # 6544-6), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7769. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan; Plan Revision, South Coast Air Quality Management District (Region 9)" (FRL # 6541-9), received February 18, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7770. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan; Plan Revision, South Coast Air Quality Management District" (FRL # 6540-6), received February 18, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7771. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Correction" (FRL # 6518-7), received February 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7772. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Georgia" (FRL # 6541-5), received February 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7773. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion" (FRL # 6541-1), received February 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7774. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Secondary Aluminum Production" (FRL # 6513-8), received February 17, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7775. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of the Clean Air Act, Section 112(1), Delegation of Authority to Three Local Air Agencies in Washington, Amendment (Region 10)", received February 23, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7776. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions (Region 6)" (FRL # 6543-3), received February 23, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7777. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Missouri: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision (Region 7)" (FRL # 6543-5), received February 23, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7778. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendment to the Finding of Significant Contribution and Rulemaking for Certain States for Purposes of Reducing Regional Transport of Ozone (The NOx SIP Call Rule) (OAR)" (FRL # 6542-9), received February 23, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7779. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space

Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of calendar year 1999 actions taken which involve actual or potential cost in excess of \$50,000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7780. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the Shelikof Strait Conservation Area in the Gulf of Alaska", received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7781. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to Required Observer Coverage", received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7782. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Closures of Specified Groundfish Fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska", received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7783. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock by Vessels Not Participating in Cooperatives that are Catching Pollock for Processing by Inshore Component in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area", received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7784. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery Management Plan; Delay of Effectiveness" (RIN0648-AK79), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7785. A communication from the Attorney Adviser, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anthropomorphic Test Dummy: Occupant Safety Protection" (RIN2127-AG66), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7786. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Foreign Acquisition (Part 1825 Rewrite)", received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7787. A communication from the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "1999 Activities of the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)", to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7788. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a correction to the "Subsonic Noise Reduc-

tion Technology" report; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7789. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Regulations; Jamaica Bay and Connecting Waterways, NY (CGD01-00-008)" (RIN2115-AE47) (2000-0012), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7790. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Regulations; Norwalk River, CT (CGD01-00-006)" (RIN2115-AE47) (2000-0011), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7791. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Anchorage Areas/Anchorage Grounds Regulations; Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, CA (CGD11-99-008)" (RIN2115-AA98) (2000-0002), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7792. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Tampa Bay, FL (COTP Tampa 99-042)" (RIN2115-AA97) (2000-0003), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7793. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (25); Amdt. No. 1975 (2-25/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA65) (2000-0010), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7794. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (11); Amdt. No. 1976 (2-25/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA65) (2000-0011), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7795. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (22); Amdt. No. 1977 (2-25/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA65) (2000-0013), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7796. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Change Controlling Agency for Restricted Areas -6901A and R-6901B; Fort McCoy, WI; Docket No. 00-AGL-5 (2-25/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0057), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7797. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of the El Toro Marine Air Corps Air Station (MCAS) Airspace Area,

and the Revision of the Santa Ana Class C Airspace Area, CA; Docket No. 99-ASW-10 (2-23/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-005421), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7798. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Cuba, MO; Direct Final Rule; Request for Comments; Docket No. 00-ACE-3 (2-25/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0058), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7799. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Lexington, NC; Docket No. 00-ASO-7 (2-28/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0059), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7800. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Class E Airspace; Oak Harbor, WA; Docket No. 99-ANM-03 (2-28/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0060), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7801. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Class E Airspace; Hutchinson KS; Direct Final Rule; Confirmation of Effective Date; Docket No. 99-ACE-48 (2-22/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0056), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7802. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Amendment of Class D Airspace; Key West, FL; Docket No. 99-ASO-28 (2-22/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA66) (2000-0055), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7803. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-3 and DC-4 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-139 (2-22/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0099), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7804. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 172R 172S, 182S, 206H, and T206H Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 2000-CE-07 (2-22/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0100), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7805. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Hoffman Propeller Co. H027 and H04/27 Series Propellers; Request for Comments; Docket No. 98-ANE-64 (2-23/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0106), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7806. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Cameron Balloons Ltd. Titanium Propane Cylinders, Part Number (P/N) CB2380 and P/N CB2383; Request for Comments; Docket No. 2000-CE-08 (2-22/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0104), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7807. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries, LTD., Model Astra SPX Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-256 (2-23/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0105), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7808. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-325 (2-24/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0112), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7809. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. Model EMB 135 and EMB 145 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-370 (2-24/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0113), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7810. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, -200, and 747SP Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98-NM-339 (2-22/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0101), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7811. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-100 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98-NM-193 (2-22/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0102), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7812. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98-NM-150 (2-23/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0107), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7813. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 95-NM-150 (2-22/2-24)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0103), received February 24, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7814. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320 and A321 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-339 (2-24/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0117), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7815. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 2000-NM-51 (2-24/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0116), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7816. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace BAe Model ATP Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-344 (2-24/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0114), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7817. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace BAe Model ATP Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-344 (2-24/2-28)" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0114), received February 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-420. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa relative to appropriations for the United States Naval Fleet and the United States Flag Merchant Marine Fleet; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 108

Whereas, the continuing reduction of the United States armed forces is dangerously straining the ability of the United States to respond adequately to regional threats, with the United States Naval Fleet shrinking from nearly 600 ships in 1987 to less than 325 ships today; and

Whereas, the United States is currently building military ships at half the rate needed to maintain even a modest fleet, while the demands on the United States sea power forces have increased significantly since the end of the Cold War; and

Whereas, the United States is presently deploying its Navy and Marines three times as often as the United States did before the fall of the Soviet Union, while procuring fewer ships than at anytime since 1932, with the current fleet being the smallest since 1917; and

Whereas, the safety and economic prosperity of the United States are tied to the political stability of every part of the globe, and the United States faces a dangerous and challenging situation where, as the only superpower, it has an obligation to ensure that conflicts do not escalate into major military or humanitarian disasters; and

Whereas, the United States has a different and far more complex duty now than during the Cold War, and must be prepared to deploy air and sea power as well as ground troops, upon short notice; and

Whereas, because the United States has closed many military bases in the past decade, only the Naval Fleet can transport large numbers of Army and Air Force equipment, troops, and supplies around the world to support military operations that deal with threats to national security of the United States; and

Whereas, nations engaging in terrorist activities have vast supplies of chemical and

biological agents, with several nations developing their own nuclear weapons; and

Whereas, the health of the economy of the United States depends on international stability as vast markets for the agricultural and manufactured products of the United States and the world's investment markets are intertwined; now therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the Iowa General Assembly requests that the Congress of the United States, committed to the safety and economic security of the United States, authorize and appropriate sufficient funding to build at least 10 ships per year for the next decade; and be it further

Resolved, That the Iowa General Assembly call upon the Presidential candidates to express their commitment to rebuilding the United States Naval Fleet and the United States Flag Merchant Marine Fleet; and be it further

Resolved, That official copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of Iowa's congressional delegation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CLELAND :

S. 2113. A bill to provide wage parity for certain Department of Defense prevailing rate employees in Georgia; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN :

S. 2114. A bill to exempt certain entries of titanium disks from antidumping duties retroactively applied by the United States Customs Service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 2115. A bill to ensure adequate monitoring of the commitments made by the People's Republic of China in its accession to the World Trade Organization and to create new procedures to ensure compliance with those commitments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2116. A bill to amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to support teacher corps programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2117. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, with respect to consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 2118. A bill to amend Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964 to modify the computation of certain weighted student units; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO:

S. 2119. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve training for teachers in the use of technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. 2120. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish teacher recruitment and professional

development programs for rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. 2121. A bill to provide for rural education assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. 2122. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve provisions relating to initial teaching experiences and alternative routes to certification; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BREAUX, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2123. A bill to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. DODD):

S. 2124. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for the urgent repair and renovation of public elementary and secondary schools in high-need areas; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. L. CHAFEE):

S. 2125. A bill to provide for the disclosure of certain information relating to tobacco products and to prescribe labels for packages and advertising of tobacco products; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. FRIST):

S.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Alan G. Spoon as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Sheila E. Widnall as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Manuel L. Ibanez as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. EDWARDS):

S. Res. 264. A resolution congratulating and thanking Chairman Robert F. Bennett and Vice Chairman Christopher J. Dodd for their tremendous leadership, poise, and dedication in leading the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem and commending the members of the Committee for their fine work; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mr. ROBB):

S. Con. Res. 85. A concurrent resolution condemning the discriminatory practices prevalent at Bob Jones University; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEWINE:

S. Con. Res. 86. A concurrent resolution requesting that the United States Postal Service issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry Units, collectively known as the Buffalo Soldiers; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2114. A bill to exempt certain entries of titanium disks from antidumping duties retroactively applied by the United States Customs Service; to the Committee on Finance.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO A TARIFF CLASSIFICATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation to correct a technical error made by the U.S. Customs Service, and exempt Waldron Pacific from antidumping duties which were retroactively applied by Customs to three import shipments of titanium. This bill is a companion to legislation introduced by Representative DAVID WU in the House of Representatives.

Waldron Pacific, a small business located in Lake Oswego, Oregon, is a distributor of non-ferrous alloys, such as aluminum, zinc and brass, used in the die casting and foundry industries. With just two employees, Waldron Pacific has been a very successful business operation.

When a customer of Waldron Pacific needed a certain type of titanium not available in this country, the entrepreneurial Waldron Pacific found a supplier outside the U.S., in Russia. Having no import experience, but hearing of potential antidumping duties on certain titanium products, Waldron Pacific sought a binding Classification Ruling from Customs before importing the product. Customs' Classification Ruling indicated that the proper import duty was 15%, and Waldron Pacific began importing the product to fulfill the needs of its customer. After three shipments had been imported, Customs revoked its previous Classification Ruling and applied retroactively an additional 85% antidumping duty on these shipments. The three shipments had already been imported, delivered and paid for by Waldron Pacific's customer, leaving Waldron Pacific liable to pay \$42,000 in unexpected duties.

Whether or not the product should be subject to the antidumping order is not at issue nor is that the matter addressed by this legislation. The key point is that Waldron Pacific exercised due diligence in obtaining a Classification Ruling prior to importing the product, and relied upon that Classification Ruling as a basis for importing and selling the product. Even the domestic producers who are protected by the antidumping order agree that Waldron Pacific should not have to pay antidumping duties on these three shipments. Ironically, the antidumping order has since been repealed entirely. Providing Waldron Pacific relief from

Customs' mistake and subsequent attempt to retroactively apply a higher tariff is a question of basic fairness.

The legislation I am introducing today would correct this technical error and exempt these import shipments from the unfair, retroactive application of antidumping duties.

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. 2114

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

SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ENTRIES OF TITANIUM DISKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 15144) or any other provision of law, the United States Customs Service shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, liquidate or reliquidate the entries listed in subsection (b) as exempt from antidumping duties under antidumping case number A-462-103; and

(2) not later than 90 days after such liquidation or reliquidation under paragraph (1), refund any antidumping duties paid with respect to such entries, including interest from the date of entry, if the importer of the entries files a request therefor with the Customs Service within such 90-day period.

(b) ENTRIES.—The entries referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

<i>Entry Number</i>	<i>Date of Entry</i>
EE1-0001115-8	January 26, 1995
EE1-0001313-9	June 23, 1995
EE1-0001449-1	September 25, 1995

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 2115. A bill to ensure adequate monitoring of the commitments made by the People's Republic of China in its accession to the World Trade Organization and to create new procedures to ensure compliance with those commitments; to the Committee on Finance.

CHINA-WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION COMPLIANCE ACT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the China WTO Compliance Act, along with Senators MURKOWSKI, BINGAMAN, AKAKA, WYDEN, and DORGAN.

This bill is designed to ensure continuous and rigorous monitoring of China's WTO commitments. It also provides new mechanisms in the Congress and in the Executive Branch to make sure that China complies with those commitments.

Twenty years of negotiations with our Asian partners have demonstrated that trade agreements are often not self-executing. This is just as true with China today as it has been with Japan over these last two decades. The Congress and the Administration must both be resolutely committed to monitoring and enforcement. Only then do our trade agreements succeed and bring the desired results. Inattention by the United States leads to inaction

by our trading partners. It leads to failure to achieve market opening objectives.

This bill will make sure that future Congresses and future Administrations, whether they are Democratic or Republican, will keep trade agreement compliance permanently at the top of the agenda with China. We must ensure that inattention never sets in. We must also ensure that other elements in the bilateral relationship not be allowed to prevent the United States from gaining the maximum trade and economic benefit from China's WTO promises.

Let me be clear that this bill is not designed to set conditions for the Congressional vote on granting China Permanent Normal Trade Relations status, PNTR. Rather, this bill addresses one of the major concerns that many in the Congress have. That is, China historical record in complying with bilateral trade agreements has been spotty. So, how can we be confident that compliance with this agreement will be any better? I hope that enactment of this bill will provide some reassurance to Senators and House members in this regard. I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in approving this legislation.

Let me outline the main provisions of the China WTO Compliance Act.

First, monitoring. The President must submit a detailed plan to Congress for monitoring Chinese compliance three months after China accedes to the WTO. The plan must be updated yearly and include detailed tasking responsibilities for each agency.

The General Accounting Office will be required annually to survey the top 50 American firms in each of five different categories. Companies that export non-agricultural goods to China. That export agricultural goods to China. That provide services in China. That invest in China. And that import goods from China. The purpose of the survey is to determine if China is abiding by its WTO commitments. The survey will also provide information about any problems confronted by those firms.

The International Trade Commission will report annually on United States-China bilateral export and import statistics. They will also, as best they can, seek to reconcile the different United States-source and China-source statistics.

The second element in the bill deals with compliance. USTR must submit an annual report to Congress on China's compliance with its WTO commitments. After analyzing this report, a majority vote of either the Finance Committee or the Ways and Means Committee would require USTR to initiate a Section 301 investigation of Chinese practices that do not abide by China's WTO commitments. If USTR then determines that China is violating any of those commitments, USTR shall initiate dispute settlement action at the WTO, unless there exists another more effective action. USTR shall consult with the Congress and provide an explanation of its action.

Going further, a majority vote of both the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee will require USTR to initiate immediately a case under the dispute settlement mechanism of the WTO.

The bill also amends Section 301. It authorizes USTR to draw a negative inference if a country being investigated does not cooperate in providing information. This has become a serious problem with some of our trading partners. A 301 investigation can bog down when a country with a non-transparent trading regime refuses to provide detailed information. This provision provides an incentive for cooperation.

Third, the bill calls for a special WTO review of China. It is the Sense of the Congress that there should be a special multilateral process at the WTO for a thorough and comprehensive annual review of Chinese compliance. The bill directs USTR to propose that the Trade Policy Review Mechanism, the TPRM, at the WTO execute such a review of China's trade policies every year. It also directs USTR to take measures to improve the TPRM process.

Finally, institution-building in China. Coming out of half a century of communism, China does not have the institutions necessary to carry out fully its WTO obligations. This bill requires the President to submit a plan to provide assistance to China to build those institutions necessary to fulfill the obligations China has made as part of its accession to the WTO. The bill expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should provide such assistance through bilateral mechanisms, in particular, through appropriate non-governmental organizations. It also provides for the possibility of some multilateral assistance under the auspices of the WTO.

Finally, because a primary beneficiary of the results of successful institution-building in China would be American business, efforts shall be made to develop cost-sharing with the private sector.

There has been a lot of talk about the need to ensure full Chinese compliance with its WTO commitments. This bill is an attempt to establish a system that will do just that. We need this legislation. And we need to pass PNTR as soon as possible.

Let me conclude with a few remarks about Chinese compliance with the Agricultural Cooperation Agreement, which went into effect in December. Three weeks ago, I initiated a letter signed by 53 Senators to Chinese President Jiang Zemin. In the letter, we insisted that China proceed with full and immediate implementation of that agreement. I was pleased to announce on Monday the first purchase by China under this agreement. 50,000 metric tons of Pacific Northwest wheat. This is an important step that should be followed by other agricultural purchases.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the legislation introduced

today by the distinguished Senators from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) entitled the "China-World Trade Organization Compliance Act."

Last November, the United States and China announced that a bilateral agreement had been reached on China's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO). The agreement covers all agricultural products, industrial goods, and service areas. It promises to open up the Chinese market to American exports and American investment.

Nevertheless, many Americans are hesitant at embracing this accord. Part of their concern is over the requirement that in order for the United States to benefit fully from this agreement. Congress will have to pass legislation granting permanent Normal Trade Relations (NTR) status to China. Previously known as Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) trading status, NTR has been subject to an annual renewal vote each year in the Congress. This yearly vote has allowed for a full airing of American concerns over relations with China—relations which remain contentious to this day because of the Chinese government's human rights behavior, proliferation activities, trade policy, and relations with its neighbors, most especially Taiwan.

I cannot predict the result of the vote later this year on granting China permanent NTR.

I do know that a Congressional vote against China will not necessarily prevent China from joining the WTO if it concludes successfully its accession agreements with other WTO members. China still has to resolve issues with the European Union and then have its accession approved by the WTO General Council/Ministerial Conference. But I think it is reasonable to assume that later this year China will join the WTO whether or not the United States grants permanent NTR.

In light of this possibility, the legislation proposed today by my colleagues, and which I am pleased to co-sponsor, is a reasonable and prudent step to take in order to ensure that the agreements which China commits to in joining the WTO are ones which China will fulfill.

The history of Chinese compliance with international agreements has not been as good as it should be. In particular, China has not successfully implemented the commitments it made in March 1995 to protect American intellectual property rights. Intellectual piracy remains a major threat to the American music, cinema, and computer software industries. The Chinese government has demonstrated an impressive ability to arrest and intimidate massive numbers of Falun Gong followers but seems unable to locate factories mass producing thousands of counterfeit CDs, videos, and computer software. Clearly, where there is a will, there is a way for the Chinese government.

In addition, the Chinese government has proven itself very adept at protecting its domestic market from foreign goods and investment, devising formal and informal barriers to trade. The concept of transparency in Chinese trade law leaves much to be desired. An October 1992 market access agreement between the United States and China has yet to be fully implemented with China eliminating some barriers while imposing new ones.

The pattern of past Chinese behavior to international trading agreements suggest that we must be vigilant in ensuring compliance with the WTO accession agreement.

The legislation we offer today is a significant step towards ensuring that China's promises are fulfilled. The bill establishes a process within the United States government for monitoring Chinese compliance with its WTO commitments. The monitoring would occur regardless of whether or not the United States grants permanent NTR to China, although surely it would have more effect if we do grant this to China.

We have lacked a process, and an agency, within the United States government with the mandate, the expertise, institutional memory, and the resources to ensure that the promise of bilateral and multilateral trade agreements are fulfilled. This legislation is a major step in starting the debate on how to ensure that promises made are promises kept.

As ranking member of the International Security, Proliferation And Federal Services Subcommittee of the Governmental Affairs Committee, I am keenly interested in the implications of the legislation for the organization of our government's trade agencies. There are several areas where I would like to work with the legislation's authors to refine their proposal. I believe that it might be appropriate to designate the United States Trade Representative's Office as the lead agency working with other agencies to monitor compliance. I intend to study further the best means for ensuring the effectiveness of this legislation.

I believe it also important that public participation in commenting on China's compliance should not be limited to business groups but include environmental, labor, and human rights organizations. The climate affecting the world economy is not solely determined by the financial bottom line.

This legislation is an important step towards a trade environment which benefits the many, not the few, and I am pleased to cosponsor it.

By Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2116. A bill to amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to support teacher corps programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

TEACHER CORPS

• Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, if there is one thing we all can agree on in education, it is that teacher quality is absolutely critical to how well children learn. Yet, the nation confronts one of the worst teacher shortages in history. With expanding enrollment, decreasing class size and one third of the nation's teachers nearing retirement age, public schools will need to hire as many as 2.2 million teachers over the next decade.

The need is greatest in specific subject areas such as mathematics, science, special education and bilingual education, all important subjects if the nation is to have an educated work force to keep it competitive in the world marketplace.

Need is also greatest in specific geographical areas such as the inner city and rural areas. Ironically, it is the most educationally and socio-economically disadvantaged students that are under served. If there is one action we can take guaranteed to help struggling schools and children, it is to provide states and school districts the means to ensure that there is a highly qualified teacher in every classroom.

My legislation, Teacher Corps, which I am proud to introduce today with my colleagues, Senators KENNEDY and SCHUMER, who for so long have fought to bring the best possible educational opportunities to all of America's children, is designed to do just that. Its components are based on a definite need and sound research concerning effective mechanisms for meeting that need.

Teacher Corps would fund collaboratives between state education agencies, local education agencies and institutions of higher education.

The collaboratives would recruit top ranked college students and qualified mid career individuals, who have not yet been trained as teachers, to teach in the nation's poorest schools in the areas of greatest need—both geographically and academically. Districts and universities would work together to only recruit candidates who have an academic major or extensive and substantive professional experience in the subject in which they will teach.

The collaboratives would provide recruits a tuition free alternative route to certification which includes intensive study and a teaching internship. The internship would include mentoring, co-teaching and advanced course work in pedagogy, state standards, technology and other areas.

After the internship period, the collaboratives would offer individualized follow up training and mentoring in the first two years of full time teaching.

Corps members that become certified will be given priority in hiring within that district in exchange for a commitment to teach in low income schools for 3 years.

A good teacher can mean the world to any child whether it is through car-

ing or through providing children with the skills they need to open their own doors to the future. Every time I enter schools in Minnesota, I am in awe of teachers' work.

That is why it is so tragic to think that there are so many children that do not have access to qualified teachers, at the same time that many people interested in teaching are either not entering the profession or are not staying there once they have qualified.

Teacher Corps will help meet the growing need for teachers in low income urban and rural schools, and in high need subject areas such as math, science, bilingual and special education.

It will do so because Teacher Corps is rooted in three fundamental parts. Recruitment, retention and innovative, flexible, high quality training programs for college graduates and mid-career professionals who want to teach in high need areas.

The first principle is recruitment. As I mentioned before, we may need to hire as many as 2.2 million new teachers in the next decade to ensure that there are enough teachers in our schools. But, overall quantity is not the only issue. Quality and shortages in specific geographic and curriculum areas are equally critical. While there are teacher surpluses in some areas, certain states and cities are facing acute teacher shortages. In California, 1 out of every 10 teachers lacks proper credentials. 58 percent of new hires in Los Angeles are not certified.

There are also crucial shortages in some subject areas such as math, science, bilingual and special education. In my home state of Minnesota, 90 percent of principals report a serious shortage of strong candidates in at least one curriculum area. 54 percent of the mathematics teachers in the state of Idaho and 48 percent of the science teachers in Florida and Tennessee did not major in the subject of their primary assignment.

Teacher Corps would meet this need because it would recruit and train thousands of high quality teachers into the field to meet the specific teaching needs of local school districts.

It would recruit and train top college students and mid-career professionals from around the country, who increasingly want to enter the teaching profession.

More college students want to enter teaching today than have wanted to join the profession in the past 30 years. According to a recent UCLA survey, over 10 percent of all freshman say they want to teach in elementary and secondary schools.

Second, the design of the program ensures that the needs of local school districts will be considered so that only those candidates who meet the specific needs of that district will be recruited and trained. If, for example, there is a shortage of special education, bilingual, math and science teachers in a particular district, Teacher Corps

would only train people with those skills. In setting up collaboratives in this way, teacher corps helps avoid the overproduction of candidates in areas where they are not needed.

Finally, Teacher Corps gives priority to high need rural, inner suburban and urban districts to ensure that new teachers will enter where they are needed most.

However, it does not help to recruit teachers into high need schools and train them if we cannot retain them in the profession. Teaching is one of the hardest, most important jobs there is. We ask teachers to prepare our children for adulthood. We ask them to educate our children so that they may be productive members of society. We entrust them with our children's minds and with their future. It is a disgrace how little support we give them in return. It is no surprise that one of the major causes of our teacher shortage is that teachers decide to change professions before retirement. 73 percent of Minnesota teachers who leave the profession, leave for reasons other than retirement. In urban schools, 50 percent of teachers leave the field within five years of when they start teaching.

To retain high quality teachers in the profession, we must give teachers the support they deserve. Teachers, like doctors need monitoring and support during the first years of their professional life. Teacher Corps offers new teachers the training, monitoring and support they need to meet the profession's many challenges. It includes methods of support that have proven effective in ensuring that teachers stay in schools. The key elements for effective teacher retention were laid out by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future in 1996. Effective programs organize professional development around standards for teachers and students; provide a year long, pre-service internship; include mentoring and strong evaluation of teacher skills; offer stable, high quality professional development.

Each of these criteria are included in the Teacher Corps program.

Further, Teacher Corps supports people who choose teaching by paying for their training. Through this financial and professional support, Teacher Corps will go a long way toward keeping recruits in teaching.

But, it is still not enough to recruit and retain teachers. Quality must be of primary importance. Research shows that the most important predictor of student success is not income, but the quality of the teacher. Despite this need, studies show that as the level of students of color and students from low-income families increases in schools, the test scores of teachers declines.

This is wrong. We are denying children from low-income areas, from racial minorities, with limited English proficiency, access to what we know works. Several studies have shown that if poor and minority students are

taught by high quality teachers at the same rate as other students, a large part of the gap between poor and minority students and their more affluent white counterparts would disappear. For example, one Alabama study shows that an increase of one standard deviation in teacher test scores leads to a two-thirds reduction in the gap between black/white tests scores.

We can not turn our back on this knowledge. We must act on it. We must give low income, minority and limited English proficiency children the same opportunities that all children have and we must do it now.

The very essence of Teacher Corps is to funnel high quality teachers where they are needed most. Teacher Corps would help ensure quality by using a selective, competitive recruitment process. It would provide high quality training, professional development, monitoring and evaluations of corps member performance, all of which have been proven to increase the quality of the teaching force and the achievement of the students they teach.

Further, by creating strong connections between universities and districts and by implementing effective professional development projects within districts, we are setting up powerful structures to benefit all teachers and students.

Mr. President, we have an opportunity to do what we know works to help children who need our help most. Good teachers have an extraordinary impact on children's lives and learning. We need to be sure that all children have access to such teachers and all children have the opportunity to learn so that all children may take advantage of the many opportunities this country provides.●

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2117. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, with respect to consumer credit transaction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I introduce the Consumer Credit Fair Dispute Resolution Act of 2000, a bill that will protect and preserve American consumers' right to take their disputes with creditors to court. This bill is identical to an amendment that I offered recently to the bankruptcy reform bill.

In recent years, credit card companies and consumer credit lenders are increasingly requiring their customers to use binding arbitration when a dispute arises. Consumers are barred by contract from taking a dispute to court, even small claims court. While arbitration can be an efficient tool to settle claims, it is credible and effective only when consumers enter into it knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily. Unfortunately, that's not happening in the credit card and consumer credit lending arenas.

One of the most fundamental principles of our justice system is the con-

stitutional right to take a dispute to court. Indeed, all Americans have the right in civil and criminal cases to a trial by jury. The right to a jury trial in criminal cases is contained in the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution. The right to a jury trial in civil cases is contained in the Seventh Amendment, which provides "In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved. . . ."

Some argue that Americans are overusing the courts. Court dockets across the country are congested with civil cases. In part as a response to these concerns, various ways to resolve disputes have been developed, short of going to court. Alternatives to court litigation are collectively known as alternative dispute resolution, or ADR. ADR includes mediation and arbitration. Mediation and arbitration are often efficient ways to resolve disputes because the parties can have their case heard well before they would have received a trial date in court.

Mediation is conducted by a neutral third party—the mediator—who meets with the opposing parties to help them find a mutually satisfactory solution. Unlike a judge in a courtroom, the mediator has no power to impose a solution. No formal rules of evidence or procedure control mediation; the mediator and the parties mutually agree on the best way to proceed.

Arbitration also involves a third party—an arbitrator or arbitration panel. Unlike mediation but similar to a court proceeding, the arbitrator issues a decision after reviewing the arguments by all parties. Arbitration uses rules of evidence and procedure, although it may use rules that are simpler or more flexible than the evidentiary and procedural rules that the parties would follow in a court proceeding.

Arbitration can be either binding or non-binding. Non-binding arbitration means that the decision issued by the arbitrator or arbitration panel takes effect only if the parties agree to it after they know what the decision is. In binding arbitration, parties agree in advance to accept and abide by the decision, whatever it is.

Some contracts contain clauses that require arbitration to be used to resolve disputes that arise after the contract is signed. This is called "mandatory arbitration." This means that if there is a dispute, the complaining party cannot file suit in court and instead is required to pursue arbitration. "Mandatory, binding arbitration" therefore means that under the contract, the parties must use arbitration to resolve a future disagreement and the decision of the arbitrator or arbitration panel is final. The parties have no ability to seek relief in court or through mediation. In fact, if they are not satisfied with the arbitration outcome, they are probably stuck with the decision.

Under mandatory, binding arbitration, even if a party believes that the arbitrator did not consider all the facts or follow the law, the party cannot file a suit in court. The only basis for challenging a binding arbitration decision is if there is reason to believe that the arbitrator committed actual fraud. In contrast, if a dispute is resolved by a court, the parties can potentially pursue an appeal of the lower court's decision.

Mr. President, because mandatory, binding arbitration is so conclusive, it can be a credible means of dispute resolution only when all parties understand the full ramifications of agreeing to it.

But that's not what's happening in a variety of contexts—from motor vehicle franchise agreements, to employment agreements, to credit card agreements. I'm proud to have sponsored legislation addressing employment agreements and motor vehicle franchise agreements. In fact, I am the original cosponsor with my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, of S. 1020, which would prohibit the unilateral imposition of mandatory, binding arbitration in motor vehicle dealership agreements with manufacturers. Many of our colleagues have joined us as cosponsors.

Similar to the problem in the motor vehicle dealership franchise context, there is a growing, menacing trend of credit card companies and consumer credit lenders inserting mandatory, binding arbitration clauses in agreements with consumers. Companies like First USA Bank, American Express and Green Tree Discount Company unilaterally insert mandatory, binding arbitration clauses in their agreements with consumers, often without the consumer's knowledge or consent.

The most common way credit card companies have done this is through the use of a "bill stuffer." Bill stuffers are the advertisements and other materials that credit card companies insert into envelopes with their customers' monthly statements. Some credit card issuers like American Express have placed fine print mandatory arbitration clauses in bill stuffers. The arbitration provision is usually buried in fine print in a mailing that includes a bill and various advertising materials. It is often described in a lengthy legal document that most consumers probably don't even skim, much less read carefully.

American Express issued its mandatory arbitration provision last year. It took effect on June 1st. So, if you're an American Express cardholder and you have a dispute with American Express, as of June 1999, you can't take your claim to court, even small claims court. You are bound to use arbitration, and you are bound to the final arbitration decision. In this case, you are also bound to use an arbitration organization selected by American Express, the National Arbitration Forum.

American Express isn't the only credit card company imposing mandatory

arbitration on its customers. First USA Bank, the largest issuer of Visa cards, with 58 million customers, has been doing the same thing since 1997. First USA also alerted its cardholders with a bill stuffer, containing a condensed set of terms and conditions in fine print. The cardholder, by virtue of continuing to use the First USA card, gave up the right to go to court, even small claims court, to resolve a dispute.

Mr. President, this growing practice extends beyond credit cards into the consumer loan industry. Consumer credit lenders like Green Tree Consumer Discount Company are inserting mandatory, binding arbitration clauses in their loan agreements. The problem is that these loan agreements are usually adhesion contracts, which means that consumers must either sign the agreement as is, or forego a loan. In other words, consumers lack the bargaining power to have the clause removed. More importantly, when signing on the dotted line of the loan agreement, consumers may not even understand what mandatory arbitration means. In all likelihood, they do not understand that they have just signed away a right to go to court to resolve a dispute with the lender.

It might be argued that if consumers are not pleased with being subjected to a mandatory arbitration clause, they can cancel their credit card, or not execute on their loan agreement, and take their business elsewhere. Unfortunately, that's easier said than done. As I mentioned, First USA Bank, the nation's largest Visa card issuer, is part of this questionable practice. In fact, the practice is becoming so pervasive that consumers may soon no longer have an alternative, unless they forego use of a credit card or a consumer loan entirely. Consumers should not be forced to make that choice.

Companies like First USA, American Express and Green Tree argue that they rely on mandatory arbitration to resolve disputes faster and cheaper than court litigation. The claim may be resolved faster but is it really cheaper? Is it as fair as a court of law? I don't think so. Arbitration organizations often charge exorbitant fees to the consumer who brings a dispute—often an initial filing fee plus hourly fees to the arbitrator or arbitrators involved in the case. These costs can be much higher than bringing the matter to small claims court and paying a court filing fee.

For example, the National Arbitration Forum, the arbitration entity of choice for American Express and First USA charges fees that are likely greater than if the consumer brought a dispute in small claims court. For a claim of less than \$1,000, the National Arbitration Forum charges the consumer a \$49 filing fee. In contrast, a consumer can bring the same claim to small claims court here in the District of Columbia for a filing fee of no more than \$10. In other words, the consumer pays

a fee to the National Arbitration Forum that is nearly five times more than the fee for filing a case in small claims court.

That's bad enough, but some other arbitration firms are even more expensive. The American Arbitration Association charges a \$500 filing fee for claims of less than \$10,000, or more if the claim exceeds \$10,000, and a minimum filing fee of \$2,000 if the case involves three or more arbitrators. In addition to the filing fee, it also charges a hearing fee for holding hearings other than the initial hearing—\$150 to be paid by each party for each day of hearings before a single arbitrator, or \$250 if the hearing is held before an arbitration panel. The International Chamber of Commerce requires a \$2,500 administrative fee plus an arbitrator's fee of at least \$2,500, if the claim is less than \$50,000. These fees are greater if the claim exceeds \$50,000. The fees could very well be greater than the consumer's claim. So, as you can see, a consumer's claim is not necessarily resolved more efficiently with arbitration. It is resolved either at greater cost to the consumer or not at all, if the consumer cannot afford the costs, or the costs outweigh the amount in dispute.

Another significant problem with mandatory, binding arbitration is that the lender gets to decide in advance who the arbitrator will be. In the case of American Express and First USA, they have chosen the National Arbitration Forum. All credit card disputes with consumers involving American Express or First USA are handled by that entity. There would seem to be a significant danger that this would result in an advantage for the lenders who are "repeat players." After all, if the National Arbitration Forum develops a pattern of reaching decisions that favor cardholders, American Express or First USA may very well decide to take their arbitration business elsewhere. A system where the arbitrator has a financial interest in reaching an outcome that favors the credit card company is not a fair alternative dispute resolution system.

There has been one important court decision on the enforceability of mandatory arbitration provisions in credit card agreements. The case arose out of a mandatory arbitration provision announced in mailings to Bank of America credit card and deposit account holders. In 1998, the California Court of Appeals ruled that the mandatory arbitration clauses unilaterally imposed on the Bank's customers were invalid and unenforceable. The California Supreme Court refused to review the decision of the lower court. As a result, credit card companies in California cannot invoke mandatory arbitration in their disputes with customers. In fact, the American Express bill stuffer notes that the mandatory, binding arbitration provision will not apply to California residents until further notice from the company. The California appellate court decision was wise and

well-reasoned, but consumers in other states cannot be sure that all courts will reach the same conclusion.

My bill extends the wisdom of the California appellate decision to every credit cardholder and consumer loan borrower. It amends the Federal Arbitration Act to invalidate mandatory, binding arbitration provisions in consumer credit agreements. Now, let me be clear. I believe that arbitration can be a fair and efficient way to settle disputes. I agree we ought to encourage alternative dispute resolution. But I also believe that arbitration is a fair way to settle disputes between consumers and lenders only when it is entered into knowingly and voluntarily by both parties to the dispute after the dispute has arisen. Pre-dispute agreements to take disputes to arbitration cannot be voluntary and knowing in the consumer lending context because the bargaining power of the parties is so unequal. My bill does not prohibit arbitration of consumer credit transactions. It merely prohibits mandatory, binding arbitration provisions in consumer credit agreements.

Credit card companies and consumer credit lenders are increasingly slamming the courthouse doors shut on consumers, often unbeknownst to them. This is grossly unjust. We need to restore fairness to the resolution of consumer credit disputes. I urge my colleagues to support the Consumer Credit Fair Dispute Resolution Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill follows:

S. 2117

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 "Consumer Credit Fair Dispute Resolution Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 1 of title 9, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "**and 'commerce' defined**" and inserting "**;', 'commerce', 'consumer credit transaction', and 'consumer credit contract' defined**"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "**;', 'consumer credit transaction', as herein defined, means the right granted to a natural person to incur debt and defer its payment, where the credit is intended primarily for personal, family, or household purposes; and 'consumer credit contract', as herein defined, means any contract between the parties to a consumer credit transaction.**";

(b) AGREEMENTS TO ARBITRATE.—Section 2 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a written provision in any consumer credit contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce to settle by arbitration a controversy thereafter arising out of the contract, or the refusal to perform the whole or any part thereof, shall not be valid or enforceable. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the enforcement of any written agreement to settle by arbitration a controversy arising out of a consumer credit contract, if such written agreement has been entered into by the par-

ties to the consumer credit contract after the controversy has arisen."•

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL):

S. 2118. A bill to amend Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964 to modify the computation of certain weighted student units; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO:

S. 2119. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve training for teachers in the use of technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. 2120. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish teacher recruitment and professional development programs for rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. 2121. A bill to provide for rural education assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. 2122. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve provisions relating to initial teaching experiences and alternative routes to certification; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

IMPACT AID LEGISLATION

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and am pleased to be introducing five bills that will benefit teachers and students all across this Nation. Collectively, these measures create a package of fundamental reform to the ESEA bill. These pieces of legislation complement existing programs that have proven to work successfully in schools and they provide assistance and support in areas where educators have expressed the greatest need. And these measures represent my commitment to improving the quality of education so that all of our children can achieve their greatest potential.

First, I am introducing a measure to strengthen the Federal Impact Aid program. Specifically, my bill, which is supported by the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, recommends increasing the weighted Federal student units for off-base military children and for civilian dependent children. Knowing that Impact Aid funds help 1.6 million federally-connected children, as well as 1,600 school districts serving over 17 million students, I am confident that my colleagues in the Senate support increases in funding for the Impact Aid program. But some of them may not be familiar with the formulas by which these funds are distributed to schools. Changing the computation of repayment will assure that funds will be distributed in a more equitable manner, reflecting the composition of local education agencies.

The simple changes, which I am proposing, will benefit children in schools where the loss of local property taxes due to a large Federal presence has placed an extra burden on local taxpayers. We must make up the difference for all the children in the Impact Aid program, not just a select few.

The second bill that I am proposing would build on the strong educational technology infrastructure already in place in school districts in nearly every state. As you know, education technology can significantly improve student achievement. Congress has recognized this fact by continually voting to dramatically increase funding for education technology. In fact, in just the programs under ESEA, federal support has grown from \$52.6 million in Fiscal Year 1995, to \$698 million just four years later.

But we need to do more than simply place computers in classrooms. We need to provide our educators with the skills they need to incorporate evolving educational technology in the classroom. My bill does exactly that. It will encourage states to develop and implement professional development programs that train teachers in the use of technology in the classroom. Effective teaching strategies must incorporate educational technology if we are to ensure that all children have the skills they need to compete in a high-tech workplace. An investment in professional development for our teachers is an investment in our children and our future.

Third, continuing on the lines of professional development, I am introducing a bill that outlines the essential components of mentoring programs that would improve the experience of new teachers and reduce the high turnover currently seen among beginning teachers. My legislation will ensure program quality and accountability by providing that teachers mentor their peers who teach the same subject. The mentoring programs that are created in this legislation must comply with state standards. Additionally, the bill will provide incentives, and grant states the flexibility to create alternative teacher certification and licensure programs, to recruit well-educated and talented people into the teacher profession.

The recruitment and retention of good teachers is paramount to improving our national education system. Mentor programs provide teachers with the support of a senior colleague. And under the supervision and guidance of a colleague, teachers are able to develop skills and achieve a higher level of proficiency. The confidence and experience gained during this time will improve the quality of instruction, which in turn will improve overall student achievement.

Fourth, attracting and retaining quality teachers is a difficult task, especially in rural impoverished areas. As a result, teacher shortages and high turnover are commonplace in rural

communities in almost every state in the nation. The fourth education bill I am introducing today would allow the Secretary of Education to direct a portion of the general funds in ESEA to rural impoverished areas. Under this proposal, a needy rural school district could prevent the exodus of qualified teachers by first creating incentive programs to retain teachers; second, improve the quality of the teacher through enhanced professional development; and, third, hire new teachers. This bill recognizes the unique challenges facing rural school districts and allows them the option of addressing these challenges.

The final bill, is the only one being introduced today with an authorization for appropriation. It makes Federal grant programs more flexible in order to help school districts in rural communities. Under this provision, districts would be able to combine the funds from specified programs and use the money to support local or statewide education reform efforts intended to improve the achievement of elementary school and secondary school students and the quality of instruction provided. This measure asks for an authorization of \$125 million for small rural and poor rural schools—a small price that could produce large results.

The goal of these bills, which I have briefly outlined, are threefold: 1) to provide teachers with the tools to grow as professionals; 2) to assist rural school districts so that they may compete competitively with other school districts that oftentimes have more money and resources; and, (3) to provide every child with unsurpassed education opportunities. Together, these are the keys to our children's success.

In reauthorizing ESEA, Congress has an extraordinary opportunity to change the course of education. We must embrace this opportunity by supporting creative and innovative reform proposals, like the ones that I have introduced here today. I am committed to working in the best interest of our children to develop an education system that is the best in the world. These bills move us in the right direction and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting these measures. I urge the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee to incorporate these provisions into the upcoming ESEA bill.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself,
Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LOTT, Mr.
BREAUX, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2123. A bill to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1999

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, on Thursday February 17th, the House Resources Committee filed their report on a historic piece of legislation, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, H.R. 701 which would reinvest a portion of offshore oil and gas revenues in coastal conservation and impact assistance programs, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, wildlife conservation, historic treasures and outdoor recreation. This remarkable compromise was developed by Congressmen DON YOUNG, GEORGE MILLER, BILLY TAUZIN, JOHN DINGELL, CHRIS JOHN, BRUCE VENTO, and TOM UDALL and was passed by the House Resources Committee by a vote of 37-12 on November 10, 1999. To date, the bill has accumulated over 300 co-sponsors. Hopefully, this legislation will be considered by the full House sometime this Spring.

The H.R. 701 compromise is a companion to the Senate version of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, S. 25. Today I would like to acknowledge the remarkable work done by Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MILLER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. JOHN, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. UDALL as I, along with Senators MURKOWSKI, LOTT, BREAUX and FEINSTEIN introduce the H.R. 701 compromise in the Senate. While I would like to take a moment to note that there are some provisions of S. 25 that I along with several other co-sponsors strongly believe need to be incorporated into H.R. 701, today I am introducing the exact version that the House Resources Committee reported out on February 17th.

This compelling and balanced bipartisan proposal: will provide a fair share of funding to all coastal states, including producing states; is free of harmful environmental impacts to coastal and ocean resources; does not unduly hinder land acquisition yet acknowledges Congress' role in making these decisions; reflects a true partnership among federal, state and local governments and reinvests in the renewable resource of wildlife conservation through the currently authorized Pittman-Robertson program by nearly doubling the Federal funds available for wildlife conservation and education programs.

This legislation provides \$2.8 billion for seven district reinvestment programs. Title I authorizes \$1 billion for Impact Assistance and Coastal Conservation by creating a revenue sharing and coastal conservation fund for coastal states and eligible local governments to mitigate the various impacts of OCS activities while providing funds for the conservation of our coastal ecosystems. In addition, the funds of Title I will support sustainable development of nonrenewable resources without providing incentives for new oil and gas development. All coastal states and territories will benefit from coastal impact assistance under this legislation, not just those states that host federal OCS oil and gas development. Title II guarantees stable and annual funding for the state and federal sides of the Land and Water Con-

servation Fund (LWCF) at its authorized \$900 million level while protecting the rights of private property rights owners. The bill will restore Congressional intent with respect to the LWCF, the goal of which is to share a significant portion of revenues from offshore development with the states to provide for protection and public use of the natural environment. Title III establishes a Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Fund at \$350 million through the successful program of Pittman-Robertson by reinvesting the development of nonrenewable resources into a renewable resource of wildlife conservation and education. This new source of funding will nearly double the Federal funds available for wildlife conservation. This program enjoys a great deal of support and would be enhanced without imposing new taxes. Title IV provides \$125 million for the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery program through matching grants to local governments to rehabilitate and develop recreation programs, sites and facilities. The Urban Parks and Recreation program would enable cities and towns to focus on the needs of its populations within our more densely inhabited areas with fewer greenspaces, playgrounds and soccer fields for our youth. Stable funding will provide greater revenue certainty to state and local planning authorities. Title V provides \$100 million for a Historic Preservation Fund through the programs of the Historic Preservation Act, including grants to the States, maintaining the National Register of Historic Places and administering numerous historic preservation programs. Title VI provides \$200 million for Federal and Indian Lands Restoration through a coordinated program on Federal and Indian lands to restore degraded lands, protect resources that are threatened with degradation and protect public health and safety. Title VII provides \$150 million for Conservation Easements and Species Recovery through annual and dedicated funding for conservation easements and funding for landowner incentives to aid in the recovery of endangered and threatened species. Finally, there is up to \$200 million available for the Payment In-Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program through the annual interest generated from the CARA fund.

The time has come to take the proceeds from a non-renewable resource for the purpose of reinvesting a portion of these revenues in the conservation and enhancement of our renewable resources. To continue to do otherwise, as we have over the last fifty years, is fiscally irresponsible. I want to thank the chairman of the Senate Energy Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, the majority leader, Senator LOTT, my colleague from Louisiana, Senator BREAUX as well as the other co-sponsors of S. 25 for all their continued

support and efforts in attempting to enact what may well be the most significant conservation effort of the century. I look forward to continue working with the other members of the Energy Committee on this legislation this year so that we may reach a compromise and give the country a true legacy for generations to come.

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. 2123

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 "Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Annual reports.
- Sec. 5. Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 6. Limitation on use of available amounts for administration.
- Sec. 7. Budgetary treatment of receipts and disbursements.
- Sec. 8. Recordkeeping requirements.
- Sec. 9. Maintenance of effort and matching funding.
- Sec. 10. Sunset.
- Sec. 11. Protection of private property rights.
- Sec. 12. Signs.

TITLE I—IMPACT ASSISTANCE AND COASTAL CONSERVATION

- Sec. 101. Impact assistance formula and payments.
- Sec. 102. Coastal State conservation and impact assistance plans.

TITLE II—LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND REVITALIZATION

- Sec. 201. Amendment of Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.
- Sec. 202. Extension of fund; treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 203. Availability of amounts.
- Sec. 204. Allocation of Fund.
- Sec. 205. Use of Federal portion.
- Sec. 206. Allocation of amounts available for State purposes.
- Sec. 207. State planning.
- Sec. 208. Assistance to States for other projects.
- Sec. 209. Conversion of property to other use.
- Sec. 210. Water rights.

TITLE III—WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

- Sec. 301. Purposes.
- Sec. 302. Definitions.
- Sec. 303. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 304. Apportionment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 305. Education.
- Sec. 306. Prohibition against diversion.

TITLE IV—URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

- Sec. 401. Amendment of Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978.
- Sec. 402. Purpose.
- Sec. 403. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.

Sec. 404. Authority to develop new areas and facilities.

Sec. 405. Definitions.

Sec. 406. Eligibility.

Sec. 407. Grants.

Sec. 408. Recovery action programs.

Sec. 409. State action incentives.

Sec. 410. Conversion of recreation property.

Sec. 411. Repeal.

TITLE V—HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

Sec. 501. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.

Sec. 502. State use of historic preservation assistance for national heritage areas and corridors.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL AND INDIAN LANDS RESTORATION

Sec. 601. Purpose.

Sec. 602. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund; allocation.

Sec. 603. Authorized uses of transferred amounts.

Sec. 604. Indian tribe defined.

TITLE VII—CONSERVATION EASEMENTS AND ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY**Subtitle A—Conservation Easements**

Sec. 701. Purpose.

Sec. 702. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.

Sec. 703. Authorized uses of transferred amounts.

Sec. 704. Conservation Easement Program.

Subtitle B—Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery

Sec. 711. Purposes.

Sec. 712. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.

Sec. 713. Endangered and threatened species recovery assistance.

Sec. 714. Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreements.

Sec. 715. Definitions.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "coastal population" means the population of all political subdivisions, as determined by the most recent official data of the Census Bureau, contained in whole or in part within the designated coastal boundary of a State as defined in a State's coastal zone management program under the Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1451 and following).

(2) The term "coastal political subdivision" means a political subdivision of a coastal State all or part of which political subdivision is within the coastal zone (as defined in section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1453)).

(3) The term "coastal State" has the same meaning as provided by section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1453)).

(4) The term "coastline" has the same meaning that it has in the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301 and following).

(5) The term "distance" means minimum great circle distance, measured in statute miles.

(6) The term "fiscal year" means the Federal Government's accounting period which begins on October 1st and ends on September 30th, and is designated by the calendar year in which it ends.

(7) The term "Governor" means the highest elected official of a State or of any other political entity that is defined as, or treated as, a State under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 and following), the Act of September 2, 1937

(16 U.S.C. 669 and following), commonly referred to as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act or the Pittman-Robertson Act, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 and following), the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470h and following), or the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 16 U.S.C. 3830 note).

(8) The term "leased tract" means a tract, leased under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) for the purpose of drilling for, developing, and producing oil and natural gas resources, which is a unit consisting of either a block, a portion of a block, a combination of blocks or portions of blocks, or a combination of portions of blocks, as specified in the lease, and as depicted on an Outer Continental Shelf Official Protraction Diagram.

(9) The term "Outer Continental Shelf" means all submerged lands lying seaward and outside of the area of "lands beneath navigable waters" as defined in section 2(a) of the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301(a)), and of which the subsoil and seabed appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control.

(10) The term "political subdivision" means the local political jurisdiction immediately below the level of State government, including counties, parishes, and boroughs. If State law recognizes an entity of general government that functions in lieu of, and is not within, a county, parish, or borough, the Secretary may recognize an area under the jurisdiction of such other entities of general government as a political subdivision for purposes of this title.

(11) The term "producing State" means a State with a coastal seaward boundary within 200 miles from the geographic center of a leased tract other than a leased tract or portion of a leased tract that is located in a geographic area subject to a leasing moratorium on January 1, 1999 (unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 1999).

(12) The term "qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues" means (except as otherwise provided in this paragraph) all moneys received by the United States from each leased tract or portion of a leased tract lying seaward of the zone defined and governed by section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)), or lying within such zone but to which section 8(g) does not apply, the geographic center of which lies within a distance of 200 miles from any part of the coastline of any coastal State, including bonus bids, rents, royalties (including payments for royalty taken in kind and sold), net profit share payments, and related late-payment interest from natural gas and oil leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Such term does not include any revenues from a leased tract or portion of a leased tract that is located in a geographic area subject to a leasing moratorium on January 1, 1999, unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 1999.

(13) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary's designee, except as otherwise specifically provided.

(14) The term "Fund" means the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund established under section 5.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL REPORTS.

(a) STATE REPORTS.—On June 15 of each year, each Governor receiving moneys from

the Fund shall account for all moneys so received for the previous fiscal year in a written report to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as appropriate. The report shall include, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretaries, a description of all projects and activities receiving funds under this Act. In order to avoid duplication, such report may incorporate by reference any other reports required to be submitted under other provisions of law to the Secretary concerned by the Governor regarding any portion of such moneys.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—On January 1 of each year the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit an annual report to the Congress documenting all moneys expended by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from the Fund during the previous fiscal year and summarizing the contents of the Governors' reports submitted to the Secretaries under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund which shall be known as the "Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund". In each fiscal year after the fiscal year 2000, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit into the Fund the following amounts:

(1) OCS REVENUES.—An amount in each such fiscal year from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues equal to the difference between \$2,825,000,000 and the amounts deposited in the Fund under paragraph (2), notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338).

(2) AMOUNTS NOT DISBURSED.—All allocated but undisbursed amounts returned to the Fund under section 101(a)(2).

(3) INTEREST.—All interest earned under subsection (d) that is not made available under paragraph (2) or (4) of that subsection.

(b) TRANSFER FOR EXPENDITURE.—In each fiscal year after the fiscal year 2001, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer amounts deposited into the Fund as follows:

(1) \$1,000,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of making payments to coastal States under title I of this Act.

(2) To the Land and Water Conservation Fund for expenditure as provided in section 3(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6(a)) such amounts as are necessary to make the income of the fund \$900,000,000 in each such fiscal year.

(3) \$350,000,000 to the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund established under section 3 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b).

(4) \$125,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 and following).

(5) \$100,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 and following).

(6) \$200,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out title VI of this Act.

(7) \$150,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out title VII of this Act with (A) \$100,000,000 of such amount transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of subtitle A of title VII and (B) \$50,000,000 of such amount transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of subtitle B of title VII.

(c) SHORTFALL.—If amounts deposited into the Fund in any fiscal year after the fiscal year 2000 are less than \$2,825,000,000, the amounts transferred under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b) for that fiscal year shall each be reduced proportionately.

(d) INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest moneys in the Fund in public debt securities with maturities suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, and bearing interest at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

(2) USE OF INTEREST.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), interest earned on such moneys shall be available, without further appropriation, for obligation or expenditure under—

(A) chapter 69 of title 31 of the United States Code (relating to P.I.L.T.), and

(B) section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s) (relating to refugee revenue sharing).

In each fiscal year such interest shall be allocated between the programs referred to in subparagraph (A) and (B) in proportion to the amounts authorized and appropriated for that fiscal year under other provisions of law for purposes of such programs.

(3) CEILING ON EXPENDITURES OF INTEREST.—Amounts made available under paragraph (2) in each fiscal year shall not exceed the lesser of the following:

(A) \$200,000,000.

(B) The total amount authorized and appropriated for that fiscal year under other provisions of law for purposes of the programs referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(4) TITLE III INTEREST.—All interest attributable to amounts transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of title III of this Act (and the amendments made by such title III) shall be available, without further appropriation, for obligation or expenditure for purposes of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 4401 and following)

(e) REFUNDS.—In those instances where through judicial decision, administrative review, arbitration, or other means there are royalty refunds owed to entities generating revenues under this title, such refunds shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from amounts available in the Fund.

SEC. 6. LIMITATION ON USE OF AVAILABLE AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of amounts made available by this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) for a particular activity, not more than 2 percent may be used for administrative expenses of that activity. Nothing in this section shall affect the prohibition contained in section 4(c)(3) of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (as amended by this Act).

SEC. 7. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of funds under this Act and the amendments made by this Act—

(1) shall not be counted as new budget authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit or surplus for purposes of—

(A) the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President;

(B) the congressional budget (including allocations of budget authority and outlays provided therein); or

(C) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; and

(2) shall be exempt from any general budget limitation imposed by statute on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the United States Government.

SEC. 8. RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.

The Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture shall

establish such rules regarding recordkeeping by State and local governments and the auditing of expenditures made by State and local governments from funds made available under this Act as may be necessary. Such rules shall be in addition to other requirements established regarding recordkeeping and the auditing of such expenditures under other authority of law.

SEC. 9. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT AND MATCHING FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no State or local government shall receive any funds under this Act during any fiscal year when its expenditures of non-Federal funds for recurrent expenditures for programs for which funding is provided under this Act will be less than its expenditures were for such programs during the preceding fiscal year. No State or local government shall receive any funding under this Act with respect to a program unless the Secretary is satisfied that such a grant will be so used to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of State, local, or other non-Federal funds available for such program. In order for the Secretary to provide funding under this Act in a timely manner each fiscal year, the Secretary shall compare a State or local government's prospective expenditure level to that of its second preceding fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may provide funding under this Act to a State or local government not meeting the requirements of subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that a reduction in expenditures is attributable to a non-selective reduction in the expenditures in the programs of all Executive branch agencies of the State or local government.

(c) USE OF FUND TO MEET MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—All funds received by a State or local government under this Act shall be treated as Federal funds for purposes of compliance with any provision in effect under any other law requiring that non-Federal funds be used to provide a portion of the funding for any program or project.

SEC. 10. SUNSET.

This Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2015.

SEC. 11. PROTECTION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in the Act shall authorize that private property be taken for public use, without just compensation as provided by the Fifth and Fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution.

(b) REGULATION.—Federal agencies, using funds appropriated by this Act, may not apply any regulation on any lands until the lands or water, or an interest therein, is acquired, unless authorized to do so by another Act of Congress.

SEC. 12. SIGNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require, as a condition of any financial assistance provided with amounts made available by this Act, that the person that owns or administers any site that benefits from such assistance shall include on any sign otherwise installed at that site at or near an entrance or public use focal point, a statement that the existence or development of the site (or both), as appropriate, is a product of such assistance.

(b) STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall provide for the design of standardized signs for purposes of subsection (a), and shall prescribe standards and guidelines for such signs.

TITLE I—IMPACT ASSISTANCE AND COASTAL CONSERVATION

SEC. 101. IMPACT ASSISTANCE FORMULA AND PAYMENTS.

(a) IMPACT ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS TO STATES.—

(1) GRANT PROGRAM.—Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund under section 5(b)(1) of this Act for purposes of making payments to coastal States under this title in any fiscal year shall be allocated by the Secretary of the Interior among coastal States as provided in this section in each such fiscal year. In each such fiscal year, the Secretary of the Interior shall, without further appropriation, disburse such allocated funds to those coastal States for which the Secretary has approved a Coastal State Conservation and Impact Assistance Plan as required by this title. Payments for all projects shall be made by the Secretary to the Governor of the State or to the State official or agency designated by the Governor or by State law as having authority and responsibility to accept and to administer funds paid hereunder. No payment shall be made to any State until the State has agreed to provide such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to perform his duties under this title, and provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal revenues paid to the State under this title.

(2) FAILURE TO HAVE PLAN APPROVED.—At the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall return to the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund any amount that the Secretary allocated, but did not disburse, in that fiscal year to a coastal State that does not have an approved plan under this title before the end of the fiscal year in which such grant is allocated, except that the Secretary shall hold in escrow until the final resolution of the appeal any amount allocated, but not disbursed, to a coastal State that has appealed the disapproval of a plan submitted under this title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG COASTAL STATES.—

(1) ALLOCABLE SHARE FOR EACH STATE.—For each coastal State, the Secretary shall determine the State's allocable share of the total amount of the revenues transferred from the Fund under section 5(b)(1) for each fiscal year using the following weighted formula:

(A) 50 percent of such revenues shall be allocated among the coastal States as provided in paragraph (2).

(B) 25 percent of such revenues shall be allocated to each coastal State based on the ratio of each State's shoreline miles to the shoreline miles of all coastal States.

(C) 25 percent of such revenues shall be allocated to each coastal State based on the ratio of each State's coastal population to the coastal population of all coastal States.

(2) OFFSHORE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF SHARE.—If any portion of a producing State lies within a distance of 200 miles from the geographic center of any leased tract, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine such State's allocable share under paragraph (1)(A) based on the formula set forth in this paragraph. Such State share shall be calculated as of the date of the enactment of this Act for the first 5-fiscal year period during which funds are disbursed under this title and recalculated on the anniversary of such date each fifth year thereafter for each succeeding 5-fiscal year period. Each such State's allocable share of the revenues disbursed under paragraph (1)(A) shall be inversely proportional to the distance between

the nearest point on the coastline of such State and the geographic center of each leased tract or portion of the leased tract (to the nearest whole mile) that is within 200 miles of that coastline, as determined by the Secretary for the 5-year period concerned. In applying this paragraph a leased tract or portion of a leased tract shall be excluded if the tract or portion is located in a geographic area subject to a leasing moratorium on January 1, 1999, unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 1999.

(3) MINIMUM STATE SHARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The allocable share of revenues determined by the Secretary under this subsection for each coastal State with an approved coastal management program (as defined by the Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1451)), or which is making satisfactory progress toward one, shall not be less in any fiscal year than 0.50 percent of the total amount of the revenues transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of this title for that fiscal year under subsection (a). For any other coastal State the allocable share of such revenues shall not be less than 0.25 percent of such revenues.

(B) RECOMPUTATION.—Where one or more coastal States' allocable shares, as computed under paragraphs (1) and (2), are increased by any amount under this paragraph, the allocable share for all other coastal States shall be recomputed and reduced by the same amount so that not more than 100 percent of the amount transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of this title for that fiscal year under section 5(b)(1) is allocated to all coastal States. The reduction shall be divided pro rata among such other coastal States.

(c) PAYMENTS TO POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—In the case of a producing State, the Governor of the State shall pay 50 percent of the State's allocable share, as determined under subsection (b), to the coastal political subdivisions in such State. Such payments shall be allocated among such coastal political subdivisions of the State according to an allocation formula analogous to the allocation formula used in subsection (b) to allocate revenues among the coastal States, except that a coastal political subdivision in the State of California that has a coastal shoreline, that is not within 200 miles of the geographic center of a leased tract or portion of a leased tract, and in which there is located one or more oil refineries shall be eligible for that portion of the allocation described in subsection (b)(1)(A) and (b)(2) in the same manner as if that political subdivision were located within a distance of 50 miles from the geographic center of any leased tract.

(d) TIME OF PAYMENT.—Payments to coastal States and coastal political subdivisions under this section shall be made not later than December 31 of each year from revenues received during the immediately preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 102. COASTAL STATE CONSERVATION AND IMPACT ASSISTANCE PLANS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF STATE PLANS.—Each coastal State seeking to receive grants under this title shall prepare, and submit to the Secretary, a Statewide Coastal State Conservation and Impact Assistance Plan. In the case of a producing State, the Governor shall incorporate the plans of the coastal political subdivisions into the Statewide plan for transmittal to the Secretary. The Governor shall solicit local input and shall provide for public participation in the development of the Statewide plan. The plan shall be submitted to the Secretary by April 1 of the calendar year

after the calendar year in which this Act is enacted.

(b) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Approval of a Statewide plan under subsection (a) is required prior to disbursement of funds under this title by the Secretary. The Secretary shall approve the Statewide plan if the Secretary determines, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, that the plan is consistent with the uses set forth in subsection (c) and if the plan contains each of the following:

(A) The name of the State agency that will have the authority to represent and act for the State in dealing with the Secretary for purposes of this title.

(B) A program for the implementation of the plan which, for producing States, includes a description of how funds will be used to address the impacts of oil and gas production from the Outer Continental Shelf.

(C) Certification by the Governor that ample opportunity has been accorded for public participation in the development and revision of the plan.

(D) Measures for taking into account other relevant Federal resources and programs. The plan shall be correlated so far as practicable with other State, regional, and local plans.

(2) PROCEDURE AND TIMING; REVISIONS.—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove each plan submitted in accordance with this section. If a State first submits a plan by not later than 90 days before the beginning of the first fiscal year to which the plan applies, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the plan by not later than 30 days before the beginning of that fiscal year.

(3) AMENDMENT OR REVISION.—Any amendment to or revision of the plan shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements of this subsection and shall be submitted to the Secretary for approval or disapproval. Any such amendment or revision shall take effect only for fiscal years after the fiscal year in which the amendment or revision is approved by the Secretary.

(c) AUTHORIZED USES OF STATE GRANT FUNDING.—The funds provided under this title to a coastal State and for coastal political subdivisions are authorized to be used only for one or more of the following purposes:

(1) Data collection, including but not limited to fishery or marine mammal stock surveys in State waters or both, cooperative State, interstate, and Federal fishery or marine mammal stock surveys or both, cooperative initiatives with university and private entities for fishery and marine mammal surveys, activities related to marine mammal and fishery interactions, and other coastal living marine resources surveys.

(2) The conservation, restoration, enhancement, or creation of coastal habitats.

(3) Cooperative Federal or State enforcement of marine resources management statutes.

(4) Fishery observer coverage programs in State or Federal waters.

(5) Invasive, exotic, and nonindigenous species identification and control.

(6) Coordination and preparation of cooperative fishery conservation and management plans between States including the development and implementation of population surveys, assessments and monitoring plans, and the preparation and implementation of State fishery management plans developed by interstate marine fishery commissions.

(7) Preparation and implementation of State fishery or marine mammal management plans that comply with bilateral or multilateral international fishery or marine mammal conservation and management agreements or both.

(8) Coastal and ocean observations necessary to develop and implement real time tide and current measurement systems.

(9) Implementation of federally approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation and management plans.

(10) Mitigating marine and coastal impacts of Outer Continental Shelf activities including impacts on onshore infrastructure.

(11) Projects that promote research, education, training, and advisory services in fields related to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH AUTHORIZED USES.—Based on the annual reports submitted under section 4 of this Act and on audits conducted by the Secretary under section 8, the Secretary shall review the expenditures made by each State and coastal political subdivision from funds made available under this title. If the Secretary determines that any expenditure made by a State or coastal political subdivision of a State from such funds is not consistent with the authorized uses set forth in subsection (c), the Secretary shall not make any further grants under this title to that State until the funds used for such expenditure have been repaid to the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.

TITLE II—LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND REVITALIZATION

SEC. 201. AMENDMENT OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title 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 Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 and following).

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF FUND; TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Section 2(c) is amended to read as follows:“(c) AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.—In addition to the sum of the revenues and collections estimated by the Secretary of the Interior to be covered into the fund pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, there shall be covered into the fund all amounts transferred to the fund under section 5(b)(2) of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999.”

SEC. 203. AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.

Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6) is amended to read as follows:

“APPROPRIATIONS

“SEC. 3. (a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary from the fund to carry out this Act not more than \$900,000,000 in any fiscal year after the fiscal year 2001. Amounts transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund and amounts covered into the fund under subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 shall be available to the Secretary in fiscal years after the fiscal year 2001 without further appropriation to carry out this Act.

“(b) OBLIGATION AND EXPENDITURE OF AVAILABLE AMOUNTS.—Amounts available for obligation or expenditure from the fund or from the special account established under section 4(i)(1) may be obligated or expended only as provided in this Act.”

SEC. 204. ALLOCATION OF FUND.

Section 5 (16 U.S.C. 4601-7) is amended to read as follows:

“ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

“SEC. 5. Of the amounts made available for each fiscal year to carry out this Act—

“(1) 50 percent shall be available for Federal purposes (in this Act referred to as the ‘Federal portion’); and

“(2) 50 percent shall be available for grants to States.”

SEC. 205. USE OF FEDERAL PORTION.

Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) USE OF FEDERAL PORTION.—

“(1) APPROVAL BY CONGRESS REQUIRED.—The Federal portion (as that term is defined in section 5(1)) may not be obligated or expended by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for any acquisition except those specifically referred to, and approved by the Congress, in an Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, respectively.

“(2) WILLING SELLER REQUIREMENT.—The Federal portion may not be used to acquire any property unless—

“(A) the owner of the property concurs in the acquisition; or

“(B) acquisition of that property is specifically approved by an Act of Congress.

“(e) LIST OF PROPOSED FEDERAL ACQUISITIONS.—

“(1) RESTRICTION ON USE.—The Federal portion for a fiscal year may not be obligated or expended to acquire any interest in lands or water unless the lands or water were included in a list of acquisitions that is approved by the Congress. This list shall include an inventory of surplus lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture for which there is no demonstrated compelling program need.

“(2) TRANSMISSION OF LIST.—(A) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly transmit to the appropriate authorizing and appropriations committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate for each fiscal year, by no later than the submission of the budget for the fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, a list of the acquisitions of interests in lands and water proposed to be made with the Federal portion for the fiscal year.

“(B) In preparing each list, the Secretary shall—

“(i) seek to consolidate Federal landholdings in States with checkerboard Federal land ownership patterns;

“(ii) consider the use of equal value land exchanges, where feasible and suitable, as an alternative means of land acquisition;

“(iii) consider the use of permanent conservation easements, where feasible and suitable, as an alternative means of acquisition;

“(iv) identify those properties that are proposed to be acquired from willing sellers and specify any for which adverse condemnation is requested; and

“(v) establish priorities based on such factors as important or special resource attributes, threats to resource integrity, timely availability, owner hardship, cost escalation, public recreation use values, and similar considerations.

“(3) INFORMATION REGARDING PROPOSED ACQUISITIONS.—Each list shall include, for each proposed acquisition included in the list—

“(A) citation of the statutory authority for the acquisition, if such authority exists; and

“(B) an explanation of why the particular interest proposed to be acquired was selected.

“(f) NOTIFICATION TO AFFECTED AREAS REQUIRED.—The Federal portion for a fiscal year may not be used to acquire any interest in land unless the Secretary administering the acquisition, by not later than 30 days after the date the Secretaries submit the list under subsection (e) for the fiscal year, provides notice of the proposed acquisition—

“(1) in writing to each Member of and each Delegate and Resident Commissioner to the

Congress elected to represent any area in which is located—

“(A) the land; or

“(B) any part of any federally designated unit that includes the land;

“(2) in writing to the Governor of the State in which the land is located;

“(3) in writing to each State political subdivision having jurisdiction over the land; and

“(4) by publication of a notice in a newspaper that is widely distributed in the area under the jurisdiction of each such State political subdivision, that includes a clear statement that the Federal Government intends to acquire an interest in land.

“(g) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS UNDER FEDERAL LAWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal portion for a fiscal year may not be used to acquire any interest in land or water unless the following have occurred:

“(A) All actions required under Federal law with respect to the acquisition have been complied with.

“(B) A copy of each final environmental impact statement or environmental assessment required by law, and a summary of all public comments regarding the acquisition that have been received by the agency making the acquisition, are submitted to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

“(C) A notice of the availability of such statement or assessment and of such summary is provided to—

“(i) each Member of and each Delegate and Resident Commissioner to the Congress elected to represent the area in which the land is located;

“(ii) the Governor of the State in which the land is located; and

“(iii) each State political subdivision having jurisdiction over the land.

“(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any acquisition that is specifically authorized by a Federal law.”

SEC. 206. ALLOCATION OF AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR STATE PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(b) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) DISTRIBUTION AMONG THE STATES.—(1) Sums in the fund available each fiscal year for State purposes shall be apportioned among the several States by the Secretary, in accordance with this subsection. The determination of the apportionment by the Secretary shall be final.

“(2) Subject to paragraph (3), of sums in the fund available each fiscal year for State purposes—

“(A) 30 percent shall be apportioned equally among the several States; and

“(B) 70 percent shall be apportioned so that the ratio that the amount apportioned to each State under this subparagraph bears to the total amount apportioned under this subparagraph for the fiscal year is equal to the ratio that the population of the State bears to the total population of all States.

“(3) The total allocation to an individual State for a fiscal year under paragraph (2) shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount allocated to the several States under paragraph (2) for that fiscal year.

“(4) The Secretary shall notify each State of its apportionment, and the amounts thereof shall be available thereafter to the State for planning, acquisition, or development projects as hereafter described. Any amount of any apportionment under this subsection that has not been paid or obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which such notification is given and the two fiscal

years thereafter shall be reapportioned by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (2), but without regard to the 10 percent limitation to an individual State specified in paragraph (3).

“(5)(A) For the purposes of paragraph (2)(A)—

“(i) the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State; and

“(ii) Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa—

“(I) shall be treated collectively as one State; and

“(II) shall each be allocated an equal share of any amount distributed to them pursuant to clause (i).

“(B) Each of the areas referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be treated as a State for all other purposes of this Act.”.

(b) TRIBES AND ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—Section 6(b)(5) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(b)(5)) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) For the purposes of paragraph (1), all federally recognized Indian tribes and Native Corporations (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)), shall be eligible to receive shares of the apportionment under paragraph (1) in accordance with a competitive grant program established by the Secretary by rule. The total apportionment available to such tribes and Native Corporations shall be equivalent to the amount available to a single State. No single tribe or Native Corporation shall receive a grant that constitutes more than 10 percent of the total amount made available to all tribes and Native Corporations pursuant to the apportionment under paragraph (1). Funds received by a tribe or Native Corporation under this subparagraph may be expended only for the purposes specified in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (a).”.

(c) LOCAL ALLOCATION.—Section 6(b) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) Absent some compelling and annually documented reason to the contrary acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, each State (other than an area treated as a State under paragraph (5)) shall make available as grants to local governments, at least 50 percent of the annual State apportionment, or an equivalent amount made available from other sources.”.

SEC. 207. STATE PLANNING.

(a) STATE ACTION AGENDA REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(d) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) STATE ACTION AGENDA REQUIRED.—(1) Each State may define its own priorities and criteria for selection of outdoor conservation and recreation acquisition and development projects eligible for grants under this Act so long as it provides for public involvement in this process and publishes an accurate and current State Action Agenda for Community Conservation and Recreation (in this Act referred to as the ‘State Action Agenda’) indicating the needs it has identified and the priorities and criteria it has established. In order to assess its needs and establish its overall priorities, each State, in partnership with its local governments and Federal agencies, and in consultation with its citizens, shall develop, within 5 years after the enactment of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999, a State Action Agenda that meets the following requirements:

“(A) The agenda must be strategic, originating in broad-based and long-term needs, but focused on actions that can be funded over the next 4 years.

“(B) The agenda must be updated at least once every 4 years and certified by the Governor that the State Action Agenda conclu-

sions and proposed actions have been considered in an active public involvement process.

“(2) State Action Agendas shall take into account all providers of conservation and recreation lands within each State, including Federal, regional, and local government resources, and shall be correlated whenever possible with other State, regional, and local plans for parks, recreation, open space, and wetlands conservation. Recovery action programs developed by urban localities under section 1007 of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 shall be used by a State as a guide to the conclusions, priorities, and action schedules contained in State Action Agenda. Each State shall assure that any requirements for local outdoor conservation and recreation planning, promulgated as conditions for grants, minimize redundancy of local efforts by allowing, wherever possible, use of the findings, priorities, and implementation schedules of recovery action programs to meet such requirements.”.

(2) EXISTING STATE PLANS.—Comprehensive State Plans developed by any State under section 6(d) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 before the date that is 5 years after the enactment of this Act shall remain in effect in that State until a State Action Agenda has been adopted pursuant to the amendment made by this subsection, but no later than 5 years after the enactment of this Act.

(b) MISCELLANEOUS.—Section 6(e) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(e)) is amended as follows:

(1) In the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “State comprehensive plan” and inserting “State Action Agenda”.

(2) In paragraph (1) by striking “comprehensive plan” and inserting “State Action Agenda”.

SEC. 208. ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR OTHER PROJECTS.

Section 6(e) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(e)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(1) by striking “, but not including incidental costs relating to acquisition”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or to enhance public safety within a designated park or recreation area”.

SEC. 209. CONVERSION OF PROPERTY TO OTHER USE.

Section 6(f)(3) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(f)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” before “No property”; and

(2) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following:

“(B) The Secretary shall approve such conversion only if the State demonstrates no prudent or feasible alternative exists with the exception of those properties that no longer meet the criteria within the State Plan or Agenda as an outdoor conservation and recreation facility due to changes in demographics or that must be abandoned because of environmental contamination which endangers public health and safety. Any conversion must satisfy such conditions as the Secretary deems necessary to assure the substitution of other conservation and recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and reasonably equivalent usefulness and location and which are consistent with the existing State Plan or Agenda; except that wetland areas and interests therein as identified in the wetlands provisions of the action agenda and proposed to be acquired as suitable replacement property within that same State that is otherwise acceptable to the Secretary shall be considered to be of reasonably equivalent usefulness with the property proposed for conversion.”.

SEC. 210. WATER RIGHTS.

Title I is amended by adding at the end the following:

“WATER RIGHTS

“SEC. 14. Nothing in this title—

“(1) invalidates or preempts State or Federal water law or an interstate compact governing water;

“(2) alters the rights of any State to any appropriated share of the waters of any body of surface or ground water, whether determined by past or future interstate compacts or by past or future legislative or final judicial allocations;

“(3) preempts or modifies any Federal or State law, or interstate compact, dealing with water quality or disposal; or

“(4) confers on any non-Federal entity the ability to exercise any Federal right to the waters of any stream or to any ground water resource.”.

TITLE III—WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

SEC. 301. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to extend financial and technical assistance to the States under the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act for the benefit of a diverse array of wildlife and associated habitats, including species that are not hunted or fished, to fulfill unmet needs of wildlife within the States in recognition of the primary role of the States to conserve all wildlife;

(2) to assure sound conservation policies through the development, revision, and implementation of a comprehensive wildlife conservation and restoration plan;

(3) to encourage State fish and wildlife agencies to participate with the Federal Government, other State agencies, wildlife conservation organizations, and outdoor recreation and conservation interests through cooperative planning and implementation of this title; and

(4) to encourage State fish and wildlife agencies to provide for public involvement in the process of development and implementation of a wildlife conservation and restoration program.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

(a) REFERENCE TO LAW.—In this title, the term “Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act” means the Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669 and following), commonly referred to as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act or the Pittman-Robertson Act.

(b) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PROGRAM.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended by inserting after “shall be construed” the first place it appears the following: “to include the wildlife conservation and restoration program and”.

(c) STATE AGENCIES.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended by inserting “or State fish and wildlife department” after “State fish and game department”.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended by striking the period at the end thereof, substituting a semicolon, and adding the following: “the term ‘conservation’ shall be construed to mean the use of methods and procedures necessary or desirable to sustain healthy populations of wildlife including all activities associated with scientific resources management such as research, census, monitoring of populations, acquisition, improvement and management of habitat, live trapping and transplantation, wildlife damage management, and periodic or total protection of a species or population as well as the taking of individuals within wildlife stock or population if permitted by applicable State and Federal law; the term ‘wildlife conservation and restoration program’ means a program developed by a State fish and wildlife department

and approved by the Secretary under section 4(d), the projects that constitute such a program, which may be implemented in whole or part through grants and contracts by a State to other State, Federal, or local agencies (including those that gather, evaluate, and disseminate information on wildlife and their habitats), wildlife conservation organizations, and outdoor recreation and conservation education entities from funds apportioned under this title, and maintenance of such projects; the term 'wildlife' shall be construed to mean any species of wild, free-ranging fauna including fish, and also fauna in captive breeding programs the object of which is to reintroduce individuals of a depleted indigenous species into previously occupied range; the term 'wildlife-associated recreation' shall be construed to mean projects intended to meet the demand for outdoor activities associated with wildlife including, but not limited to, hunting and fishing, wildlife observation and photography, such projects as construction or restoration of wildlife viewing areas, observation towers, blinds, platforms, land and water trails, water access, trail heads, and access for such projects; and the term 'wildlife conservation education' shall be construed to mean projects, including public outreach, intended to foster responsible natural resource stewardship."

SEC. 303. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Section 3 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and by adding at the end the following:

"(2) There is established in the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund a subaccount to be known as the 'wildlife conservation and restoration account'. Amounts transferred to the fund for a fiscal year under section 5(b)(3) of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 shall be deposited in the subaccount and shall be available without further appropriation, in each fiscal year, for apportionment in accordance with this Act to carry out State wildlife conservation and restoration programs."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) Amounts transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund and apportioned under subsection (a)(2) shall supplement, but not replace, existing funds available to the States from the sport fish restoration account and wildlife restoration account and shall be used for the development, revision, and implementation of wildlife conservation and restoration programs and should be used to address the unmet needs for a diverse array of wildlife and associated habitats, including species that are not hunted or fished, for wildlife conservation, wildlife conservation education, and wildlife-associated recreation projects. Such funds may be used for new programs and projects as well as to enhance existing programs and projects.

"(d) (1) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of this section, with respect to amounts transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund so much of such amounts as is apportioned to any State for any fiscal year and as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall remain available for expenditure in that State until the close of—

"(A) the fourth succeeding fiscal year, in the case of amounts transferred in any of the first 10 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999; or

"(B) the second succeeding fiscal year, in the case of amounts transferred in a fiscal year beginning after the 10-fiscal-year period referred to in subparagraph (A).

"(2) Any amount apportioned to a State under this subsection that is unexpended or unobligated at the end of the period during which it is available under paragraph (1) shall be reappportioned to all States during the succeeding fiscal year."

SEC. 304. APPORTIONMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall make the following apportionment from the amount transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund for each fiscal year:

"(A) To the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than 1/2 of 1 percent thereof.

"(B) To Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than 1/6 of 1 percent thereof.

"(2)(A) The Secretary of the Interior, after making the apportionment under paragraph (1), shall apportion the remainder of the amount transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund for each fiscal year among the States in the following manner:

"(i) 1/3 of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States.

"(ii) 2/3 of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States.

"(B) The amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no such State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1/2 of 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount.

"(3) Amounts transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund shall not be available for any expenses incurred in the administration and execution of programs carried out with such amounts.

"(d) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PROGRAMS.—(1) Any State, through its fish and wildlife department, may apply to the Secretary of the Interior for approval of a wildlife conservation and restoration program, or for funds to develop a program. To apply, a State shall submit a comprehensive plan that includes—

"(A) provisions vesting in the fish and wildlife department of the State overall responsibility and accountability for the program;

"(B) provisions for the development and implementation of—

"(i) wildlife conservation projects that expand and support existing wildlife programs, giving appropriate consideration to all wildlife;

"(ii) wildlife-associated recreation projects; and

"(iii) wildlife conservation education projects pursuant to programs under section 8(a); and

"(C) provisions to ensure public participation in the development, revision, and implementation of projects and programs required under this paragraph.

"(2) A State shall provide an opportunity for public participation in the development of the comprehensive plan required under paragraph (1).

"(3) If the Secretary finds that the comprehensive plan submitted by a State complies with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall approve the wildlife conservation and res-

toration program of the State and set aside from the apportionment to the State made pursuant to subsection (c) an amount that shall not exceed 75 percent of the estimated cost of developing and implementing the program.

"(4)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), after the Secretary approves a State's wildlife conservation and restoration program, the Secretary may make payments on a project that is a segment of the State's wildlife conservation and restoration program as the project progresses. Such payments, including previous payments on the project, if any, shall not be more than the United States pro rata share of such project. The Secretary, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may advance funds representing the United States pro rata share of a project that is a segment of a wildlife conservation and restoration program, including funds to develop such program.

"(B) Not more than 10 percent of the amounts apportioned to each State under this section for a State's wildlife conservation and restoration program may be used for wildlife-associated recreation.

"(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands."

(b) FACA.—Coordination with State fish and wildlife agency personnel or with personnel of other State agencies pursuant to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act or the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.). Except for the preceding sentence, the provisions of this title relate solely to wildlife conservation and restoration programs and shall not be construed to affect the provisions of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act relating to wildlife restoration projects or the provisions of the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act relating to fish restoration and management projects.

SEC. 305. EDUCATION.

Section 8(a) of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669g(a)) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Funds available from the amount transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund may be used for a wildlife conservation education program, except that no such funds may be used for education efforts, projects, or programs that promote or encourage opposition to the regulated taking of wildlife."

SEC. 306. PROHIBITION AGAINST DIVERSION.

No designated State agency shall be eligible to receive matching funds under this title if sources of revenue available to it after January 1, 1999, for conservation of wildlife are diverted for any purpose other than the administration of the designated State agency, it being the intention of Congress that funds available to States under this title be added to revenues from existing State sources and not serve as a substitute for revenues from such sources. Such revenues shall include interest, dividends, or other income earned on the forgoing.

TITLE IV—URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

SEC. 401. AMENDMENT OF URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title 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 Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 and following).

SEC. 402. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide a dedicated source of funding to assist local governments in improving their park and recreation systems.

SEC. 403. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Section 1013 (16 U.S.C. 2512) is amended to read as follows:

"TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND

"SEC. 1013. (a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under section 5(b)(4) of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 in a fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary without further appropriation to carry out this title. Any amount that has not been paid or obligated by the Secretary before the end of the second fiscal year beginning after the first fiscal year in which the amount is available shall be reapportioned by the Secretary among grantees under this title.

"(b) LIMITATIONS ON ANNUAL GRANTS.—Of the amounts available in a fiscal year under subsection (a)—

"(1) not more than 3 percent may be used for grants for the development of local park and recreation recovery action programs pursuant to sections 1007(a) and 1007(c);

"(2) not more than 10 percent may be used for innovation grants pursuant to section 1006; and

"(3) not more than 15 percent may be provided as grants (in the aggregate) for projects in any one State.

"(c) LIMITATION ON USE FOR GRANT ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall establish a limit on the portion of any grant under this title that may be used for grant and program administration."

SEC. 404. AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP NEW AREAS AND FACILITIES.

Section 1003 (16 U.S.C. 2502) is amended by inserting "development of new recreation areas and facilities, including the acquisition of lands for such development," after "rehabilitation of critically needed recreation areas, facilities,".

SEC. 405. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1004 (16 U.S.C. 2503) is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (j) by striking "and" after the semicolon.

(2) In paragraph (k) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon.

(3) By adding at the end the following:

"(1) 'development grants'—

"(1) subject to subparagraph (2) means matching capital grants to units of local government to cover costs of development, land acquisition, and construction on existing or new neighborhood recreation sites, including indoor and outdoor recreational areas and facilities, support facilities, and landscaping; and

"(2) does not include routine maintenance, and upkeep activities; and

"(m) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 406. ELIGIBILITY.

Section 1005(a) (16 U.S.C. 2504(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Eligibility of general purpose local governments to compete for assistance under this title shall be based upon need as determined by the Secretary. Generally, eligible general purpose local governments shall include the following:

"(1) All political subdivisions of Metropolitan, Primary, or Consolidated Statistical Areas, as determined by the most recent Census.

"(2) Any other city, town, or group of cities or towns (or both) within such a Metropolitan Statistical Area, that has a total

population of 50,000 or more as determined by the most recent Census.

"(3) Any other county, parish, or township with a total population of 250,000 or more as determined by the most recent Census."

SEC. 407. GRANTS.

Section 1006 (16 U.S.C. 2505) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking so much as precedes subsection (a)(4) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

"GRANTS

"SEC. 1006. (a)(1) The Secretary may provide 70 percent matching grants for rehabilitation, development, and innovation purposes to any eligible general purpose local government upon approval by the Secretary of an application submitted by the chief executive of such government.

"(2) At the discretion of such an applicant, a grant under this section may be transferred in whole or part to independent special purpose local governments, private nonprofit agencies, or county or regional park authorities, if—

"(A) such transfer is consistent with the approved application for the grant; and

"(B) the applicant provides assurance to the Secretary that the applicant will maintain public recreation opportunities at assisted areas and facilities owned or managed by the applicant in accordance with section 1010.

"(3) Payments may be made only for those rehabilitation, development, or innovation projects that have been approved by the Secretary. Such payments may be made from time to time in keeping with the rate of progress toward completion of a project, on a reimbursable basis."

SEC. 408. RECOVERY ACTION PROGRAMS.

Section 1007(a) (16 U.S.C. 2506(a)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the first sentence by inserting "development," after "commitments to ongoing planning,"; and

(2) in subsection (a)(2) by inserting "development and" after "adequate planning for".

SEC. 409. STATE ACTION INCENTIVES.

Section 1008 (16 U.S.C. 2507) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before the first sentence; and

(2) by striking the last sentence of subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) and inserting the following:

"(b) COORDINATION WITH LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACTIVITIES.—(1) The Secretary and general purpose local governments are encouraged to coordinate preparation of recovery action programs required by this title with State Plans or Agendas required under section 6 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, including by allowing flexibility in preparation of recovery action programs so they may be used to meet State and local qualifications for local receipt of Land and Water Conservation Fund grants or State grants for similar purposes or for other conservation or recreation purposes.

"(2) The Secretary shall encourage States to consider the findings, priorities, strategies, and schedules included in the recovery action programs of their urban localities in preparation and updating of State plans in accordance with the public coordination and citizen consultation requirements of subsection 6(d) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965."

SEC. 410. CONVERSION OF RECREATION PROPERTY.

Section 1010 (16 U.S.C. 2509) is amended to read as follows:

"CONVERSION OF RECREATION PROPERTY

"SEC. 1010. (a)(1) No property developed, acquired, or rehabilitated under this title

shall, without the approval of the Secretary, be converted to any purpose other than public recreation purposes.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall apply to—

"(A) property developed with amounts provided under this title; and

"(B) the park, recreation, or conservation area of which the property is a part.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall approve such conversion only if the grantee demonstrates no prudent or feasible alternative exists.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall apply to property that is no longer a viable recreation facility due to changes in demographics or that must be abandoned because of environmental contamination which endangers public health or safety.

"(c) Any conversion must satisfy any conditions the Secretary considers necessary to assure substitution of other recreation property that is—

"(1) of at least equal fair market value, or reasonably equivalent usefulness and location; and

"(2) in accord with the current recreation recovery action plan of the grantee."

SEC. 411. REPEAL.

Section 1015 (16 U.S.C. 2514) is repealed.

TITLE V—HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND**SEC. 501. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.**

Section 108 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470h) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence;

(2) in subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) by striking all after the first sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) Amounts transferred to the Secretary under section 5(b)(5) of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 in a fiscal year shall be deposited into the Fund and shall be available without further appropriation, in that fiscal year, to carry out this Act.

"(c) At least ½ of the funds obligated or expended each fiscal year under this Act shall be used in accordance with this Act for preservation projects on historic properties. In making such funds available, the Secretary shall give priority to the preservation of endangered historic properties."

SEC. 502. STATE USE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS AND CORRIDORS.

Title I of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a and following) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 114. STATE USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS AND CORRIDORS.

"In addition to other uses authorized by this Act, amounts provided to a State under this title may be used by the State to provide financial assistance to the management entity for any national heritage area or national heritage corridor established under the laws of the United States, to support cooperative historic preservation planning and development."

TITLE VI—FEDERAL AND INDIAN LANDS RESTORATION**SEC. 601. PURPOSE.**

The purpose of this title is to provide a dedicated source of funding for a coordinated program on Federal and Indian lands to restore degraded lands, protect resources that are threatened with degradation, and protect public health and safety.

SEC. 602. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND; ALLOCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture under section 5(b)(6) of

this Act in a fiscal year shall be available without further appropriation, in that fiscal year, to carry out this title.

(b) ALLOCATION.—Amounts referred to in subsection (a) year shall be allocated and available as follows:

(1) DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—60 percent shall be allocated and available to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the purpose of this title on lands within the National Park System, lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System, and public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—30 percent shall be allocated and available to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purpose of this title on lands within the National Forest System.

(3) INDIAN TRIBES.—10 percent shall be allocated and available to the Secretary of the Interior for competitive grants to qualified Indian tribes under section 603(b).

SEC. 603. AUTHORIZED USES OF TRANSFERRED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available to carry out this title shall be used solely for restoration of degraded lands, resource protection, maintenance activities related to resource protection, or protection of public health or safety.

(b) COMPETITIVE GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—

(1) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall administer a competitive grant program for Indian tribes, giving priority to projects based upon the protection of significant resources, the severity of damages or threats to resources, and the protection of public health or safety.

(2) LIMITATION.—The amount received for a fiscal year by a single Indian tribe in the form of grants under this subsection may not exceed 10 percent of the total amount available for that fiscal year for grants under this subsection.

(c) PRIORITY LIST.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each establish priority lists for the use of funds available under this title. Each list shall give priority to projects based upon the protection of significant resources, the severity of damages or threats to resources, and the protection of public health or safety.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE PLANS.—Any project carried out on Federal lands with amounts provided under this title shall be carried out in accordance with all management plans that apply under Federal law to the lands.

(e) TRACKING RESULTS.—Not later than the end of the first full fiscal year for which funds are available under this title, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly establish a coordinated program for—

(1) tracking the progress of activities carried out with amounts made available by this title; and

(2) determining the extent to which demonstrable results are being achieved by those activities.

SEC. 604. INDIAN TRIBE DEFINED.

In this title, the term "Indian tribe" means an Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior recognizes as an Indian tribe under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

TITLE VII—CONSERVATION EASEMENTS AND ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY

Subtitle A—Conservation Easements

SEC. 701. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to provide a dedicated source of funding to the Secretary

of the Interior for programs to provide matching grants to certain eligible entities to facilitate the purchase of permanent conservation easements in order to—

(1) protect the ability of these lands to maintain their traditional uses; and

(2) prevent the loss of their value to the public because of development that is inconsistent with their traditional uses.

SEC. 702. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under section 5(b)(7)(A) in a fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior without further appropriation, in that fiscal year, to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 703. AUTHORIZED USES OF TRANSFERRED AMOUNTS.

The Secretary of the Interior may use the amounts available under section 702 for the Conservation Easement Program established by section 704.

SEC. 704. CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED; PURPOSE.—The Secretary the Interior shall establish and carry out a program, to be known as the "Conservation Easement Program", under which the Secretary shall provide grants to eligible entities described in subsection (c) to provide the Federal share of the cost of purchasing permanent conservation easements in land with prime, unique, or other productive uses.

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of purchasing a conservation easement described in subsection (a) may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of purchasing the easement.

(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "eligible entity" means any of the following:

(1) An agency of a State or local government.

(2) A federally recognized Indian tribe.

(3) Any organization that is organized for, and at all times since its formation has been operated principally for, one or more of the conservation purposes specified in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 170(h)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and—

(A) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Code;

(B) is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Code; and

(C) is described in paragraph (2) of section 509(a) of the Code, or paragraph (3) of such section, but is controlled by an organization described in paragraph (2) of such section.

(d) TITLE; ENFORCEMENT.—Any eligible entity may hold title to a conservation easement described in subsection (a) and enforce the conservation requirements of the easement.

(e) STATE CERTIFICATION.—As a condition of the receipt by an eligible entity of a grant under subsection (a), the attorney general of the State in which the conservation easement is to be purchased using the grant funds shall certify that the conservation easement to be purchased is in a form that is sufficient, under the laws of the State, to achieve the conservation purpose of the Conservation Easement Program and the terms and conditions of the grant.

(f) CONSERVATION PLAN.—Any land for which a conservation easement is purchased under this section shall be subject to the requirements of a conservation plan to the extent that the plan does not negate or adversely affect the restrictions contained in the easement.

(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of the Interior may not use more than 10 percent of the amount that is made available for any fiscal year under this program to

provide technical assistance to carry out this section.

Subtitle B—Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery

SEC. 711. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are the following:

(1) To provide a dedicated source of funding to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the purpose of implementing an incentives program to promote the recovery of endangered species and threatened species and the habitat upon which they depend.

(2) To promote greater involvement by non-Federal entities in the recovery of the Nation's endangered species and threatened species and the habitat upon which they depend.

SEC. 712. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under section 5(b)(7)(B) of this Act in a fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior without further appropriation, in that fiscal year, to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 713. ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may use amounts made available under section 712 to provide financial assistance to any person for development and implementation of Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreements entered into by the Secretary under section 714.

(b) PRIORITY.—In providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the development and implementation of species recovery agreements that—

(1) implement actions identified under recovery plans approved by the Secretary under section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(f));

(2) have the greatest potential for contributing to the recovery of an endangered or threatened species; and

(3) to the extent practicable, require use of the assistance—

(A) on land owned by a small landowner; or

(B) on a family farm by the owner or operator of the family farm.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE FOR REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may not provide financial assistance under this section for any action that is required by a permit issued under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1539(a)(1)(B)) or an incidental take statement issued under section 7 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1536), or that is otherwise required under that Act or any other Federal law.

(d) PAYMENTS UNDER OTHER PROGRAMS.—

(1) OTHER PAYMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Financial assistance provided to a person under this section shall be in addition to, and shall not affect, the total amount of payments that the person is otherwise eligible to receive under the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 and following), the wetlands reserve program established under subchapter C of that chapter (16 U.S.C. 3837 and following), or the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program established under section 387 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 3836a).

(2) LIMITATION.—A person may not receive financial assistance under this section to carry out activities under a species recovery agreement in addition to payments under the programs referred to in paragraph (1) made for the same activities, if the terms of the species recovery agreement do not require financial or management obligations

by the person in addition to any such obligations of the person under such programs.

SEC. 714. ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY AGREEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may enter into Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreements for purposes of this subtitle in accordance with this section.

(b) **REQUIRED TERMS.**—The Secretary shall include in each species recovery agreement provisions that—

(1) require the person—

(A) to carry out on real property owned or leased by the person activities not otherwise required by law that contribute to the recovery of an endangered or threatened species;

(B) to refrain from carrying out on real property owned or leased by the person otherwise lawful activities that would inhibit the recovery of an endangered or threatened species; or

(C) to do any combination of subparagraphs (A) and (B);

(2) describe the real property referred to in paragraph (1)(A) and (B) (as applicable);

(3) specify species recovery goals for the agreement, and measures for attaining such goals;

(4) require the person to make measurable progress each year in achieving those goals, including a schedule for implementation of the agreement;

(5) specify actions to be taken by the Secretary or the person (or both) to monitor the effectiveness of the agreement in attaining those recovery goals;

(6) require the person to notify the Secretary if—

(A) any right or obligation of the person under the agreement is assigned to any other person; or

(B) any term of the agreement is breached by the person or any other person to whom is assigned a right or obligation of the person under the agreement;

(7) specify the date on which the agreement takes effect and the period of time during which the agreement shall remain in effect;

(8) provide that the agreement shall not be in effect on and after any date on which the Secretary publishes a certification by the Secretary that the person has not complied with the agreement; and

(9) allocate financial assistance provided under this subtitle for implementation of the agreement, on an annual or other basis during the period the agreement is in effect based on the schedule for implementation required under paragraph (4).

(c) **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AGREEMENTS.**—Upon submission by any person of a proposed species recovery agreement under this section, the Secretary—

(1) shall review the proposed agreement and determine whether it complies with the requirements of this section and will contribute to the recovery of endangered or threatened species that are the subject of the proposed agreement;

(2) propose to the person any additional provisions necessary for the agreement to comply with this section; and

(3) if the Secretary determines that the agreement complies with the requirements of this section, shall approve and enter with the person into the agreement.

(d) **MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) periodically monitor the implementation of each species recovery agreement entered into by the Secretary under this section; and

(2) based on the information obtained from that monitoring, annually or otherwise disburse financial assistance under this subtitle to implement the agreement as the Sec-

retary determines is appropriate under the terms of the agreement.

SEC. 715. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **ENDANGERED OR THREATENED SPECIES.**—The term “endangered or threatened species” means any species that is listed as an endangered species or threatened species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533).

(2) **FAMILY FARM.**—The term “family farm” means a farm that—

(A) produces agricultural commodities for sale in such quantities so as to be recognized in the community as a farm and not as a rural residence;

(B) produces enough income, including off-farm employment, to pay family and farm operating expenses, pay debts, and maintain the property;

(C) is managed by the operator;

(D) has a substantial amount of labor provided by the operator and the operator's family; and

(E) uses seasonal labor only during peak periods, and uses no more than a reasonable amount of full-time hired labor.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, in accordance with section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532).

(4) **SMALL LANDOWNER.**—The term “small landowner” means an individual who owns 50 acres or fewer of land.

(5) **SPECIES RECOVERY AGREEMENT.**—The term “species recovery agreement” means an Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreement entered into by the Secretary under section 714.

• **Mr. MURKOWSKI.** Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues from Louisiana, Mississippi and California to introduce the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000. This legislation remedies a tremendous inequity in the distribution of revenues generated by offshore oil and gas production from the Federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). It directs that a portion of those moneys be allocated to coastal States and communities who shoulder the responsibility for energy development off their coastlines. It also provides secure funding for a number of conservation programs.

This bill is similar to S. 25 which I cosponsored a little more than a year ago with Senators LANDRIEU and LOTT, along with a number of other Senators from both sides of the aisle. S. 25 and other proposals to spend OCS revenues are pending before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and a series of legislative hearings were held on these bills in the first session. The Committee continues to strive to reach an agreement on legislation which can be reported favorably to the floor.

Today, I am cosponsoring this bill in an effort to continue to move the process forward in the Senate. This bill is identical to the bipartisan bill reported by the House Resources Committee and which presently has 302 sponsors. At the same time, the Administration has proposed its Lands Legacy Initiative which would provide \$1.4 billion annually in dedicated funding for a number of the programs funded in this bill. Given the Administration's action and

anticipated passage by the House of Representatives of OCS legislation, I believe it is crucial that the Senate pass its own OCS bill.

This bill is not perfect and I have serious reservations about some of the provisions in Title 1. Title 1 provides \$1 billion a year to coastal States and communities to mitigate the impacts of OCS activities off their shores. Offshore oil and gas production generates \$3 to \$4 billion in revenues annually for the U.S. Treasury. Yet, unlike mineral receipts from onshore Federal lands, very little of OCS oil and gas revenues are shared with coastal States. This bill remedies that disparity.

As Americans confront increasing oil and gas prices caused by this nation's reliance on foreign petroleum products, we should all recognize the importance of the OCS to this nation's energy independence. According to the Energy Information Administration, the OCS accounts for 27 to 28 percent of total U.S. oil and gas production. This production is authorized to occur off the coast of six States: parts of Alaska, parts of California; Texas, Mississippi, Alabama; and Louisiana. All Americans benefit from OCS production yet the States which produce this oil and gas off their coasts bear the burden.

It is in the long-term best interest of this country to support responsible and sustainable development of nonrenewable resources. We now import more than 55 percent of our domestic petroleum requirements and it is predicted that America will be at least 65 percent dependent on foreign energy sources by 2020. OCS development will play an important role in offsetting even greater dependence on foreign energy.

I do, however, have concerns about some of the provisions in Title 1. Title 1 places unreasonable restrictions on the use of coastal impact assistance funds by States and local governments. Like onshore mineral revenue sharing payments, the decision as to how to spend this money should be made by State and local government officials after a public process. There is no need for the Federal government to mandate that these funds be used for only certain, specific programs. Coastal impact assistance funds are just that—funds coastal States can use to offset the unavoidable impacts of OCS development. These impacts can range from shoreline erosion to the need for new schools to educate the children of oil and gas workers. And, these impacts can vary from year-to-year. It is important that the Federal government give States the flexibility they need to determine their needs and for Washington not to mandate a one-size fits all solution.

I also am concerned that Title 1 allows coastal States—without any OCS production—to receive more coastal impact assistance funds than States with OCS production. We cannot forget where this money comes from: it is generated by OCS oil and gas development. Nor can we forget the purpose of sharing these revenues with coastal

States: to offset the unavoidable impacts of this OCS development. It is unfair to allow States which do not bear the burdens of this development to benefit at the expense of States off whose shores development occurs. This provision must be added to this bill.

I do want to note a few other provisions in this bill which I believe are critical. Title 2 provides \$900 million a year for the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). These LWCF monies are split between Federal land acquisition and the state-side LWCF matching grant program. As to the Federal land acquisition funds, a number of sensible limitations are placed on the expenditure of this money to ensure that Federal funds are spent to address Americans' concerns about the loss of private property in many States.

Each year the Administration must submit a list to Congress of each tract of land it proposes to acquire with LWCF monies and Congress must specifically approve each project through the appropriations process. Within 30 days of the submission of this list, Congressional representatives, the Governors and local government officials must be notified of relevant purchase requests. At the same time, the local public must be notified in a newspaper that is widely distributed in the area in which the proposed acquisition is to take place.

The Administration must seek to consolidate Federal land holdings in States with checkerboard Federal land ownership patterns. It also must seek to use exchanges and conservation easements as an alternative to fee title acquisition. If the Administration identifies tracts from non-willing sellers, it must notify Congress and, unless specifically authorized by Congress, the bill prohibits adverse condemnation. The Administration must identify to Congress its authority to carry out Federal acquisitions. No purchases can occur until all actions under Federal law are completed and a copy of the final NEPA document must be sent to Congress and the Governor and local government officials must be notified that the NEPA document is available.

The bill has a number of other provisions of interest to Westerners where the vast majority of Federal land is located. The bill requires just compensation for the taking of private property and protects State water rights. It provides \$200 million annually for the maintenance of Federal lands managed by the Department of the Interior or the Forest Service. It also provides up to \$200 million in additional funding for the Payment in-lieu-of Taxes and Refugee Revenue Sharing programs. The bill provides the necessary funds to reduce the \$10 billion backlog of willing sellers located within the boundaries of Federal land management units. Finally, the bill restricts the Federal government's regulatory ability over private lands.

This bill is not perfect but it does reflect a bipartisan consensus. It pro-

vides a starting point for Senate discussions of conflicting OCS revenue-sharing proposals. With the anticipated action of the House and the Administration's Lands Legacy Initiative, it is imperative that the Senate put forth its own proposal to distribute OCS revenues. I remain committed to working with all Senators on such a proposal.●

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. L. CHAFEE):

S. 2125. A bill to provide for the disclosure of certain information relating to tobacco products and to prescribe labels for packages and advertising of tobacco products; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SMOKER'S RIGHT TO KNOW AND TRUTH IN TOBACCO LABELING ACT

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today I introduce the Smoker's Right to Know and Truth in Tobacco Labeling Act. I am joined by my colleagues, Senator LUGAR, Senator DURBIN, and Senator CHAFEE.

Mr. President, the Smoker's Right to Know and Truth in Tobacco Labeling Act has two common-sense objectives.

First, the bill will require tobacco manufacturers to disclose the ingredients of their products to the public—including toxic and cancer-causing ingredients.

Second, our bill will replace the small health warnings on the side of a cigarette pack with larger warnings on the front and back that are simple and direct: "Cigarettes Cause Cancer." "Cigarettes are Addictive." "Smoking Can Kill You."

Of the hundreds of products for sale in America that go into the human body, tobacco products are the only ones—the only ones—for which manufacturers do not have to disclose ingredients. Even Coca-Cola, with a proud tradition of keeping its formula secret, has to list Coke's ingredients on every can.

Mr. President, manufacturers of every food product and every over-the-counter drug disclose their contents. Cigarette manufacturers do not. Yet, of any consumable product for sale in the United States, cigarettes are by far the most deadly.

One in three smokers will die from a smoking-related disease. That is more than 400,000 Americans every year. We should disclose information on cigarette ingredients to the public and provide realistic warnings about the health risks cigarettes cause.

Mr. President, how much do smokers really know about the chemicals they are inhaling with every puff of cigarette smoke? When a smoker lights a cigarette, the burning ingredients create other chemicals. Some of these are carcinogenic.

A Surgeon General's report in 1989 reported that cigarettes contain 43 carcinogens. Forty-three. The public has a right to know.

Do most smokers realize that one of these chemicals is arsenic? Yes, ar-

senic. I do not think most smokers know that.

Our bill will disclose that, as well as the other chemical carcinogens in cigarette smoke.

Mr. President, with all these known dangers about smoking, we should not hide the health warning labels in small type on the side of a cigarette pack. Other countries, such as Canada, Australia and Thailand, put large labels on the front of each pack. The United States should provide equal protection to consumers. The warnings should be stark, clear, and easily seen.

When cigarettes get in the hands of children, and with 3,000 children becoming regular smokers every day, we have a duty to give them the facts: "Cigarettes Cause Cancer." "Smoking is Addictive." "Smoking Can Kill You."

That is a lot more graphic and descriptive than the small print that appears today. Large and forthright warnings are more likely to be seen, read, understood, and recalled. More children—and adults—will get the message, and put down the pack rather than lighting up.

In a recent study of Canadian cigarette pack messages—similar to those required by this legislation—half of all smokers who were smoking less, or trying to quit, cited cigarette pack messages as contributing to their decisions. Larger, bolder warnings can make a difference.

Mr. President, the 106th Congress should enact this legislation. This is a bipartisan bill, and I want to thank my cosponsors, Senators LUGAR, DURBIN and CHAFEE for joining me in this effort. In the coming weeks, I expect that this bill will attract more cosponsors from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill follows:

S. 2125

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 "Smoker's Right to Know and Truth in Tobacco Labeling Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADVERTISEMENT.**—The term "advertisement" means all newspapers and magazine advertisements and advertising inserts, billboards, posters, signs, decals, banners, matchbook advertising, point-of-purchase display material and all other written or other material used for promoting the sale or consumption of tobacco products to consumers, and advertising at an Internet site.

(2) **BRAND.**—The term "brand" means a variety of tobacco products distinguished by the tobacco used, tar and nicotine content, flavoring used, size of the tobacco product, filtration, or packaging.

(3) **BRAND STYLE.**—The term "brand style" means a variety of cigarettes distinguished by the tobacco used, tar and nicotine content, flavoring used, size of the cigarette, filtration on the cigarette, or packaging.

(4) **CARCINOGEN.**—The term "carcinogen" means any agent that is determined to be tumorigenic according to the National Toxicology Program or the International Agency

for Research on Cancer, or that is otherwise known by the manufacturer to be tumorigenic.

(5) CIGAR.—The term “cigar” means any roll of tobacco wrapped in leaf tobacco or in any substance containing tobacco, that weighs 3 pounds or more per thousand, and is not a cigarette or little cigar.

(6) CIGARETTE.—The term “cigarette” means—

(A) any roll of tobacco wrapped in paper or tobacco leaf or in any substance not containing tobacco which is to be burned,

(B) any roll of tobacco wrapped in any substance containing tobacco which, because of its appearance, the type of tobacco used in the filler, or its packaging or labeling is likely to be offered to, or purchased by consumers as a cigarette described in subparagraph (A),

(C) little cigars which are any roll of tobacco wrapped in leaf tobacco or any substance containing tobacco (other than any roll of tobacco which is a cigarette within the meaning of subparagraph (A)) and as to which 1,000 units weigh not more than 3 pounds, and

(D) loose rolling tobacco that, because of its appearance, type, packaging, or labeling, is likely to be offered to, or purchased by, consumers as tobacco for making cigarettes.

(7) COMMERCE.—The term “commerce” means—

(A) commerce between any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, or Johnston Island and any place outside thereof;

(B) commerce between points in any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, or Johnston Island, but through any place outside thereof; or

(C) commerce wholly within the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, or Johnston Island.

(8) CONSTITUENT.—The term “constituent” means any element of tobacco or cigarette mainstream or sidestream smoke, including tar, the components of the tar, nicotine, and carbon monoxide or any other component designated by the Secretary.

(9) DISTRIBUTOR.—The term “distributor” does not include a retailer and the term “distribute” does not include retail distribution.

(10) INGREDIENT.—The term “ingredient” means any substance the use of which results, or may reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in its becoming a component of any tobacco product, including any component of the paper or filter of such product.

(11) PACKAGE.—The term “package” means a pack, box, carton, or other container of any kind in which cigarettes or other tobacco products are offered for sale, sold, or otherwise distributed to customers.

(12) PERSON.—The term “person” means an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other business or legal entity.

(13) PIPE TOBACCO.—The term “pipe tobacco” means any loose tobacco that, because of its appearance, type, packaging, or labeling, is likely to be offered to, or purchased by, consumers as a tobacco product to be smoked in a pipe.

(14) SALE OR DISTRIBUTION.—The term “sale or distribution” includes sampling or any other distribution not for sale.

(15) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(16) SMOKELESS TOBACCO.—The term “smokeless tobacco” means any product that includes cut, ground, powdered, or leaf

tobacco that is intended to be placed in the oral or nasal cavity.

(17) STATE.—The term “State” includes, in addition to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(18) TAR.—The term “tar” means the particulate matter from tobacco smoke minus water and nicotine.

(19) TOBACCO PRODUCT.—The term “tobacco product” means any product made of or derived from tobacco leaf for human consumption, including cigarettes, cigars, little cigars, loose tobacco, smokeless tobacco, and pipe tobacco.

(20) TRADEMARK.—The term “trademark” means any word, name, symbol, logo, or device or any combination thereof used by a person to identify or distinguish such person’s goods from those manufactured or sold by another person and to indicate the source of the goods.

(21) UNITED STATES.—The term “United States” includes the States and installations of the Armed Forces of the United States located outside a State.

SEC. 3. CIGARETTE PRODUCT PACKAGE LABELING; ADVERTISING WARNINGS.

(a) WARNING LABELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, package, or import for sale or distribution within the United States any cigarettes the package of which fails to bear, in accordance with the requirements of this section, one of the following label statements:

WARNING: Cigarettes are addictive

WARNING: Tobacco smoke can harm your children

WARNING: Cigarettes cause fatal lung disease

WARNING: Cigarettes cause cancer

WARNING: Cigarettes cause strokes and heart disease

WARNING: Smoking during pregnancy can harm your baby

WARNING: Smoking can kill you

WARNING: Tobacco smoke causes fatal lung disease in non-smokers

WARNING: Quitting smoking now greatly reduces serious risks to your health

WARNING: Smoking causes sexual dysfunction.

(2) LIST OF CARCINOGENS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, package, or import for sale or distribution in the United States any cigarettes the package of which fails to bear, in accordance with the requirements of this section, a statement that lists in the manner and order as required by subparagraph (B) certain carcinogens present in that cigarette brand’s ingredients or constituents.

(B) STATEMENT REQUIRED.—The statement required under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) be listed as follows:

“CANCER-CAUSING AGENTS: The following cancer-causing agents are inhaled in this product’s smoke: [list of carcinogens]”;

(ii) in the bracketed area in the statement described in clause (i), list carcinogens in the following categories that are present in that cigarette brand’s ingredients or constituents in the following descending order—

(I) inorganic compounds;

(II) miscellaneous organic compounds;

(III) aldehydes;

(IV) carcinogenic tobacco-specific nitrosamines (TSNAs).

(V) volatile nitrosamines; and

(VI) if any other carcinogens are present, state the following: “and other carcinogens”;

and

(iii) display, in bold print, the percentage of any carcinogen listed in clause (ii) rel-

ative to the average of such concentration of such carcinogen in the sales weighted average of all cigarettes marketed in the United States.

(3) PLACEMENT; TYPOGRAPHY.—

(A) WARNING LABELS.—Each label statement required by paragraph (1) shall be located in the upper portion of the front and rear panels of the package, directly on the package underneath the cellophane or other clear wrapping. Each label statement shall comprise at least the top 33 percent of the front and rear panels of the package. The word “WARNING” shall appear in capital letters and all text shall be in conspicuous and legible 17-point bold, uncondensed, sans serif type. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the point size may be reduced when the longest line of text exceeds 16 typographic characters (letters and space), except that such reduced point size may never be smaller than 15-point and at least 60 percent of the area involved shall be occupied by the required text. The text shall be black on a white background, or white on a black background, in a manner that contrasts, by typography, layout, or color, with all other printed material on the package, in an alternating fashion under the plan submitted under subsection (c)(4).

(B) LIST OF CARCINOGENS.—Each statement required by paragraph (2) shall be located in the same place that label statements were placed on cigarette packages as of October 12, 1984. The text of the statement shall be in conspicuous and legible 9-point uncondensed, sans serif type and shall appear in a conspicuous and prominent format on 1 side of the package. The Secretary may revise type sizes for the text in such an area and in such a manner as the Secretary determines to be appropriate. The term “CANCER-CAUSING AGENTS” shall appear in bold capital letters, and the text shall be black on a white background, or white on a black background, in a manner that contrasts, by typography, layout, or color, with all other printed material on the package, except the label statement required under paragraph (1).

(4) DOES NOT APPLY TO FOREIGN DISTRIBUTION.—The provisions of this subsection do not apply to a manufacturer or distributor of cigarettes which does not manufacture, package, or import cigarettes for sale or distribution within the United States.

(b) PACKAGE INSERT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, import, package, or distribute for sale within the United States any cigarettes unless the cigarette package includes a package insert, prepared in accordance with guidelines established by the Secretary by regulation, on carcinogens, toxins, and other substances posing a risk to human health that are contained in the ingredients and constituents of the cigarettes in such package. The Secretary shall include in such guidelines information on the health impact of smoking and smoking cessation as determined to be necessary by the Secretary to advance public health.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations requiring the package insert required by paragraph (1) to provide the information required by such paragraph (including carcinogens and other dangerous substances) in a prominent, clear fashion and a detailed list of the ingredients and constituents.

(c) ADVERTISING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer of cigarettes to advertise or cause to be advertised within the United States any cigarette, or any similar tobacco product, unless its advertising bears, in accordance with the requirements of this section—

(A) one of the label statements specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (a); and

(B) a list of carcinogens specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(2) **TYPOGRAPHY.**—

(A) **WARNINGS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Each cigarette advertisement shall include a label statement required by subsection (a)(1) as set forth in this subparagraph.

(ii) **ADVERTISEMENTS.**—For press (including magazine and newspaper), poster and billboard advertisements, each such label statement shall comprise at least 30 percent of the area of the advertisement and shall appear in a conspicuous and prominent format and location at the top of each advertisement within the printing safety area. The Secretary may revise the required type sizes in such area in such manner as the Secretary determines appropriate to advance public health.

(iii) **TEXT.**—The word “WARNING” shall appear in capital letters, and each label statement shall appear in conspicuous, uncondensed, bold, sans serif type. The text of the label statement shall be black if the background is white and white if the background is black, under the plan submitted under paragraph (4). The label statements shall be enclosed by a rectangular border that is the same color as the letters of the statements and that is twice the width of the vertical stroke of the letter “I” in the word “WARNING” in the label statements.

(iv) **POINT TYPE.**—The text of such label statements shall be in a bold typeface pro rata to the following requirements:

(I) 45-point type for a whole-page broadsheet newspaper advertisement.

(II) 39-point type for a half-page broadsheet newspaper advertisement.

(III) 39-point type for a whole-page tabloid newspaper advertisement.

(IV) 27-point type for a half-page tabloid newspaper advertisement.

(V) 31.5-point type for a double page spread magazine or whole-page magazine advertisement.

(VI) 22.5-point type for a 28 centimeter by 3 column advertisement.

(VII) 15-point type for a 20 centimeter by 2 column advertisement.

(v) **BILLBOARDS.**—For billboard advertisements, the typeface shall be adjusted so that the text occupies 60-70 percent of the label area. The warning label on billboards that use artificial lighting shall not be less visible than other printed matter on the billboard when the lighting is in use.

(vi) **ALL LABEL STATEMENTS.**—The label statements shall be in English, except that in the case of—

(I) an advertisement that appears in a newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication that is not in English, the statements shall appear in the predominant language of the publication; and

(II) in the case of any other advertisement that is not in English, the label statements shall appear in the same language as that principally used in the advertisement.

(B) **LIST OF CARCINOGENS.**—Each statement required by subsection (a)(2) in cigarette advertising shall comply with the standards set forth in this subparagraph. For press, poster and billboard advertisements, each such statement shall appear in a conspicuous and prominent format and be located at the bottom of each advertisement within the printing safety area. Each such statement shall comprise not less than 15 percent of the area of the advertisement, with the text of the statement comprising not less than 60 percent and not more than 70 percent of such an area. The Secretary may designate required type sizes in such an area in such a manner as the Secretary determines appropriate to

advance public health. The text of such a statement shall be black if the background is white, and white if the background is black, and shall be in type that is otherwise in contrast in typography, layout, or color with all other printed material in the advertisement.

(3) **ADJUSTMENT BY SECRETARY.**—The Secretary may, through a rulemaking under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, adjust the format and type sizes and content for the label statements required by this section or the text, format, and type sizes of any required tar, nicotine yield, or other constituent disclosures, or to establish the text, format, and type sizes for any other disclosures required under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et. seq.). The text of any such label statements or disclosures shall be required to appear only within the 30 percent area of cigarette advertisements provided by paragraph (2). The Secretary shall promulgate regulations which provide for adjustments in the format and type sizes of any text required to appear in such area to ensure that the total text required to appear by law will fit within such area.

(4) **MARKETING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The label statements specified in subsection (a)(1) shall be randomly displayed in each 12-month period, in as equal a number of times as is possible on each brand and brand style of the product and be randomly distributed in all areas of the United States in which the product is marketed in accordance with a plan submitted by the cigarette manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer, and approved by the Secretary.

(B) **ROTATION.**—The label statements specified in subsection (a)(1) shall be rotated quarterly in alternating sequence in advertisements for each brand and brand style of cigarettes in accordance with a plan submitted by the cigarette manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer to, and approved by, the Secretary.

(C) **REVIEW OF PLAN.**—The Secretary shall review each plan submitted under subparagraph (B) and approve it if the plan—

(i) will provide for the equal distribution and display on packaging and the rotation required in advertising under this subsection; and

(ii) assures that all of the label statements required under this section will be displayed by the cigarette manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer at the same time.

(d) **TELEVISION AND RADIO ADVERTISING.**—It is unlawful to advertise cigarettes on any medium of electronic communications subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 4. LABELS AND ADVERTISING WARNINGS FOR SMOKELESS TOBACCO, CIGARS, AND PIPE TOBACCO.

(a) **WARNING LABELS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, package, or import for sale or distribution within the United States any smokeless tobacco product, cigar product, or pipe tobacco product, or any similar tobacco product, unless the product package bears, in accordance with the requirements of this Act, one of the following label statements:

(A) Any smokeless tobacco product shall bear one of the following label statements:

WARNING: Smokeless tobacco causes mouth cancer

WARNING: Smokeless tobacco causes gum disease and tooth loss

WARNING: Smokeless tobacco is not a safe alternative to cigarettes

WARNING: Smokeless tobacco is addictive

(B) Any cigar product shall bear one of the following label statements:

WARNING: Cigar smoke causes mouth cancer

WARNING: Cigar smoke causes throat cancer

WARNING: Cigar smoke causes lung cancer

WARNING: Cigars are not a safe alternative to cigarettes

WARNING: Cigar smoke can harm your children

(C) Any pipe tobacco product shall bear one of the following label statements:

WARNING: Pipe smoking causes mouth cancer

WARNING: Pipe smoking causes throat cancer

WARNING: Pipe smoking is not a safe alternative to cigarettes

WARNING: Pipe smoking can harm your children

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **LOCATION OF LABEL STATEMENT.**—Each label statement required by paragraph (1) shall—

(i) for any smokeless tobacco or pipe tobacco product, be located on the 2 principal display panels of the product package, and comprise at least 25 percent of each such display panel; and

(ii) for any cigar product, be located on a band around each cigar that is packaged for individual sale, and for each package of cigars, be located in the upper portion of the front and rear panels of the package and comprise at least the top 33 percent of the front and rear panels of the package.

(B) **SIZE AND TEXT OF LABEL STATEMENT.**—Each label statement required by paragraph (1) shall be in 17-point bold, uncondensed, sans serif type and in black text on a white background, or white text on a black background, in a manner that contrasts by typography, layout, or color, with all other printed material on the package or band, in an alternating fashion under the plan submitted under subsection (b)(3), except that if the text of a label statement would occupy more than 70 percent of the area specified by subparagraph (A), such text may appear in a smaller type size, so long as at least 60 percent of such warning area is occupied by the label statement.

(3) **INTRODUCTION.**—The label statements required by paragraph (1) shall be introduced by each manufacturer, packager, importer, distributor, or retailer of smokeless tobacco products, cigar products, and pipe tobacco products concurrently into the distribution chain of such products.

(4) **DOES NOT APPLY TO FOREIGN DISTRIBUTION.**—The provisions of this subsection do not apply to a manufacturer or distributor of any smokeless tobacco product, cigar product, or pipe tobacco product that does not manufacture, package, or import such products for sale or distribution within the United States.

(b) **ADVERTISEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer, packager, importer, distributor, or retailer of smokeless tobacco products, cigar products, or pipe tobacco products to advertise or cause to be advertised within the United States any such product unless its advertising bears, in accordance with the requirements of this section, one of the label statements specified in subsection (a) that is applicable to such product.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each label statement required by paragraph (1) shall comply with the standards set forth in this paragraph. For press and poster advertisements, each such statement and (where applicable) any required statement relating to tar, nicotine, or other constituent yield shall—

(A) comprise at least 20 percent of the area of the advertisement, and the warning area shall be delineated by a dividing line of contrasting color from the advertisement; and

(B) the word "WARNING" shall appear in capital letters and each label statement shall appear in conspicuous and legible type. The text of the label statement shall be black on a white background, or white on a black background, in an alternating fashion under the plan submitted under paragraph (3).

(3) DISPLAY.—

(A) RANDOM DISPLAY.—The label statements specified in subsection (a)(1) shall be randomly displayed in each 12-month period, in as equal a number of times as is possible on each brand of the product and be randomly distributed in all areas of the United States in which the product is marketed in accordance with a plan submitted by the manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer of smokeless tobacco products, cigar products, or pipe tobacco products and approved by the Secretary.

(B) ROTATION.—The label statements specified in subsection (a)(1) shall be rotated quarterly in alternating sequence in advertisements for each brand of smokeless tobacco product, cigar product, and pipe tobacco product, in accordance with a plan submitted by the tobacco product manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer to, and approved by, the Secretary.

(C) REVIEW OF PLAN.—The Secretary shall review each plan submitted under subparagraph (B) and approve it if the plan—

(i) will provide for the equal distribution and display on packaging and the rotation required in advertising under this subsection; and

(ii) assures that all of the label statements required under this section will be displayed by the manufacturer, importer, distributor, or retailer of smokeless tobacco products, cigar products, or pipe tobacco products, at the same time.

(c) PACKAGE INSERT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, import, package, or distribute for sale within the United States any smokeless tobacco product, cigar product, or pipe tobacco product unless such product, not including a cigar that is sold individually, includes a package insert, prepared in accordance with guidelines established by the Secretary by regulation, on carcinogens, toxins, and other substances posing a risk to human health that are contained in the ingredients and constituents of such product. The Secretary shall include in such guidelines information on the health impact of smoking and smoking cessation as the Secretary determines to be necessary to advance public health.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations requiring the package insert required by paragraph (1) to provide the information required by such paragraph (including carcinogens and other dangerous substances) in a prominent, clear fashion and a detailed list of the ingredients and constituents.

(d) TELEVISION AND RADIO ADVERTISING.—It is unlawful to advertise smokeless tobacco product, cigar product, or pipe tobacco product on any medium of electronic communications subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITY TO REVISE WARNING LABEL STATEMENTS.

The Secretary may, by a rulemaking conducted under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, adjust the format, type size, content, and text of any of the warning label statements required by this Act, or establish the format, type size, and text of any other disclosures required under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), or alter the list of carcinogens disclosed on label statements, if the Secretary

finds that such a change would promote greater public understanding of the risks associated with the use of tobacco.

SEC. 6. TOBACCO PRODUCT INGREDIENTS AND CONSTITUENTS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Each person that manufactures, packages, or imports into the United States any tobacco product shall annually report, in a form and at a time specified by the Secretary by regulation—

(1) the identity of any added ingredient or constituent of the product other than tobacco, water, or reconstituted tobacco sheet made wholly from tobacco; and

(2) the nicotine, tar, and carbon monoxide yield ratings which shall accurately predict the nicotine, tar, and carbon monoxide intake from such product for average consumers based on standards established by the Secretary by regulation;

if such information is not information which the Secretary determines to be trade secret or confidential information subject to section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, and section 1905 of title 18, United States Code. The ingredients and constituents identified under paragraph (1) shall be listed in descending order according to weight, measure, or numerical count. If any of such constituents are carcinogens, or otherwise poses a risk to human health as determined by the Secretary, such information shall be included in the report.

(b) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall review the information contained in each report submitted under subsection (a) and if the Secretary determines that such information directly affects the public health, the Secretary shall require that such information be included in a label under sections 3 and 4.

(c) OTHER SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall establish a toll-free telephone number and a site on the Internet which shall make available additional information on the ingredients of such tobacco products, except information which the Secretary determines to be trade secret or confidential information subject to section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, and section 1905 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 7. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue such regulations as may be appropriate for the implementation of this Act. The Secretary shall issue proposed regulations for such implementation within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this Act. Not later than 180 days after the date of the publication of such proposed regulations, the Secretary shall issue final regulations for such implementation. If the Secretary does not issue such final regulations before the expiration of such 180 days, the proposed regulations shall become final and the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register about the new status of the proposed regulations.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the Secretary's duties under this Act, the Secretary shall, as appropriate, consult with such experts as may have appropriate training and experience in the matters subject to such duties.

(3) MONITORING OF COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary shall monitor compliance with the requirements of this Act.

(4) RECOMMENDATION FOR ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary shall recommend to the Attorney General such enforcement actions as may be appropriate under this Act.

(b) INJUNCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over civil actions brought to restrain violations of this Act. Such a civil action may be

brought in the United States district court for the judicial district in which any substantial portion of the violation occurred or in which the defendant is found or transacts business. In such a civil action, process may be served on a defendant in any judicial district in which the defendant resides or may be found and subpoenas requiring attendance of witnesses in any such action may be served in any judicial district.

(2) ACTIONS BY INTERESTED PARTIES.—Any interested organization may bring a civil action described in paragraph (1). If such an organization substantially prevails in such an action, the court may award it reasonable attorney's fees and expenses. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "interested organization" means any nonprofit organization one of whose purposes, and a substantial part of its activities, include the promotion of public health through reduction in the use of tobacco products.

(c) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person who manufactures, packages, distributes, or advertises a tobacco product in violation of this Act shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000 for each violation per day.

SEC. 8. REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE SECRETARY.

Not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this Act and biannually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a report describing actions taken pursuant to this Act, current practices and methods of tobacco advertising and promotion, and recommendations if any for legislation.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATES AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that section 3, 4, 5 and 6 shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Effective on the date that is 1 year from the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) and the Comprehensive Smokeless Tobacco Health Education Act of 1986 (15 U.S.C. 4401) are repealed.●

●Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words, and perhaps echo some of those of my colleague. I am proud to sponsor this important piece of legislation with Senator LAUTENBERG. I was a co-sponsor of a similar bill in the last Congress, and am glad to join him again in this effort. I also thank my colleagues Senator DURBIN and Senator CHAFEE for their co-sponsorship of this good policy initiative.

Let me start by saying that this bill is about health education and responsible individual decision-making. As Mayor of Indianapolis and in the U.S. Senate, I have advocated good health and fitness. I have integrated running into my daily routine and encourage my staff to do the same. In 1977, I founded the annual Dick Lugar Fitness festival in Indiana, which is an event I look forward to every year.

A good health and fitness regimen requires an assumption of personal responsibility and an active role on the part of the individual, but it also requires a knowledge of two essential components of good health—proper diet and exercise. I speak on a regular basis on the exercise component, but would like to make a couple of basic points about proper diet that are well within

the scope of the federal government's responsibilities.

We have taken great strides in the area of food packaging and labeling, pointing out to consumers vitamin and fat content; caloric and cholesterol facts. We require data on tests done on artificial sweeteners. But, in a product that threatens the life of one out of three regular users, we ignore those basic principles.

Mr. President, we all know that in a food product, the discovery of even a single carcinogen can trigger media attack, consumer outrage and FDA regulation. However, under current law, a cigarette package is not even required to list its ingredients despite the presence of dozens of carcinogens. Applying a simple content labeling standard to tobacco in the interest of consistency and public health is overdue considering the massive health problems inflicted by tobacco.

As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, which has jurisdiction over some aspects of tobacco, I believe that our government must speak consistently and clearly about tobacco's risks. That has not always been the case. In the past, our government has sent mixed messages, for example, subsidizing the cultivation of tobacco and including cigarettes in military rations, even as it warned against tobacco's dangers. If public health warnings are to be trusted, they should not be ambiguous. The small, side-panel warnings currently in use on tobacco packages are not adequate in reflecting the risks of tobacco use as we now know them. We can and we should speak the truth with a clearer voice.

Prominent labels on cigarette packages in plain English would be a steady reminder of the risks smokers face when they light up. True, almost every smoker understands that cigarettes are bad for health, but fewer know the degree of risk.

Many smokers have tried to quit, some more than once. These labels will encourage them in this endeavor and remind them why they should try again.

Most importantly, Mr. President, as Senator LAUTENBERG stated, the warnings will be prominent and readily understood by young Americans, thousands of whom light up for the first time every day.

This bill does not interfere with an adult's freedom to choose to smoke, it does not raise tobacco prices, and it does not expand government regulatory authority beyond the labeling requirement. It is a modest and conservative step, but a decisive and important step in good public policy.●

● Mr. L. CHAFÉE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators LUGAR, LAUTENBERG, and DURBIN today in introducing the Smoker's Right to Know and Truth in Labeling Act, which would require comprehensive and prominent labeling of cigarettes. This legislation is a commonsense and bi-

partisan approach to give every American a chance to make an informed decision about tobacco use.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, nearly one in five deaths annually are attributed to tobacco use, making it the single most preventable cause of premature death, disease and disability facing our nation. In fact, more Americans die each year from tobacco use than from AIDS, alcohol, drug abuse, car accidents, murders, suicides, and fires combined.

America's children are most at risk. Despite all we know about the effects of tobacco, each day, 3,000 kids become regular smokers. Of these, 1,000 will eventually die from tobacco-related illnesses. Almost 90 percent of current adult smokers began at or before age 18.

Rhode Island—which already has one of the highest rates of teen smoking in the nation—has recently seen another increase in teen smoking. Today, over 37 percent of Rhode Island's high school kids smoke cigarettes. Over 23,000 Rhode Island kids under age 18 will die prematurely from tobacco-related illnesses.

Tobacco manufacturers say that tobacco use is a matter of choice. They argue that adults, with the full knowledge of the consequences, have the right to choose to smoke. I agree. But I also believe that individuals who choose to smoke should be making informed decisions.

The Smoker's Right to Know and Truth in Tobacco Labelling Act would ensure that tobacco users understand the consequences of the choice they are making. With comprehensive labelling of cigarette packs, adults and especially minors, will know the dangers that cigarettes pose to their health and the health of their loved ones.

This legislation follows on the recent example set by Canada, which passed tough labelling guidelines that have worked as a strong disincentive to beginning this deadly habit. Under the legislation we are introducing today, there will be no mistake about the life-threatening health effects of tobacco products.

As the father of three young children, I have a personal stake in helping to pass legislation to ensure that our kids do not develop this deadly habit. I hope our colleagues in the Senate will join us in passing this important, common-sense legislation.●

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. DODD):

S. 2124. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for the urgent repair and renovation of public elementary and secondary schools in high-need areas; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL REPAIR AND RENOVATION ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today we will be introducing the Public

School Repair and Renovation Act. This legislation will authorize \$1.3 billion in grants and no interest loans to enable school districts to make urgent repairs at our nation's public schools. I am pleased to be joined by Senators ROBB, BINGAMAN, FEINSTEIN, KENNEDY, WELLSTONE, and DODD in cosponsoring this legislation in the Senate.

The facts about the condition of our nation's schools are well known. The average age of the schools in this country is 42 years. 14 million children attend classes in buildings that are unsafe or inadequate. The General Accounting Office reports we need \$112 billion to just bring our schools up to overall good condition. How can kids prepare for the 21st century in schools that didn't even make the grade in the 20th century?

It is a national disgrace that the nicest thing our kids see are shopping malls, sports arenas, and movie theaters, and the most rundown place they see is their school. What signal are we sending them about the value we place on them, their education and future?

I was disturbed by the comments of Tunisia, a Washington, D.C. 5th grader in Jonathan Kozol's book, "Savage Inequalities." This is what she said.

It's like this. The school is dirty. There isn't any playground. There's a hole in the wall behind the principal's desk. What we need to do is first rebuild the school. Build a playground. Plant a lot of flowers. Paint the classrooms. Fix the hole in the principal's office. Buy doors for the toilet stalls in the girl's bathroom. Make it a beautiful clean building. Make it pretty. Way it is, I feel ashamed.

The legislation we are introducing would make it possible to fix the holes in the walls of Tunisia's school, put doors on the bathroom stalls and paint the classrooms. These repairs would make Tunisia feel a little less ashamed of herself and of her school.

This legislation is part of a comprehensive two-prong strategy to modernize our nation's schools. This bill complements our continuing effort to provide tax credits for new construction and modernization projects. We have advocated school modernization tax credits that would finance \$25 billion in new construction or major renovations. The Public School Repair and Renovation Act will complement that effort and I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. FRIST):

S.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Alan G. Spoon as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Sheila E. Widnall as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Manuel

L. Ibanez as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION BOARD OF REGENTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing three Senate joint resolutions reappointing citizen regents of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. I am pleased that my fellow Smithsonian Institution Regents, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), are co-sponsors.

At its meeting on January 24, 2000, the Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents recommended the following distinguished individuals for appointment to the Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents: Mr. Manuel L. Ibanez of Texas; Mr. Alan G. Spoon of Maryland; and Ms. Sheila E. Widnall of Massachusetts.

I ask unanimous consent that the biographies of the nominees and the text of the joint resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of resignation of Louis Gerstner of New York, is filled by the appointment of Alan G. Spoon of Maryland. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

S.J. RES. 41

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of resignation of Louis Gerstner of New York, is filled by the appointment of Alan G. Spoon of Maryland. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

S.J. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Manuel L. Ibanez of Texas on May 4, 2000, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent for a term of 6 years. The reappointment shall take effect on May 5, 2000.

MANUEL LUIS IBANEZ

(President of Texas A&I University and Professor of Microbiology)

B.S.—1957: Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio (*cum laude*).

M.S.—1959: Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Ph.D.—1961: Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

National Science Foundation Cooperative Fellowship, 1959–1961 (2 year Full Fellowship).

Postdoctoral training, 1962—University of California at Los Angeles, Nuclear Medicine.

Field of Specialization: Bacterial Physiology.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1961–1962: Bucknell University, Assistant Professor of Bacteriology.

5/62–11/62: UCLA, Postdoctoral trainee.

1962–1965: Interamerican Institute of Agricultural Science of the O.A.S. (Costa Rica), Senior Biochemist.

1965–1970: LSU in New Orleans, Associate Professor and Chairman, Biology.

1970–1075: LSU in New Orleans, Associate Professor of Biology.

1973: Sabbatical Leave, University of California, San Diego and Scripps Institute of Oceanography.

1975–1978: University of New Orleans, Associate Professor and Coordinator Allied Health Sciences.

1977: University of New Orleans, Professor, Biological Sciences.

1978–1982: University of New Orleans, Professor, Biological Sciences and Associate Dean of the Graduate School.

1/1/82–6/30/83: University of New Orleans, Professor, Biological Sciences and Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

7/1/83–3/31/85: University of New Orleans, Professor, Biological Sciences and Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

4/1/85–7/31/89: University of New Orleans, Professor, Biological Sciences and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost.

8/89: University of New Orleans, Professor Emeritus.

8/1/89–Present: Texas A&I University, Professor of Microbiology and President.

8/1/90–Present: Texas A&M University, Visiting Professor of Biochemistry.

Professional Society Memberships Past and Present: American Society for Microbiology; American Association for the Advancement of Science; Fitotecnia Latinoamericana; Society of Sigma Xi (Science); American Association of University Administrators; American Association of State Colleges and Universities; Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities.

ALAN GARY SPOON

Communications and publishing executive; b. Detroit, June 4, 1951; s. Harry and Mildred (Rudman) S.; m. Terri Alper, June 3, 1975; children: Ryan, Leigh, Randi, B.S., MIT, 1973, M.S. 1973; J.D., Harvard U., 1976. Cons. The Boston Cons. Group, 1976–79, mgr., 1979–81, v.p., 1981; v.p., The Washington Post Co., 1984–85; v.p., contr. Washington Post, 1985–86, v.p. mktg., 1986–87; v.p. fin., CFO The Washington Post Co., 1987–89; pres. Newsweek mag., 1989–91; COO, The Washington Post Co., 1991–, pres., 1993–; dir. Info. Industry Assn., Washington, 1982–83, 88–89; bd. dirs., trustee WETA-Pub. Broadcasting, 1986–92; bd. dirs. The Riggs Nat. Bank of Washington, 1991–93, dir. Genome Scis., Inc. (HGSI), (Rockville, MD), 1998. Dir. Norwood Sch., 1989–93, chmn., 1993–95; dir. Internat. Herald Tribune, 1991–, Smithsonian Nat. Mus. Natural History, Wash. D.C. 1994–, Am. Mgmt. Sys., Inc., Fairfax, VA, 1996–, Human Genome Scis. Inc., Rockville, MD, 1998–. Recipient award for scholarship and athletics Eastern Coll. Athletic Conf., and MIT, 1973. Home: 7300 Loch Edin Ct, Potomac MD 20854-4835; Office: The Washington Post Co, 1150 15th St. NW, Washington, DC 20071-0002.

SHEILA EVANS WIDNALL

Aeronautical educator, former secretary of the airforce, aeronautical educator, former university official; b. Tacoma, July 13, 1938; d. Rolland John and Genievue Alice (Krause) Evans; m. William Soule Widnall, June 11, 1960; children: William, Ann. BS in Aero. and Astronautics, MIT, 1960, MS in Aero. and Astronautics, 1961, DSc, 1964; PhD (hon.), New Eng. Coll., 1975, Lawrence U., 1987, Cedar Crest Coll., 1988, Smith Coll., 1990, Mt. Holyoke, Coll., 1991, Ill. Inst. Tech., 1991, Columbia U., 1994, Simmons Coll., 1994, Suffolk U., 1994, Princeton U., 1994. Asst. prof. aeros. and astronautics MIT, Cambridge, 1964–70, assoc. prof., 1970–74, prof., 1974–93, head divsn. fluid mechanics, 1975–79; dir. Fluid Dynamics Rsch. Lab., MIT, Cambridge, 1979–90; chmn. faculty MIT, Cambridge, 1979–80, chairperson com. on acad. responsibility, 1991–92, assoc. provost, 1992–93; sec. USAF, 1993–97; prof. MIT, Cambridge, 1997–; trustee Sloan Found., 1998–; bd. dirs. Chemfab Inc., Bennington, VT., Aerospace Corp., L.A., Draper Labs., Cambridge; past trustee Carnegie Corp., 1984–92, Charles Stark Draper Lab. Inc.; mem. Carnegie Commn. Sci., Tech. and Govt. Contbr. articles to prof. jour.; patentee in field; assoc. editor AIAA Jour. Aircraft, 1972–75, Physics of Fluids, 1981–88, Jour. Applied Mechanics, 1983–87; emm. editorial bd. Sci., 1984–86. Bd. visitors USAF Acad., Colorado Springs, Colo., 1978–84, bd. chairperson, 1980–82; trustee Boston Mus. Scie., 1989–. Recipient Washburn award Boston Mus. Sci., 1987. Fellow AAAS (bd. dirs. 1982–89, pres. 1987–88, chmn. 1988–89), AIAA (bd. dirs. 1975–77, Lawrence Sperry award 1972, Durand Lectureship for Pub. Svc. award 1996, pres.-elect 1999–), Am. Phys. Soc. (exec. com. 1979–82); mem. ASME (Applied Mechs. award 1995, Pres. award 1999), NAE (coun. 1992–93, v.p. 1998–), NAS (panel on sci. responsibility), Am. Acad. Arts and Scis., Soc. Women Engrs. (Outstanding Achievement award 1975), Internat. Acad. Astronautics, Seattle Mountaineers. Office: MIT Bldg 33-411 77 Massachusetts Ave Cambridge MA 02139.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 345

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

S. 374

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 374, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 542

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 542, a bill to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the deduction for computer donations to schools and allow a tax credit for donated computers.

S. 577

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 577, a bill to provide for injunctive relief in Federal district court to enforce State laws relating to the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquor.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the time limitation on benefits for immunosuppressive drugs under the medicare program, to provide continued entitlement for such drugs for certain individuals after medicare benefits end, and to extend certain medicare secondary payer requirements.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program.

S. 717

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 717, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reductions in social security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which two-thirds of the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds \$1,200, adjusted for inflation.

S. 821

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 821, a bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops.

S. 867

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 867, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 1028

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the United States Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law, and for other purposes.

S. 1044

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1044, a bill to require coverage for colorectal cancer screenings.

S. 1066

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1066, a bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to encourage the use of and research into agricultural best practices to improve the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 1142

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1142, a bill to protect the right of a member of a health maintenance organization to receive continuing care at a facility selected by that member, and for other purposes.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1196, a bill to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes.

S. 1199

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1199, a bill to require the Secretary of State to report on United States citizens injured or killed by certain terrorist groups.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to provide States with the option to allow legal immigrant pregnant women and children to be eligible for medical assistance under the medical program, and for other purposes.

S. 1452

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1452, a bill to modernize the requirements under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards of 1974 and to establish a balanced consensus process for the development, revision, and interpretation of Federal construction and safety standards for manufactured homes.

S. 1580

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to assist agricultural producers in managing risk, and for other purposes.

S. 1594

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr.

AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1594, a bill to amend the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

S. 1716

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1716, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to require local educational agencies and schools to implement integrated pest management systems to minimize the use of pesticides in schools and to provide parents, guardians, and employees with notice of the use of pesticides in schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1796

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1796, a bill to modify the enforcement of certain anti-terrorism judgements, and for other purposes.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1810, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve veterans' claims and appellate procedures.

S. 1900

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1900, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued by Amtrak, and for other purposes.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1921, a bill to authorize the placement within the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial of a plaque to honor Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service.

S. 1984

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1984, a bill to establish in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice a position with responsibility for agricultural antitrust matters.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, *supra*.

S. 2004

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2004, a bill to amend title 49 of the United States Code to expand State authority with respect to pipeline safety, to establish new Federal requirements to improve pipeline safety, to authorize appropriations under chapter 601 of that title for fiscal years 2001 through 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2013, a bill to restore health care equity for medicare-eligible uniformed services retirees, and for other purposes.

S. 2062

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2062, a bill to amend chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for organ and tissue donation awareness through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps.

S. 2070

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2070, a bill to improve safety standards for child restraints in motor vehicles.

S. 2074

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2074, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the social security earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age.

S. 2076

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2076, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian.

S. 2083

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2083, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a uniform dollar limitation for

all types of transportation fringe benefits excludable from gross income, and for other purposes.

S. 2090

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2090, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a 1 year moratorium on certain diesel fuel excise taxes.

S. CON. RES. 81

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 81, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and permit them to move to the United States if they so desire.

S. RES. 60

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 60, a resolution recognizing the plight of the Tibetan people on the fortieth anniversary of Tibet's attempt to restore its independence and calling for serious negotiations between China and the Dalai Lama to achieve a peaceful solution to the situation in Tibet.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 128, a resolution designating March 2000, as "Arts Education Month." At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 128, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2825

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2825 intended to be proposed to S. 1134, an original bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2854

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2854 proposed to S. 1134, an original bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2854 proposed to S. 1134, an original bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 85—CONDEMNING THE DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES PREVALENT AT BOB JONES UNIVERSITY

Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mr. ROBB) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 85

Whereas the Senate strongly rejects the practices of racism, segregation, and intolerance based on religious beliefs;

Whereas the administration of Bob Jones University enforces a segregationist policy by prohibiting interracial couples on the Bob Jones University campus;

Whereas officials of Bob Jones University routinely disparage those of other religious faiths with intolerant and derogatory remarks;

Whereas officials of Bob Jones University have likened the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church to a "possessed demon", and branded Catholicism as a "satanic system and religion of the anti-Christ";

Whereas the Website of Bob Jones University greets visitors with the University's belief that Catholicism and Mormonism are "cults"; and

Whereas senior officials of Bob Jones University have made openly racist remarks on many occasions regarding African Americans and Asian Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns practices, such as those prevalent at Bob Jones University, that seek to discriminate against and divide Americans on the basis of race, ethnicity, and religion; and

(2) strongly denounces individuals who seek to subvert the American ideals of inclusion, equality, and social justice.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 86—REQUESTING THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE ISSUE A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP HONORING THE 9TH AND 10TH HORSE CAVALRY UNITS, COLLECTIVELY KNOWN AS THE BUFFALO SOLDIERS

Mr. DEWINE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs

S. CON. RES. 86

Whereas the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry Units, collectively known as the Buffalo Soldiers, have made key contributions to the history of the United States by fighting to defend and protect our Nation;

Whereas the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry Units maintained the trails and protected the settler communities during the period of westward expansion;

Whereas the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry Units, who came to be known as the Buffalo Soldiers while in combat with the Native Americans, secured land for the Union from the Native Americans;

Whereas the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry Units were among Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders in Cuba during the Spanish-American War, and crossed into Mexico in 1916 under General John J. Pershing;

Whereas African-American men were drafted into the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry Units to serve on harsh terrain and protect the Mexican Border;

Whereas these African-American units went to North Africa, Iran, and Italy during World War II and worked in many positions including paratroopers and combat engineers;

Whereas in the face of fear of a Japanese invasion, the soldiers in the 9th and 10th Cavalry units were placed along the rugged border terrain of the Baja Peninsula and protected dams, power stations, and rail lines that were crucial to San Diego's war industries; and

Whereas the 21 currently existing chapters of the 9th and 10th Cavalry Association, with 20 domestic chapters and 1 in Germany, have built a Buffalo Soldiers Memorial in Junction City, Kansas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That Congress requests that the United States Postal Service issue a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry Units, collectively known as the Buffalo Soldiers.

• Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, February is designated as "Black History Month." As part of the celebration of African American achievements and contributions to our country, I would like to draw your attention to the heroic and courageous acts of the African Americans who served in the Ninth and Tenth Horse Cavalry Units of the United States Army.

These units were established at the end of the Civil War and composed of former slaves. Their first charge was to maintain trails and protect settlers from Native Americans during the period of westward expansion. The units were called to combative service during the wars against the Native Americans, where they were also given the name of "Buffalo Soldiers."

During the Spanish American War, the Buffalo Soldiers were among Theo-

dore Roosevelt's Rough Riders. In 1916, they crossed into Mexico under the direction of General John J. Pershing. At a time when the majority of the troops fighting in Mexico were from the South, these soldiers faced many internal obstacles and discriminatory actions, even while defending our country.

The Buffalo Soldiers were last called into service during World War II. The soldiers went to North Africa, Iran, and Italy and held various positions as combat engineers and paratroopers, among others. When the Army feared a Japanese invasion, the Buffalo Soldiers were placed along the rugged border terrain of the Baja Peninsula and protected dams, power stations, and rail lines to ensure the safety of crucial war industries in San Diego.

Currently, there are twenty-one existing chapters of the 9th and 10th Horse Cavalry associations, one in Germany and twenty in the United States.

Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution today to honor these brave men through the creation of a commemorative postage stamp. This stamp is a way to pay tribute to the Buffalo Soldiers' great acts of courage and dedication to our country. It is my hope that this stamp can serve as a reminder of their valor and to help teach future generations about their contributions to our nation. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

An informative article about the Buffalo Soldiers in my home state of Ohio was recently featured in the Cincinnati Enquirer. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Feb. 9, 2000]
LAST OF A STORIED CAVALRY FIGHTS FOR RECOGNITION—ALL-BLACK UNIT SERVED IN WW II AFTER LONG HISTORY

(By Mark Curnutte)

In 1943, Lorenzo Denson was one of about two dozen men from Cincinnati drafted to serve in an all-black cavalry unit on the Mexican border.

"The only horse I'd ever seen was the milkman's horse on Seventh Street," he said. Shortages of men in segregated black infantry units took Mr. Denson and other Cincinnatians overseas—without their horses—to North Africa, Iran and Italy. They worked as everything from paratroopers to combat engineers. Mr. Denson was a firefighter at an airfield.

"We did our job," he said. "We did what we were told."

These Tristate men also found their way into history as the last of the Buffalo Soldiers, members of the renowned all-black cavalry units formed during the Indian wars. The U.S. Army disbanded all horseback cavalry units in 1944.

This month—Black History Month—finds Cincinnati's Buffalo Soldiers on a final ride. Like the Tuskegee Airmen and other groups of black veterans before them, the Buffalo Soldiers are trying to win recognition for contributions that they say have been overlooked for more than 50 years.

Mr. Denson, now 79, retired and living in Columbia Township, will be among a group of nine living World War II-era Buffalo Soldiers scheduled to make its first Tristate ap-

pearance Thursday at the public library in Corryville.

"We helped to win World War II," said Linwood Greene Jr., 79, of Silverton, another Buffalo Soldier.

At least 14 of Cincinnati's World War II Buffalo Soldiers are dead—none was killed in action—and chances are this piece of Tristate history would have faded away if not for George Hicks III. A retired Army veteran who's a fan of the all-black cavalry units; Mr. Hicks moved from Washington, D.C., to the Tristate a couple of years ago and immediately organized the Cincinnati-based Heartland Chapter of the Ninth and Tenth Horse Cavalry Association.

"These men are American heroes," said Mr. Hicks, 50.

There are 20 domestic chapters of the Ninth and Tenth Association and one in Germany. About 650 black cavalry veterans from World War II are still living.

"We owe a lot to George," said Mr. Denson, who appeared at the Buffalo Soldiers booth at the Indiana Black Expo in July in Indianapolis. Public reaction there added urgency to the black troopers mission.

People—black and white alike—didn't know who they were. "They thought we were actors," Mr. Denson said.

The men sported black hats with crossed cavalry swords and the No. 10 affixed to the front. With blue shirts they wore the cavalry's standard yellow neckerchief.

"Once people found out who we were and what we did, they wanted to have their pictures taken with us," Mr. Denson said.

William Snow, 77, of New Burlington will appear at the library with Mr. Denson and at least three other men.

"Overseas, we did everything we were instructed to do," said Mr. Snow, a Walnut Hills native and retired postal worker. "I was proud to be in the cavalry. I am proud to be part of the history."

The black cavalry dates to post-Civil War North America. It's first recruits in 1866 were former slaves who patrolled the frontier from Texas to Montana. They guarded settlers and protected wagon trains.

Buffalo Soldiers earned respect and their nickname from the Cheyenne, Arapahoe, Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Indians they sometimes fought, a story captured in the song "Buffalo Soldier" by the late reggae icon Bob Marley. Indians said black soldiers' hair resembled buffalo fur.

Four all-black regiments, stationed throughout the western territories, were known as some of the fiercest fighters of the Indian wars.

They were among Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders in Cuba during the Spanish-American War and crossed into Mexico in 1916 under Gen. John J. Pershing.

During World War II, fearing a Japanese land invasion through Mexico's Baja Peninsula, the government placed cavalry units—first white, then black—along the rugged border terrain. Armed units on horseback protected dams, power stations and rail lines important to San Diego's war industries.

Black troopers from Cincinnati were sworn in at Fort Thomas and sent to train at Camp Lockett near San Diego.

"We were trained in infantry and how to be infantry on horseback," Mr. Denson said. "When you were assigned a horse, you were instructed to treat this animal like it was your best friend."

African-Americans could not rise beyond the rank of sergeant, so all commanding officers were white.

"They treated black troopers very well," Mr. Denson said.

Patrolling the border is how Buffalo Soldiers figured they would close out the war.

But within a year of arriving in California, the cavalry troopers were put on alert to go

overseas. They were put aboard a segregated train for a two-day ride to Newport News, Va.

A stop in Houston showed the men that many of their white countrymen wouldn't accept them, even though the troopers would put their lives on the line for them.

"We were in cramped quarters on the train, and the colonel got us out and had us marching up and down the platform to stretch our legs," said Mr. Greene, the Madisonville native who lives in Silverton.

"The mayor of Houston heard we were there, and he came out and said, 'Get them niggers back on the train.' And that's exactly what he said.

"So the colonel has us go back to a train car and assemble our .50-caliber machine guns. We went back out and marched until it was time to switch trains."

Many historians consider Buffalo Soldiers unsung heroes, troopers who did jobs a lot of white soldiers didn't want to.

"Blacks were second-class citizens in the military, and blacks were second-class citizens in society," said Pat O'Brien, a history professor and 20th century America expert at Emporia State University in Emporia, Kan.

Emporia is near Junction City, Kan., home of the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry Association, which is raising money to build a Buffalo Soldiers memorial there.

"In many ways, World War II—and the performance of the black soldiers—provided the context for the civil rights movement," Mr. O'Brien said. "It readily exposed the paradox—how could you fight against one thing overseas and promote it at home."

Mr. Greene, who joined the combat engineers and worked as a welder, landed at Normandy on D-Day. He was wounded six days later when the Jeep in which he was riding ran over a mine.

He took shrapnel in the head, hand and stomach. The next 14 days were a blur. He received the Purple Heart and an honorable discharge at a Cleveland hospital on Aug. 4, 1945.

Mr. Greene came home to Cincinnati and went to work as a railway mail clerk. He experienced more racism at home than he did abroad.

"I was in the same boxcars sorting the same mail, and they wouldn't let me join the union," he said.

Paul Greene, his son, was a U.S. Marine killed in Vietnam in 1966. Paul Greene was 19.

"I'm proud of my son's service to his country," Linwood Greene Jr. said slowly. "I'm proud of my service to my country."

Mr. Snow, who also received an honorable discharge, didn't think he would live to see the United States again.

"I had as much fun as I could because I thought I would be gone at any minute," he said. "God was with me. That's how I didn't get hurt."

Mr. Denson is most proud of his honorable discharge, dated Nov. 6, 1945. He also received the American Theater Ribbon, Good Conduct Medal and Victory Medal.

"The No. 1 thing is that honorable discharge. A lot of things happen in the service, and they had a lot of ways of busting you down," said Mr. Denson, who retired in 1981 from Cincinnati Public Schools as a plant operator.

Not far behind are his feelings for his unit.

"I liked the outfit. I liked the horses. I learned a lot," he said. "We didn't come in until the tail end, but we did a good job.

"No, we weren't actors. We were the real thing."●

SENATE RESOLUTION 264—CONGRATULATING AND THANKING CHAIRMAN ROBERT F. BENNETT AND VICE CHAIRMAN CHRISTOPHER J. DODD FOR THEIR TREMENDOUS LEADERSHIP, POISE, AND DEDICATION IN LEADING THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE YEAR 2000 TECHNOLOGY PROBLEM AND COMMENDING THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THEIR FINE WORK

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

S. RES. 264

Whereas Senator Robert F. Bennett and Senator Christopher J. Dodd had the foresight to urge Majority Leader Lott and Senator Daschle to establish the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem under Senate Resolution on April 2, 1998;

Whereas under Chairman Bennett's and Vice Chairman Dodd's leadership, the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem always acted in a bipartisan manner;

Whereas Chairman Bennett and Vice Chairman Dodd presided over 35 hearings on various aspects of technology infrastructure including utilities, health care, telecommunications, transportation, financial services, Government involvement, and litigation;

Whereas the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem became the central repository for Y2K computer problem information both nationally and internationally;

Whereas Chairman Bennett and Vice Chairman Dodd guided the Senate in working with the White House, the House of Representatives, the United Nations, and other international organizations, and the private sector in addressing the Y2K computer problem;

Whereas under Chairman Bennett's and Vice Chairman Dodd's leadership, the Committee issued 3 excellent reports that quickly became the authoritative source on the progress of the Federal Government, the private sector, and foreign countries on the Y2K computer problem;

Whereas Chairman Bennett, Vice Chairman Dodd, and the committee helped the Federal Government, industry, nations, and global enterprises learn that by working together we can solve the kinds of technology problems we will likely face in the 21st century;

Whereas Chairman Bennett and Vice Chairman Dodd always conducted hearings in a thoughtful and judicious manner, with the intent of addressing key issues so that the Senate could better evaluate and solve the problem;

Whereas because of Chairman Bennett's and Vice Chairman Dodd's initiative, the Nation and the world began to take the Y2K computer problem seriously and worked to resolve the problem; and

Whereas due to Chairman Bennett's and Vice Chairman Dodd's tremendous leadership, dedication, and the work of the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, the first potential catastrophe of the new century was avoided: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates and thanks Chairman Robert F. Bennett and Vice Chairman Christopher J. Dodd—

(1) for their tremendous leadership in addressing a massive and pervasive problem; a problem that was largely unknown, but thanks to Chairman Bennett and Vice Chairman Dodd was studied, evaluated, and resolved;

(2) for presiding over the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem which did its work in a bipartisan and fair manner; and

(3) for helping the Government and the Nation minimize the Y2K computer problem.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE AFFORDABLE EDUCATION ACT OF 1999

DODD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2857

Mr. REID (for Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. REED)) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1134) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 101 and insert the following:

SEC. 101. IDEA.

There are appropriated to carry out part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \$1,200,000,000, which amount is equal to the projected revenue increase resulting from striking the amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by section 101 of this Act as reported by the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

WYDEN AMENDMENT NO. 2858

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1134, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . DETENTION OF JUVENILES WHO UNLAWFULLY POSSESS FIREARMS IN SCHOOLS.

Section 4112(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7112(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(5) contains an assurance that the State has in effect a policy or practice that requires State and local law enforcement agencies to detain in an appropriate juvenile community-based placement or in an appropriate juvenile justice facility, for not less than 24 hours, any juvenile who unlawfully possesses a firearm in a school, upon a finding by a judicial officer that the juvenile may be a danger to himself or herself or to the community; and"

KERRY AMENDMENT NO. 2859

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1134, supra; as follows:

On page 21, between lines 3 and 4, insert:

SEC. 204. EXCLUSION OF NATIONAL SERVICE EDUCATIONAL AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 117 (relating to qualified scholarships) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) QUALIFIED NATIONAL SERVICE EDUCATIONAL AWARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Gross income for any taxable year shall not include any qualified national service educational award.

“(2) QUALIFIED NATIONAL SERVICE EDUCATIONAL AWARD.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified national service educational award’ means any amount received by an individual in a taxable year as a national service educational award or other amount under section 148 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12604) to the extent such amount does not exceed the qualified tuition and related expenses (as defined in subsection (b)(2)) of the individual for such taxable year.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The total amount of the qualified tuition and related expenses (as so defined) which may be taken into account under subparagraph (A) with respect to an individual for the taxable year shall be reduced (after the application of the reduction provided in section 25A(g)(2)) by the amount of such expenses which were taken into account in determining the credit allowed to the taxpayer or any other person under section 25A with respect to such expenses.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts received in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

HUTCHISON AMENDMENT 2860

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill, S. 1134, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. CAREERS TO CLASSROOMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms “elementary school”, “local educational agency”, “secondary school”, and “Secretary” have the meanings given the terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

(2) ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION OR LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS.—The term “alternative certification or licensure requirements” means State or local teacher certification or licensure requirements that permit a demonstrated competence in appropriate subject areas gained in careers outside of education to be substituted for traditional teacher training course work.

(3) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—The term “eligible individual” means an individual who has received—

(A) in the case of an individual applying for assistance for placement as an elementary school or secondary school teacher, a baccalaureate or advanced degree from an institution of higher education; or

(B) in the case of an individual applying for assistance for placement as a teacher’s aide in an elementary school or secondary school, an associate, baccalaureate, or advanced degree from an institution of higher education.

(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)

(5) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States of the United States,

the District of Columbia, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Republic of Palau, and the United States Virgin Islands.

(b) PLACEMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program of awarding grants to States—

(1) to enable the States to assist eligible individuals to obtain—

(A) certification or licensure as elementary school or secondary school teachers; or

(B) the credentials necessary to serve as teachers’ aides; and

(2) to facilitate the employment of the eligible individuals by local educational agencies identified under subsection (c)(2) as experiencing a shortage of teachers or teachers’ aides.

(c) STATES WITH ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS AND TEACHER AND TEACHER’S AIDE SHORTAGES.—Upon the establishment of the placement program authorized by subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a survey of States to identify those States that have alternative certification or licensure requirements for teachers;

(2) periodically request information from States identified under paragraph (1) to identify in these States those local educational agencies that—

(A) are receiving grants under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) as a result of having within their jurisdictions concentrations of children from low-income families; and

(B) are also experiencing a shortage of qualified teachers, in particular a shortage of science, mathematics, computer science, or engineering teachers; and

(3) periodically request information from all States to identify local educational agencies that—

(A) are receiving grants under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) as a result of having within their jurisdictions concentrations of children from low-income families; and

(B) are experiencing a shortage of teachers’ aides.

(d) SELECTION OF ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Selection of eligible individuals to participate in the placement program authorized by subsection (b) shall be made on the basis of applications submitted to a State. An application shall be in such form and contain such information as the State may require.

(2) PRIORITY.—In selecting eligible individuals to receive assistance for placement as elementary school or secondary school teachers, the State shall give priority to eligible individuals who—

(A) have substantial, demonstrated career experience in science, mathematics, computer science, or engineering and agree to seek employment as science, mathematics, computer science, or engineering teachers in elementary schools or secondary schools; or

(B) have substantial, demonstrated career experience in another subject area identified by the State as important for national educational objectives and agree to seek employment in that subject area in elementary schools or secondary schools.

(e) AGREEMENT.—An eligible individual selected to participate in the placement program authorized by subsection (b) shall be required to enter into an agreement with the State, in which the eligible individual agrees—

(1) to obtain, within such time as the State may require, certification or licensure as an elementary school or secondary school teacher or the necessary credentials to serve as a teacher’s aide in an elementary school or secondary school; and

(2) to accept—

(A) in the case of an eligible individual selected for assistance for placement as a teacher, an offer of full-time employment as an elementary school or secondary school teacher for not less than two school years with a local educational agency identified under subsection (c)(2), to begin the school year after obtaining that certification or licensure; or

(B) in the case of an eligible individual selected for assistance for placement as a teacher’s aide, an offer of full-time employment as a teacher’s aide in an elementary school or secondary school for not less than 2 school years with a local educational agency identified under subsection (c)(3), to begin the school year after obtaining the necessary credentials.

(f) STIPEND FOR PARTICIPANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State shall pay to an eligible individual participating in the placement program a stipend in an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) \$5,000; or

(B) the total costs of the type described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (8), and (9) of section 472 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 10871l) incurred by the eligible individual while obtaining teacher certification or licensure or the necessary credentials to serve as a teacher’s aide and employment as an elementary school or secondary school teacher or teacher aide.

(2) RELATION TO OTHER ASSISTANCE.—A stipend paid under paragraph (1) shall be taken into account in determining the eligibility of the eligible individual for Federal student financial assistance provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

(g) GRANTS TO FACILITATE PLACEMENT.—

(1) TEACHERS.—In the case of an eligible individual in the placement program obtaining teacher certification or licensure, the State may offer to enter into an agreement under this subsection with the first local educational agency identified under subsection (b)(2) that employs the eligible individual as a full-time elementary school or secondary school teacher after the eligible individual obtains teacher certification or licensure.

(2) TEACHER’S AIDES.—In the case of an eligible individual in the program obtaining credentials to serve as a teacher’s aide, the State may offer to enter into an agreement under this subsection with the first local educational agency identified under subsection (b)(3) that employs the participant as a full-time teacher’s aide.

(3) AGREEMENTS CONTRACTS.—Under an agreement referred to in paragraph (1) or (2)—

(A) the local educational agency shall agree to employ the eligible individual full time for not less than 2 consecutive school years (at a basic salary to be certified to the State) in a school of the local educational agency that—

(i) serves a concentration of children from low-income families; and

(ii) has an exceptional need for eligible individuals; and

(B) the State shall agree to pay to the local educational agency for each eligible individual, from amounts provided under this section, \$5,000 per year for a maximum of 2 years.

(h) REIMBURSEMENT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible individual in the placement program fails to obtain teacher certification or licensure, employment as an elementary school or secondary school teacher, or employment as a teacher's aide as required under the agreement or voluntarily leaves, or is terminated for cause, from the employment during the 2 years of required service, the eligible individual shall be required to reimburse the State for any stipend paid to the eligible individual under subsection (f)(1) in an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount of the stipend as the unserved portion of required service bears to the 2 years of required service. A State shall forward the proceeds of any reimbursement received under this paragraph to the Secretary.

(2) OBLIGATION TO REIMBURSE.—The obligation to reimburse the State under this subsection is, for all purposes, a debt owing the United States. A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 shall not release a participant from the obligation to reimburse the State. Any amount owed by an eligible individual under paragraph (1) shall bear interest at the rate equal to the highest rate being paid by the United States on the day on which the reimbursement is determined to be due for securities having maturities of 90 days or less and shall accrue from the day on which the eligible individual is first notified of the amount due.

(i) EXCEPTIONS TO REIMBURSEMENT PROVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible individual in the placement program shall not be considered to be in violation of an agreement entered into under subsection (e) during any period in which the participant—

(A) is pursuing a full-time course of study related to the field of teaching at an institution of higher education;

(B) is serving on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces;

(C) is temporarily totally disabled for a period of time not to exceed 3 years as established by sworn affidavit of a qualified physician;

(D) is unable to secure employment for a period not to exceed 12 months by reason of the care required by a spouse who is disabled;

(E) is seeking and unable to find full-time employment as a teacher or teacher's aide in an elementary school or secondary school for a single period not to exceed 27 months; or

(F) satisfies the provisions of additional reimbursement exceptions that may be prescribed by the Secretary.

(2) FORGIVENESS.—An eligible individual shall be excused from reimbursement under subsection (h) if the eligible individual becomes permanently totally disabled as established by sworn affidavit of a qualified physician. The Secretary may also waive reimbursement in cases of extreme hardship to the participant, as determined by the Secretary.

ROBB (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2861

Mr. ROBB (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1134, supra; as follows:

Strike section 101 and insert:

SEC. 101. MODIFICATIONS TO EDUCATION INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS.

(a) MAXIMUM ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 530(b)(1)(A)(iii) (defining education individual retirement account) is amended by striking "\$500" and inserting "the contribution limit for such taxable year".

(2) CONTRIBUTION LIMIT.—Section 530(b) (relating to definitions and special rules) is

amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) CONTRIBUTION LIMIT.—The term 'contribution limit' means \$500 (\$2,000 in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2000, and ending before January 1, 2004)."

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4973(e)(1)(A) is amended by striking "\$500" and inserting "the contribution limit (as defined in section 530(b)(4)) for such taxable year".

(b) WAIVER OF AGE LIMITATIONS FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—Section 530(b)(1) (defining education individual retirement account) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

"The age limitations in the preceding sentence and paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (d) shall not apply to any designated beneficiary with special needs (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary)."

(c) ENTITIES PERMITTED TO CONTRIBUTE TO ACCOUNTS.—Section 530(c)(1) (relating to reduction in permitted contributions based on adjusted gross income) is amended by striking "The maximum amount which a contributor" and inserting "In the case of a contributor who is an individual, the maximum amount the contributor".

(d) TIME WHEN CONTRIBUTIONS DEEMED MADE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 530(b) (relating to definitions and special rules) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) TIME WHEN CONTRIBUTIONS DEEMED MADE.—An individual shall be deemed to have made a contribution to an education individual retirement account on the last day of the preceding taxable year if the contribution is made on account of such taxable year and is made not later than the time prescribed by law for filing the return for such taxable year (not including extensions thereof)."

(2) EXTENSION OF TIME TO RETURN EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—Subparagraph (C) of section 530(d)(4) (relating to additional tax for distributions not used for educational expenses) is amended—

(A) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

"(i) such distribution is made before the 1st day of the 6th month of the taxable year following the taxable year, and", and

(B) by striking "DUE DATE OF RETURN" in the heading and inserting "JUNE".

(e) COORDINATION WITH HOPE AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDITS AND QUALIFIED TUITION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 530(d)(2)(C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) COORDINATION WITH HOPE AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDITS AND QUALIFIED TUITION PROGRAMS.—

"(i) CREDIT COORDINATION.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), subparagraph (A) shall not apply for any taxable year to any qualified higher education expenses with respect to any individual if a credit is allowed under section 25A with respect to such expenses for such taxable year.

"(II) SPECIAL COORDINATION RULE.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2000, and before January 1, 2004, subclause (I) shall not apply, but the total amount of qualified higher education expenses otherwise taken into account under subparagraph (A) with respect to an individual for such taxable year shall be reduced (after the application of the reduction provided in section 25A(g)(2)) by the amount of such expenses which were taken into account in determining the credit allowed to the tax-

payer or any other person under section 25A with respect to such expenses.

"(ii) COORDINATION WITH QUALIFIED TUITION PROGRAMS.—If the aggregate distributions to which subparagraph (A) and section 529(c)(3)(B) apply exceed the total amount of qualified higher education expenses otherwise taken into account under subparagraph (A) (after the application of clause (i)) with respect to an individual for any taxable year, the taxpayer shall allocate such expenses among such distributions for purposes of determining the amount of the exclusion under subparagraph (A) and section 529(c)(3)(B)."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subsection (e) of section 25A is amended to read as follows:

"(e) ELECTION NOT TO HAVE SECTION APPLY.—A taxpayer may elect not to have this section apply with respect to the qualified tuition and related expenses of an individual for any taxable year."

(B) Section 135(d)(2)(A) is amended by striking "allowable" and inserting "allowed".

(C) Section 530(b)(2)(A) is amended by striking ", reduced as provided in section 25A(g)(2)".

(D) Section 530(d)(2)(D) is amended—

(i) by striking "or credit", and

(ii) by striking "CREDIT OR" in the heading.

(E) Section 4973(e)(1) is amended by adding "and" at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking subparagraph (B), and by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(F) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 101A. EXPANSION OF INCENTIVES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Record numbers of students are enrolled in our Nation's elementary and secondary schools and that record is expected to be broken every year through 2007. The record numbers are straining many school facilities. Addressing that growth will require an increasing commitment of resources to build and modernize schools, and to hire and train new teachers. In addition, the increasing use of technology in the workplace is creating new demands to incorporate computers and other high-technology equipment into the classroom and into curricula.

(2) The General Accounting Office (in this section referred to as the "GAO") has performed a comprehensive survey of the Nation's public elementary and secondary school facilities and has found severe levels of disrepair in all areas of the United States. The GAO report concluded that more than 14,000,000 children attend schools in need of extensive repair or replacement, 7,000,000 children attend schools with life safety code violations, and 12,000,000 children attend schools with leaky roofs.

(3) The General Accounting Office has found the problem of crumbling schools transcends demographic and geographic boundaries. At 38 percent of urban schools, 30 percent of rural schools, and 29 percent of suburban schools, at least one building is in need of extensive repair or should be completely replaced.

(4) The condition of school facilities has a direct effect on the safety of students and teachers and on the ability of students to learn. Academic research has provided a direct correlation between the condition of school facilities and student achievement. At Georgetown University, researchers have found the test scores of students assigned to schools in poor condition can be expected to fall 10.9 percentage points below the test scores of students in buildings in excellent condition. Similar studies have demonstrated up to a 20 percent improvement in

test scores when students were moved from a poor facility to a new facility.

(5) Furthermore, a recent study by the Environmental Working Group concluded that portable trailers, utilized by many school districts to accommodate school over-crowding, can "expose children to toxic chemicals at levels that pose an unacceptable risk of cancer or other serious illnesses." Because ventilation in portable trailers is poor, the pollution through the build-up of toxins can be significant. This is particularly hazardous to those children who have asthma. The prevalence of asthma in children increased by 160 percent between 1980 and 1994. The report also stated, "Schools are facing two epidemics: an epidemic of deteriorating facilities and an epidemic of asthma among children."

(6) The General Accounting Office has found most schools are not prepared to incorporate modern technology in the classroom. Forty-six percent of schools lack adequate electrical wiring to support the full-scale use of technology. More than a third of schools lack the requisite electrical power. Fifty-six percent of schools have insufficient phone lines for modems.

(7) The Department of Education has reported that elementary and secondary school enrollment, already at a record high level, will continue to grow over the next 10 years, and that in order to accommodate this growth, the United States will need to build an additional 2,400 schools.

(8) The General Accounting Office has determined the cost of bringing schools up to good, overall condition to be \$112,000,000,000, not including the cost of modernizing schools to accommodate technology, or the cost of building additional facilities needed to meet record enrollment levels.

(9) Schools run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (in this section referred to as the "BIA") for Native American children are also in dire need of repair and renovation. The General Accounting Office has reported that the cost of total inventory repairs needed for BIA facilities is \$754,000,000. The December 1997 report by the Comptroller General of the United States states that, "Compared with other schools nationally, BIA schools are generally in poorer physical condition, have more unsatisfactory environmental factors, more often lack key facilities requirements for education reform, and are less able to support computer and communications technology."

(10) Across the Nation, schools will need to recruit and hire an additional 2,000,000 teachers during the period from 1998 through 2008. More than 200,000 teachers will be needed annually, yet current teacher development programs produce only 100,000 to 150,000 teachers per year. This level of recruitment is simply the level needed to maintain existing student-teacher ratios.

(11) The rapid growth in the student population, in addition to the imminent shortage of qualified teachers and recent efforts by Congress to help States reduce class size, present urgent infrastructure needs across the Nation.

(12) State and local financing mechanisms have proven inadequate to meet the challenges facing today's aging school facilities. Large numbers of local educational agencies have difficulties securing financing for school facility improvement.

(13) The Federal Government has provided resources for school construction in the past. For example, between 1933 and 1939, the Federal Government assisted in 70 percent of all new school construction.

(14) The Federal Government can support elementary and secondary school facilities without interfering in issues of local control, and should help communities leverage addi-

tional funds for the improvement of elementary and secondary school facilities.

(b) PUBLIC SCHOOL MODERNIZATION.—Chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter X—Public School Modernization Provisions

"Part I. Credit to holders of qualified public school modernization bonds.

"Part II. Qualified school construction bonds.

"Part III. Incentives for education zones.

"PART I—CREDIT TO HOLDERS OF QUALIFIED PUBLIC SCHOOL MODERNIZATION BONDS

"Sec. 1400F. Credit to holders of qualified public school modernization bonds.

"SEC. 1400F. CREDIT TO HOLDERS OF QUALIFIED PUBLIC SCHOOL MODERNIZATION BONDS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of a taxpayer who holds a qualified public school modernization bond on a credit allowance date of such bond which occurs during the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year an amount equal to the sum of the credits determined under subsection (b) with respect to credit allowance dates during such year on which the taxpayer holds such bond.

"(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the credit determined under this subsection with respect to any credit allowance date for a qualified public school modernization bond is 25 percent of the annual credit determined with respect to such bond.

"(2) ANNUAL CREDIT.—The annual credit determined with respect to any qualified public school modernization bond is the product of—

"(A) the applicable credit rate, multiplied by

"(B) the outstanding face amount of the bond.

"(3) APPLICABLE CREDIT RATE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable credit rate with respect to an issue is the rate equal to an average market yield (as of the day before the date of issuance of the issue) on outstanding long-term corporate debt obligations (determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary).

"(4) SPECIAL RULE FOR ISSUANCE AND REDEMPTION.—In the case of a bond which is issued during the 3-month period ending on a credit allowance date, the amount of the credit determined under this subsection with respect to such credit allowance date shall be a ratable portion of the credit otherwise determined based on the portion of the 3-month period during which the bond is outstanding. A similar rule shall apply when the bond is redeemed.

"(c) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess of—

"(A) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55, over

"(B) the sum of the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than subpart C thereof, relating to refundable credits).

"(2) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED CREDIT.—If the credit allowable under subsection (a) exceeds the limitation imposed by paragraph (1) for such taxable year, such excess shall be carried to the succeeding taxable year and added to the credit allowable under subsection (a) for such taxable year.

"(d) QUALIFIED PUBLIC SCHOOL MODERNIZATION BOND; CREDIT ALLOWANCE DATE.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) QUALIFIED PUBLIC SCHOOL MODERNIZATION BOND.—The term 'qualified public school modernization bond' means—

"(A) a qualified school construction bond, and

"(B) a qualified zone academy bond.

"(2) CREDIT ALLOWANCE DATE.—The term 'credit allowance date' means—

"(A) March 15,

"(B) June 15,

"(C) September 15, and

"(D) December 15.

Such term includes the last day on which the bond is outstanding.

"(e) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subchapter—

"(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'local educational agency' has the meaning given to such term by section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Such term includes the local educational agency that serves the District of Columbia but does not include any other State agency.

"(2) BOND.—The term 'bond' includes any obligation.

"(3) STATE.—The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and any possession of the United States.

"(4) PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITY.—The term 'public school facility' shall not include any facility which is not owned by a State or local government or any agency or instrumentality of a State or local government.

"(f) CREDIT INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME.—Gross income includes the amount of the credit allowed to the taxpayer under this section (determined without regard to subsection (c)) and the amount so included shall be treated as interest income.

"(g) BONDS HELD BY REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—If any qualified public school modernization bond is held by a regulated investment company, the credit determined under subsection (a) shall be allowed to shareholders of such company under procedures prescribed by the Secretary.

"(h) CREDITS MAY BE STRIPPED.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There may be a separation (including at issuance) of the ownership of a qualified public school modernization bond and the entitlement to the credit under this section with respect to such bond. In case of any such separation, the credit under this section shall be allowed to the person who on the credit allowance date holds the instrument evidencing the entitlement to the credit and not to the holder of the bond.

"(2) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—In the case of a separation described in paragraph (1), the rules of section 1286 shall apply to the qualified public school modernization bond as if it were a stripped bond and to the credit under this section as if it were a stripped coupon.

"(i) TREATMENT FOR ESTIMATED TAX PURPOSES.—Solely for purposes of sections 6654 and 6655, the credit allowed by this section to a taxpayer by reason of holding qualified public school modernization bonds on a credit allowance date shall be treated as if it were a payment of estimated tax made by the taxpayer on such date.

"(j) CREDIT MAY BE TRANSFERRED.—Nothing in any law or rule of law shall be construed to limit the transferability of the credit allowed by this section through sale and repurchase agreements.

"(k) CREDIT TREATED AS ALLOWED UNDER PART IV OF SUBCHAPTER A.—For purposes of subtitle F, the credit allowed by this section shall be treated as a credit allowable under part IV of subchapter A of this chapter.

"(l) REPORTING.—Issuers of qualified public school modernization bonds shall submit reports similar to the reports required under section 149(e).

“(m) TERMINATION.—This section shall not apply to any bond issued after September 30, 2005.

“PART II—QUALIFIED SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BONDS

“Sec. 1400G. Qualified school construction bonds.

“SEC. 1400G. QUALIFIED SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BONDS.

“(a) QUALIFIED SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BOND.—For purposes of this subchapter, the term ‘qualified school construction bond’ means any bond issued as part of an issue if—

“(1) 95 percent or more of the proceeds of such issue are to be used for the construction, rehabilitation, or repair of a public school facility or for the acquisition of land on which such a facility is to be constructed with part of the proceeds of such issue,

“(2) the bond is issued by a State or local government within the jurisdiction of which such school is located,

“(3) the issuer designates such bond for purposes of this section, and

“(4) the term of each bond which is part of such issue does not exceed 15 years.

“(b) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF BONDS DESIGNATED.—The maximum aggregate face amount of bonds issued during any calendar year which may be designated under subsection (a) by any issuer shall not exceed the sum of—

“(1) the limitation amount allocated under subsection (d) for such calendar year to such issuer, and

“(2) if such issuer is a large local educational agency (as defined in subsection (e)(4)) or is issuing on behalf of such an agency, the limitation amount allocated under subsection (e) for such calendar year to such agency.

“(c) NATIONAL LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF BONDS DESIGNATED.—There is a national qualified school construction bond limitation for each calendar year. Such limitation is—

“(1) \$11,800,000,000 for 2001,

“(2) \$11,800,000,000 for 2005, and

“(3) except as provided in subsection (f), zero after 2001 and before 2005, and after 2005.

“(d) SIXTY-FIVE PERCENT OF LIMITATION ALLOCATED AMONG STATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Sixty-five percent of the limitation applicable under subsection (c) for any calendar year shall be allocated among the States under paragraph (2) by the Secretary. The limitation amount allocated to a State under the preceding sentence shall be allocated by the State to issuers within such State and such allocations may be made only if there is an approved State application.

“(2) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—The amount to be allocated under paragraph (1) for any calendar year shall be allocated among the States in proportion to the respective amounts each such State received for Basic Grants under subpart 2 of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6331 et seq.) for the most recent fiscal year ending before such calendar year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, Basic Grants attributable to large local educational agencies (as defined in subsection (e)) shall be disregarded.

“(3) MINIMUM ALLOCATIONS TO STATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall adjust the allocations under this subsection for any calendar year for each State to the extent necessary to ensure that the sum of—

“(i) the amount allocated to such State under this subsection for such year, and

“(ii) the aggregate amounts allocated under subsection (e) to large local educational agencies in such State for such year,

is not less than an amount equal to such State’s minimum percentage of the amount

to be allocated under paragraph (1) for the calendar year.

“(B) MINIMUM PERCENTAGE.—A State’s minimum percentage for any calendar year is the minimum percentage described in section 1124(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6334(d)) for such State for the most recent fiscal year ending before such calendar year.

“(4) ALLOCATIONS TO CERTAIN POSSESSIONS.—The amount to be allocated under paragraph (1) to any possession of the United States other than Puerto Rico shall be the amount which would have been allocated if all allocations under paragraph (1) were made on the basis of respective populations of individuals below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget). In making other allocations, the amount to be allocated under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by the aggregate amount allocated under this paragraph to possessions of the United States.

“(5) ALLOCATIONS FOR INDIAN SCHOOLS.—In addition to the amounts otherwise allocated under this subsection, \$200,000,000 for calendar year 2001, and \$200,000,000 for calendar year 2005, shall be allocated by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the construction, rehabilitation, and repair of schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the case of amounts allocated under the preceding sentence, Indian tribal governments (as defined in section 7871) shall be treated as qualified issuers for purposes of this subchapter.

“(6) APPROVED STATE APPLICATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘approved State application’ means an application which is approved by the Secretary of Education and which includes—

“(A) the results of a recent publicly-available survey (undertaken by the State with the involvement of local education officials, members of the public, and experts in school construction and management) of such State’s needs for public school facilities, including descriptions of—

“(i) health and safety problems at such facilities,

“(ii) the capacity of public schools in the State to house projected enrollments, and

“(iii) the extent to which the public schools in the State offer the physical infrastructure needed to provide a high-quality education to all students, and

“(B) a description of how the State will allocate to local educational agencies, or otherwise use, its allocation under this subsection to address the needs identified under subparagraph (A), including a description of how it will—

“(i) give highest priority to localities with the greatest needs, as demonstrated by inadequate school facilities coupled with a low level of resources to meet those needs,

“(ii) use its allocation under this subsection to assist localities that lack the fiscal capacity to issue bonds on their own, and

“(iii) ensure that its allocation under this subsection is used only to supplement, and not supplant, the amount of school construction, rehabilitation, and repair in the State that would have occurred in the absence of such allocation.

Any allocation under paragraph (1) by a State shall be binding if such State reasonably determined that the allocation was in accordance with the plan approved under this paragraph.

“(e) THIRTY-FIVE PERCENT OF LIMITATION ALLOCATED AMONG LARGEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Thirty-five percent of the limitation applicable under subsection (c) for any calendar year shall be allocated under paragraph (2) by the Secretary among

local educational agencies which are large local educational agencies for such year. No qualified school construction bond may be issued by reason of an allocation to a large local educational agency under the preceding sentence unless such agency has an approved local application.

“(2) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—The amount to be allocated under paragraph (1) for any calendar year shall be allocated among large local educational agencies in proportion to the respective amounts each such agency received for Basic Grants under subpart 2 of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6331 et seq.) for the most recent fiscal year ending before such calendar year.

“(3) ALLOCATION OF UNUSED LIMITATION TO STATE.—The amount allocated under this subsection to a large local educational agency for any calendar year may be reallocated by such agency to the State in which such agency is located for such calendar year. Any amount reallocated to a State under the preceding sentence may be allocated as provided in subsection (d)(1).

“(4) LARGE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘large local educational agency’ means, with respect to a calendar year, any local educational agency if such agency is—

“(A) among the 100 local educational agencies with the largest numbers of children aged 5 through 17 from families living below the poverty level, as determined by the Secretary using the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce that are satisfactory to the Secretary, or

“(B) 1 of not more than 25 local educational agencies (other than those described in subparagraph (A)) that the Secretary of Education determines (based on the most recent data available satisfactory to the Secretary) are in particular need of assistance, based on a low level of resources for school construction, a high level of enrollment growth, or such other factors as the Secretary deems appropriate.

“(5) APPROVED LOCAL APPLICATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘approved local application’ means an application which is approved by the Secretary of Education and which includes—

“(A) the results of a recent publicly-available survey (undertaken by the local educational agency or the State with the involvement of school officials, members of the public, and experts in school construction and management) of such agency’s needs for public school facilities, including descriptions of—

“(i) the overall condition of the local educational agency’s school facilities, including health and safety problems,

“(ii) the overcrowded conditions of the agency’s schools and the capacity of such schools to house projected enrollments, and

“(iii) the extent to which the agency’s schools offer the physical infrastructure needed to provide a high-quality education to all students,

“(B) a description of how the local educational agency will use its allocation under this subsection to address the needs identified under subparagraph (A), including a description of how the agency will—

“(i) give high priority to localities with the greatest needs, as demonstrated by inadequate school facilities coupled with a low level of resources to meet those needs,

“(ii) use its allocation under this subsection to assist localities that lack the fiscal capacity to issue bonds on their own,

“(iii) ensure that its allocation under this subsection is used only to supplement, and not supplant, the amount of school construction, rehabilitation, and repair in the State

that would have occurred in the absence of such allocation, and

“(iv) ensure that the needs of both rural and urban areas are recognized, and

“(C) a description of how the local educational agency will ensure that its allocation under this subsection is used only to supplement, and not supplant, the amount of school construction, rehabilitation, or repair in the locality that would have occurred in the absence of such allocation.

A rule similar to the rule of the last sentence of subsection (d)(6) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.

“(f) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED LIMITATION.—If for any calendar year—

“(1) the amount allocated under subsection (d) to any State, exceeds

“(2) the amount of bonds issued during such year which are designated under subsection (a) pursuant to such allocation,

the limitation amount under such subsection for such State for the following calendar year shall be increased by the amount of such excess. A similar rule shall apply to the amounts allocated under subsection (d)(5) or (e).

“(g) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO ARBITRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A bond shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirement of subsection (a)(1) solely by reason of the fact that the proceeds of the issue of which such bond is a part are invested for a temporary period (but not more than 36 months) until such proceeds are needed for the purpose for which such issue was issued.

“(2) BINDING COMMITMENT REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to an issue only if, as of the date of issuance, there is a reasonable expectation that—

“(A) at least 10 percent of the proceeds of the issue will be spent within the 6-month period beginning on such date for the purpose for which such issue was issued, and

“(B) the remaining proceeds of the issue will be spent with due diligence for such purpose.

“(3) EARNINGS ON PROCEEDS.—Any earnings on proceeds during the temporary period shall be treated as proceeds of the issue for purposes of applying subsection (a)(1) and paragraph (1) of this subsection.

“PART III—INCENTIVES FOR EDUCATION ZONES

“Sec. 1400H. Qualified zone academy bonds.

“SEC. 1400H. QUALIFIED ZONE ACADEMY BONDS.

“(a) QUALIFIED ZONE ACADEMY BOND.—For purposes of this subchapter—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified zone academy bond’ means any bond issued as part of an issue if—

“(A) 95 percent or more of the proceeds of such issue are to be used for a qualified purpose with respect to a qualified zone academy established by a local educational agency,

“(B) the bond is issued by a State or local government within the jurisdiction of which such academy is located,

“(C) the issuer—

“(i) designates such bond for purposes of this section,

“(ii) certifies that it has written assurances that the private business contribution requirement of paragraph (2) will be met with respect to such academy, and

“(iii) certifies that it has the written approval of the local educational agency for such bond issuance, and

“(D) the term of each bond which is part of such issue does not exceed 15 years.

Rules similar to the rules of section 1400G(g) shall apply for purposes of paragraph (1).

“(2) PRIVATE BUSINESS CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the private business contribution requirement of this paragraph is met with respect to any issue if the local educational agency that established the qualified zone academy has written commitments from private entities to make qualified contributions having a present value (as of the date of issuance of the issue) of not less than 10 percent of the proceeds of the issue.

“(B) QUALIFIED CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘qualified contribution’ means any contribution (of a type and quality acceptable to the local educational agency) of—

“(i) equipment for use in the qualified zone academy (including state-of-the-art technology and vocational equipment),

“(ii) technical assistance in developing curriculum or in training teachers in order to promote appropriate market driven technology in the classroom,

“(iii) services of employees as volunteer mentors,

“(iv) internships, field trips, or other educational opportunities outside the academy for students, or

“(v) any other property or service specified by the local educational agency.

“(3) QUALIFIED ZONE ACADEMY.—The term ‘qualified zone academy’ means any public school (or academic program within a public school) which is established by and operated under the supervision of a local educational agency to provide education or training below the postsecondary level if—

“(A) such public school or program (as the case may be) is designed in cooperation with business to enhance the academic curriculum, increase graduation and employment rates, and better prepare students for the rigors of college and the increasingly complex workforce,

“(B) students in such public school or program (as the case may be) will be subject to the same academic standards and assessments as other students educated by the local educational agency,

“(C) the comprehensive education plan of such public school or program is approved by the local educational agency, and

“(D)(i) such public school is located in an empowerment zone or enterprise community (including any such zone or community designated after the date of the enactment of this section), or

“(ii) there is a reasonable expectation (as of the date of issuance of the bonds) that at least 35 percent of the students attending such school or participating in such program (as the case may be) will be eligible for free or reduced-cost lunches under the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act.

“(4) QUALIFIED PURPOSE.—The term ‘qualified purpose’ means, with respect to any qualified zone academy—

“(A) constructing, rehabilitating, or repairing the public school facility in which the academy is established,

“(B) acquiring the land on which such facility is to be constructed with part of the proceeds of such issue,

“(C) providing equipment for use at such academy,

“(D) developing course materials for education to be provided at such academy, and

“(E) training teachers and other school personnel in such academy.

“(b) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF BONDS DESIGNATED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is a national zone academy bond limitation for each calendar year. Such limitation is—

“(A) \$400,000,000 for 1998,

“(B) \$400,000,000 for 1999,

“(C) \$400,000,000 for 2000,

“(D) \$400,000,000 for 2001, and

“(C) except as provided in paragraph (3), zero after 2001.

“(2) ALLOCATION OF LIMITATION.—

“(A) ALLOCATION AMONG STATES.—

“(i) 1998 AND 1999 LIMITATIONS.—The national zone academy bond limitations for calendar years 1998 and 1999 shall be allocated by the Secretary among the States on the basis of their respective populations of individuals below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget).

“(ii) LIMITATION AFTER 1999.—The national zone academy bond limitation for any calendar year after 1999 shall be allocated by the Secretary among the States in the manner prescribed by section 1400G(d); except that in making the allocation under this clause, the Secretary shall take into account—

“(I) Basic Grants attributable to large local educational agencies (as defined in section 1400G(e)(4)).

“(II) the national zone academy bond limitation.

“(B) ALLOCATION TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—The limitation amount allocated to a State under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated by the State education agency to qualified zone academies within such State.

“(C) DESIGNATION SUBJECT TO LIMITATION AMOUNT.—The maximum aggregate face amount of bonds issued during any calendar year which may be designated under subsection (a) with respect to any qualified zone academy shall not exceed the limitation amount allocated to such academy under subparagraph (B) for such calendar year.

“(3) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED LIMITATION.—If for any calendar year—

“(A) the limitation amount under this subsection for any State, exceeds

“(B) the amount of bonds issued during such year which are designated under subsection (a) (or the corresponding provisions of prior law) with respect to qualified zone academies within such State,

the limitation amount under this subsection for such State for the following calendar year shall be increased by the amount of such excess. Any carryforward of a limitation amount may be carried only to the first 2 years (3 years for carryforwards from 1998 or 1999) following the unused limitation year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a limitation amount shall be treated as used on a first-in first-out basis.”

(c) REPORTING.—Subsection (d) of section 6049 (relating to returns regarding payments of interest) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) REPORTING OF CREDIT ON QUALIFIED PUBLIC SCHOOL MODERNIZATION BONDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘interest’ includes amounts includable in gross income under section 1400F(f) and such amounts shall be treated as paid on the credit allowance date (as defined in section 1400F(d)(2)).

“(B) REPORTING TO CORPORATIONS, ETC.—Except as otherwise provided in regulations, in the case of any interest described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, subsection (b)(4) of this section shall be applied without regard to subparagraphs (A), (H), (I), (J), (K), and (L)(i).

“(C) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as are necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, including regulations which require more frequent or more detailed reporting.”

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subchapter U of chapter 1 is amended by striking part IV, by redesignating part V as part IV, and by redesignating section 1397F as section 1397E.

(2) The table of subchapters for chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Subchapter X. Public school modernization provisions.”

(3) The table of parts of subchapter U of chapter 1 is amended by striking the last 2 items and inserting the following item:

“Part IV. Regulations.”

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to obligations issued after December 31, 1999.

(2) REPEAL OF RESTRICTION ON ZONE ACADEMY BOND HOLDERS.—In the case of bonds to which section 1397E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act) applies, the limitation of such section to eligible taxpayers (as defined in subsection (d)(6) of such section) shall not apply after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 101C. PUBLIC SCHOOL REPAIR AND RENOVATION.

Title XII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE XII—PUBLIC SCHOOL REPAIR AND RENOVATION

“SEC. 12001. FINDINGS.

“Congress finds the following:

“(1) The General Accounting Office estimated in 1995 that it would cost \$112,000,000,000 to bring our Nation’s school facilities into good overall condition.

“(2) The General Accounting Office also found in 1995 that 60 percent of the Nation’s schools, serving 28,000,000 students, reported that 1 or more building features, such as roofs and plumbing, needed to be extensively repaired, overhauled, or replaced.

“(3) The National Center for Education Statistics reported that the average age for a school building in 1998 was 42 years and that local educational agencies with relatively high rates of poverty tend to have relatively old buildings.

“(4) School condition is positively correlated with student achievement, according to a number of research studies.

“(5) The results of a recent survey indicate that the condition of schools with large proportions of students living on Indian lands is particularly poor.

“(6) While school repair and renovation are primarily a State and local concern, some States and communities are not, on their own, able to meet the burden of providing adequate school facilities for all students, and the poorest communities have had the greatest difficulty meeting this need. It is, therefore, appropriate for the Federal Government to provide assistance to high-need communities for school repair and renovation.

“SEC. 12002. PURPOSE.

“The purpose of this title is to assist high-need local educational agencies in making urgent repairs and renovations to public school facilities in order to—

“(1) reduce health and safety problems, including violations of State or local fire codes, faced by students; and

“(2) improve the ability of students to learn in their school environment.

“SEC. 12003. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A recipient of a grant or loan under this title shall use the grant or loan funds to carry out the purpose of this title by—

“(1) repairing or replacing roofs, electrical wiring, or plumbing systems;

“(2) repairing, replacing, or installing heating, ventilation, or air conditioning systems;

“(3) ensuring that repairs and renovations under this title comply with the requirements of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 relating to the accessibility of public school programs to individuals with disabilities; and

“(4) making other types of school repairs and renovations that the Secretary may reasonably determine are urgently needed, particularly projects to correct facilities problems that endanger the health and safety of students and staff such as violations of State or local fire codes.

“(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not approve an application for a grant or loan under this title unless the applicant demonstrates to the Secretary’s satisfaction that the applicant lacks sufficient funds, from other sources, to carry out the repairs or renovations for which the applicant is requesting assistance.

“SEC. 12004. GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES WITH HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF STUDENTS LIVING ON INDIAN LANDS.

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds available under section 12008(a), the Secretary shall award grants to local educational agencies to enable the agencies to carry out the authorized activities described in section 12003 and subsection (e).

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A local educational agency is eligible for a grant under this section if the number of children determined under section 8003(a)(1)(C) of this Act for that agency constituted at least 50 percent of the number of children who were in average daily attendance at the schools of the agency during the preceding school year.

“(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall allocate funds available to carry out this section to eligible local educational agencies based on their respective numbers of children in average daily attendance who are counted under section 8003(a)(1)(C) of this Act.

“(d) APPLICATIONS.—Each eligible local educational agency that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary that includes—

“(1) a statement of how the agency will use the grant funds;

“(2) a description of the steps the agency will take to adequately maintain the facilities that the agency repairs, renovates, or constructs with those funds; and

“(3) such other information and assurances as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(e) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SCHOOLS.—In addition to any other activity authorized under section 12003, an eligible local educational agency may use grant funds received under this section to construct a new school if the agency demonstrates to the Secretary’s satisfaction that the agency will replace an existing school that is in such poor condition that renovating the school will not be cost-effective.

“SEC. 12005. GRANTS TO HIGH-POVERTY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From funds available under section 12008(b)(1), the Secretary shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies with poverty rates of 20 percent or greater to enable the agencies to carry out the authorized activities described in section 12003.

“(b) CRITERIA FOR AWARDING GRANTS.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

“(1) the poverty rate, the need for school repairs and renovations, and the fiscal capacity of each local educational agency; and

“(2) such other factors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(c) APPLICATIONS.—Each eligible local educational agency that desires to receive a

grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary that includes—

“(1) a description of the agency’s urgent need for school repair and renovation and of how the agency will use funds available under this section to meet those needs;

“(2) information on the fiscal effort that the agency is making in support of education and evidence demonstrating that the agency lacks the capacity to meet the agency’s urgent school repair and renovation needs without assistance made available under this section;

“(3) a description of the steps the agency will take to adequately maintain the facilities that the agency repairs or renovates with the assistance; and

“(4) such other information and assurances as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“SEC. 12006. SCHOOL RENOVATION GRANTS AND LOANS.

“(a) GRANTS AND LOANS.—From funds available under section 12008(b)(2), the Secretary shall make grants, and shall pay the cost of loans made, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies that lack the ability to fund urgent school repairs without a grant or loan provided under this section, to enable the agencies to carry out the authorized activities described in section 12003.

“(b) LOAN PERIOD.—Each loan under this section shall be for a period of 7 years and shall carry an interest rate of 0 percent.

“(c) CRITERIA FOR MAKING GRANTS AND LOANS.—In making grants and loans under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

“(1) the extent of poverty, the need for school repairs and renovations, and the fiscal capacity of each local educational agency; and

“(2) such other factors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(d) APPLICATIONS.—Each eligible local educational agency that desires to receive a grant or loan under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary that includes the information described in section 12005(c).

“(e) CREDIT STANDARDS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary—

“(1) shall not extend credit without finding that there is reasonable assurance of repayment; and

“(2) may use credit enhancement techniques, as appropriate, to reduce the credit risk of loans.

“SEC. 12007. PROGRESS REPORTS.

“The Secretary shall require recipients of grants and loans under this title to submit progress reports and such other information as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure compliance with this title and to evaluate the impact of the activities assisted under this title.

“SEC. 12008. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) GRANTS UNDER SECTION 12004.—For the purpose of making grants under section 12004, there are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

“(b) GRANTS UNDER SECTION 12005 AND GRANTS AND LOANS UNDER SECTION 12006.—For the purpose of making grants under section 12005, and grants and loans under section 12006, there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,250,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the succeeding 4 fiscal years, of which—

“(1) 10 percent shall be available for grants under section 12005; and

“(2) 90 percent shall be available to make grants and to pay the cost of loans under section 12006.

“(c) LIMITATION ON LOAN VOLUME.—Within the available resources and authority, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans offered by the Secretary under

section 12006 for fiscal year 2001 shall not exceed \$7,000,000,000, or the amount specified in an applicable appropriations Act, whichever is greater.

“SEC. 12009. DEFINITIONS.

“For the purpose of this title, the following terms have the following meanings:

“(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ‘local educational agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 14101(18) (A) and (B) of this Act.

“(2) PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘public school facility’ means a public building whose primary purpose is the instruction of public elementary or secondary students.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term excludes athletic stadiums or any other structure or facility intended primarily for athletic exhibitions, contests, games, or events for which admission is charged to the general public.

“(3) REPAIR AND RENOVATION.—The term ‘repair and renovation’ used with respect to an existing public school facility, means the repair or renovation of the facility without increasing the size of the facility.”

SEC. 101D. USE OF NET PROCEEDS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) section 439(a) of the General Education Provisions Act shall apply with respect to the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or repair of any school facility to the extent funded by net proceeds obtained through any provision enacted or amended by this Act,

(2) such net proceeds may not be used to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or repair of any stadium or other facility primarily used for athletic or non-academic events, and

(3) such net proceeds may be used to build small schools or create smaller learning environments within existing public school facilities.

**NATIONAL SUSTAINABLE FUELS
AND CHEMICALS ACT OF 1999**

MURKOWSKI AMENDMENT NO. 2862

Mr. CRAPO (for Mr. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 935) to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to authorize research to promote the conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

**“TITLE I—BIOMASS RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999**

“SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

“This Act may be cited as the ‘Biomass Research and Development Act of 1999’.

“SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

“Congress finds that—

“(1) conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products offers outstanding potential for benefit to the national interest through improved strategic security and balance of payments, healthier rural economies, improved environmental quality, near-zero net greenhouse gas emissions, technology export, and sustainable resource supply;

“(2) the key technical challenges to be overcome in order for biobased industrial products to be cost competitive are finding new technology and reducing the cost of technology for converting biomass into desired biobased industrial products;

“(3) biobased fuels, such as ethanol, have the clear potential to be sustainable, low

cost, and high performance fuels that are compatible with both current and future transportation systems and provide near zero net greenhouse gas emissions;

“(4) biobased chemicals—

“(A) can provide functional replacements for essentially all organic chemicals that are currently derived from petroleum; and

“(B) have the clear potential for environmentally benign product life cycles;

“(5) biobased power can provide environmental benefits, promote rural economic development, and diversify energy resource options;

“(6) many biomass feedstocks suitable for industrial processing show the clear potential for sustainable production, in some cases resulting in improved soil fertility and carbon sequestration;

“(7)(A) grain processing mills are biorefineries that produce a diversity of useful food, chemical, feed, and fuel products; and

“(B) technologies that result in further diversification of the range of value-added biobased industrial products can meet a key need for the grain processing industry;

“(8)(A) cellulosic feedstocks are attractive because of their low cost and widespread availability; and

“(B) research resulting in cost-effective technology to overcome the recalcitrance of cellulosic biomass would allow biorefineries to produce fuels and bulk chemicals on a very large scale, with a commensurately large realization of the benefit described in paragraph (1);

“(9) research into the fundamentals to understand important mechanisms of biomass conversion can be expected to accelerate the application and advancement of biomass processing technology by—

“(A) increasing the confidence and speed with which new technologies can be scaled up; and

“(B) giving rise to processing innovations based on new knowledge;

“(10) the added utility of biobased industrial products developed through improvements in processing technology would encourage the design of feedstocks that would meet future needs more effectively;

“(11) the creation of value-added biobased industrial products would create new jobs in construction, manufacturing, and distribution, as well as new higher-valued exports of products and technology;

“(12)(A) because of the relatively short-term time horizon characteristic of private sector investments, and because many benefits of biomass processing are in the national interest, it is appropriate for the Federal Government to provide precommercial investment in fundamental research and research-driven innovation in the biomass processing area; and

“(B) such an investment would provide a valuable complement to ongoing and past governmental support in the biomass processing area; and

“(13) several prominent studies, including studies by the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology and the National Research Council—

“(A) support the potential for large research-driven advances in technologies for production of biobased industrial products as well as associated benefits; and

“(B) document the need for a focused, integrated, and innovation-driven research effort to provide the appropriate progress in a timely manner.

“SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term ‘Advisory Committee’ means the Biomass Research and Development Technical Advisory Committee established by section 6.

“(2) BIOBASED INDUSTRIAL PRODUCT.—The term ‘biobased industrial product’ means fuels, commercial chemicals, building materials, or electric power or heat produced from biomass.

“(3) BIOMASS.—The term ‘biomass’ means any organic matter that is available on a renewable or recurring basis, including agricultural crops and trees, wood and wood wastes and residues, plants (including aquatic plants), grasses, residues, fibers, and animal wastes, municipal wastes and other waste materials.

“(4) BOARD.—The term ‘Board’ means the Biomass Research and Development Board established by section 5.

“(5) INITIATIVE.—The term ‘Initiative’ means the Biomass Research and Development Research Initiative established under section 7.

“(6) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given that term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

“(7) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term ‘national laboratory’ means a facility or group of facilities owned, leased, or operated by a Federal agency (including a contractor of the Federal agency) for the performance of research, development, or engineering.

“(8) POINT OF CONTACT.—The term ‘point of contact’ means a point of contact designated under section 4(d).

“(9) PROCESSING.—The term ‘processing’ means the derivation of biobased industrial products from biomass, including—

“(A) feedstock production;

“(B) harvest and handling;

“(C) pretreatment or thermochemical processing;

“(D) fermentation;

“(E) catalytic processing; and

“(F) product recovery; and

“(G) coproduct production.

**“SEC. 4. COOPERATION AND COORDINATION IN
BIOMASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy shall cooperate with respect to, and coordinate, policies and procedures that promote research and development leading to the production of biobased industrial products.

“(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the cooperation and coordination shall be to—

“(1) understand the key mechanisms underlying the recalcitrance of biomass for conversion into biobased industrial products;

“(2) develop new and cost-effective technologies that would result in large-scale commercial production of low cost and sustainable biobased industrial products;

“(3) ensure that biobased industrial products are developed in a manner that enhances their economic, energy security, and environmental benefits; and

“(4) promote the development and use of agricultural and energy crops for conversion into biobased industrial products.

“(c) AREAS.—In carrying out this title, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with heads of appropriate departments and agencies, shall promote research and development to—

“(1) advance the availability and widespread use of energy efficient, economically competitive, and environmentally sound biobased industrial products in a manner that is consistent with the goals of the United States relating to sustainable and secure supplies of food, chemicals, and fuel;

“(2) ensure full consideration of Federal land and land management programs as potential feedstock resources for biobased industrial products; and

“(3) assess the environmental, economic, and social impact of production of biobased

industrial products from biomass on a large scale.

“(d) POINTS OF CONTACT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To coordinate research and development programs and activities relating to biobased industrial products that are carried out by their respective Departments—

“(A) the Secretary of Agriculture shall designate, as the point of contact for the Department of Agriculture, an officer of the Department of Agriculture appointed by the President to a position in the Department before the date of the designation, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and

“(B) the Secretary of Energy shall designate, as the point of contact for the Department of Energy, an officer of the Department of Energy appointed by the President to a position in the Department before the date of the designation, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(2) DUTIES.—The points of contact shall jointly—

“(A) assist in arranging interlaboratory and site-specific supplemental agreements for research, development, and demonstration projects relating to biobased industrial products;

“(B) serve as cochairpersons of the Board;

“(C) administer the Initiative; and

“(D) respond in writing to each recommendation of the Advisory Committee made under section 6.

“SEC. 5. BIOMASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Biomass Research and Development Board to coordinate programs within and among departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the purpose of promoting the use of biobased industrial products by—

“(1) maximizing the benefits deriving from Federal grants and assistance; and

“(2) bringing coherence to Federal strategic planning.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall consist of:

“(1) The point of contact of the Department of Energy designated under section 4(d)(1)(B), who shall serve as cochairperson of the Board.

“(2) The point of contact of the Department of Agriculture designated under section 4(d)(1)(A), who shall serve as cochairperson of the Board.

“(3) A senior officer of each of the following agencies who is appointed by the head of the agency and who has a rank that is equivalent to the points of contact:

“(A) The Department of the Interior.

“(B) The Environmental Protection Agency.

“(C) The National Science Foundation.

“(D) The Office of Science and Technology Policy.

“(4) At the option of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, other members appointed by the Secretaries (after consultation with members described in paragraph (1) through (3)).

“(c) DUTIES.—The Board shall—

“(1) coordinate research, development, and demonstration activities relating to biobased industrial products—

“(A) between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Energy; and

“(B) with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

“(2) provide recommendations to the points of contact concerning administration of this title.

“(d) FUNDING.—Each agency represented on the Board is encouraged to provide funds for any purpose under this title.

“(e) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet at least quarterly to enable the Board to carry

out the duties of the Board under subsection (c).

“SEC. 6. BIOMASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Biomass Research and Development Technical Advisory Committee to—

“(1) advise the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Agriculture and the points of contact concerning—

“(A) the technical focus and direction of requests for proposals issued under the Initiative; and

“(B) procedures for reviewing and evaluating the proposals;

“(2) facilitate consultations and partnerships among Federal and State agencies, agricultural producers, industry, consumers, the research community, and other interested groups to carry out program activities relating to the Initiative; and

“(3) evaluate and perform strategic planning on program activities relating to the Initiative.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall consist of the following members appointed by the points of contact:

“(1) An individual affiliated with the biobased industrial products industry.

“(2) An individual affiliated with an institution of higher education who has expertise in biobased industrial products.

“(3) 2 prominent engineers or scientists from government or academia who have expertise in biobased industrial products.

“(4) An individual affiliated with a commodity trade association.

“(5) An individual affiliated with an environmental or conservation organization.

“(6) An individual associated with State government who has expertise in biobased industrial products.

“(7) At the option of the points of contact, other members.

“(c) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall—

“(1) above the points of contact with respect to the Initiative; and

“(2) evaluate whether, and make recommendations in writing to the Board to ensure that—

“(A) funds authorized for the Initiative are distributed and used in a manner that is consistent with the goals of the Initiative;

“(B) the points of contact are funding proposals under this title that are selected on the basis of merit, as determined by an independent panel of scientific and technical peers; and

“(C) activities under this title are carried out in accordance with this title.

“(d) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall meet at least quarterly to enable the Advisory Committee to carry out the duties of the Advisory Committee under subsection (c).

“SEC. 7. BIOMASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, acting through their respective points of contact and in consultation with the Board, shall establish and carry out a Biomass Research and Development Initiative under which competitively-awarded grants, contracts, and financial assistance are provided to, or entered into with, eligible entities to carry out research on biobased industrial products.

“(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of grants, contracts, and assistance under this section shall be to—

“(1) stimulate collaborative activities by a diverse range of experts in all aspects of biomass processing for the purpose of conducting fundamental and innovation-targeted research and technology development;

“(2) enhance creative and imaginative approaches toward biomass processing that

will serve to develop the next generation of advanced technologies making possible low cost and sustainable industrial products;

“(3) strengthen the intellectual resources of the United States through the training and education of future scientists, engineers, managers, and business leaders in the field of biomass processing; and

“(4) promote integrated research partnerships among colleges, universities, national laboratories, Federal and State research agencies, and the private sector as the best means of overcoming technical challenges that span multiple research and engineering disciplines and of granting better leverage from limited Federal research funds.

“(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible for a grant, contract, or assistance under this section, an applicant shall be—

“(A) an institution of higher education;

“(B) a national laboratory;

“(C) a Federal research agency;

“(D) a State research agency;

“(E) a private sector entity;

“(F) a nonprofit organization; or

“(G) a consortium of 2 or more entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—After consultation with the Board, the Points of Contact, on behalf of the Board, shall—

“(A) publish annually 1 or more joint requests for proposals for grants, contracts, and assistance under this section;

“(B) establish a priority in grants, contracts, and assistance under this section for research that—

“(i) demonstrates potential for significant advances in biomass processing;

“(ii) demonstrates potential to substantially impact scale-sensitive national objectives such as sustainable resource supply, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, healthier rural economies, and improved strategic security and trade balances; and

“(iii) would improve knowledge of important biomass processing systems that demonstrate potential for commercial applications;

“(C) require that grants, contracts, and assistance under this section be awarded competitively, on the basis of merit, after the establishment of procedures that provide for scientific peer review by an independent panel of scientific and technical peers; and

“(D) give preference to applications that—

“(i) involve a consortia of experts from multiple institutions; and

“(ii) encourage the integration of disciplines and application of the best technical resources.

“(d) USES OF GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND ASSISTANCE.—A grant, contract, or assistance under this section may be used to conduct—

“(1) research on process technology for overcoming the recalcitrance of biomass, including research on key mechanisms, advanced technologies, and demonstration test beds for—

“(A) feedstock pretreatment and hydrolysis of cellulose and hemicellulose, including new technologies for—

“(i) enhanced sugar yields;

“(ii) lower overall chemical use;

“(iii) less costly materials; and

“(iv) cost reduction;

“(B) development of novel organisms and other approaches to substantially lower the cost of cellulase enzymes and enzymatic hydrolysis, including dedicated cellulase production and consolidated bioprocessing strategies; and

“(C) approaches other than enzymatic hydrolysis for overcoming the recalcitrance of cellulosic biomass;

“(2) research on technologies for diversifying the range of products that can be efficiently and cost-competitively produced from biomass, including research on—

“(A) metabolic engineering of biological systems (including the safe use of genetically modified crops) to produce novel products, especially commodity products, or to increase product selectivity and tolerance, with a research priority on the development of biobased industrial products that can compete in performance and cost with fossil-based products;

“(B) catalytic processing to convert intermediates of biomass processing into products of interest;

“(C) separation technologies for cost-effective product recovery and purification;

“(D) approaches other than metabolic engineering and catalytic conversion of intermediates of biomass processing;

“(E) advanced biomass gasification technologies, including coproduction of power and heat as an integrated component of biomass processing, with the possibility of generating excess electricity for sale; and

“(F) related research in advanced turbine and stationary fuel cell technology for production of electricity from biomass; and

“(3) research aimed at ensuring the environmental performance and economic viability of biobased industrial products and their raw material input of biomass when considered as an integrated system, including research on—

“(A) the analysis of, and strategies to enhance, the environmental performance and sustainability of biobased industrial products, including research on—

“(i) accurate measurement and analysis of greenhouse gas emissions, carbon sequestration, and carbon cycling in relation to the life cycle of biobased industrial products and feedstocks with respect to other alternatives;

“(ii) evaluation of current and future biomass resource availability;

“(iii) development and analysis of land management practices and alternative biomass cropping systems that ensure the environmental performance and sustainability of biomass production and harvesting;

“(iv) land, air, water, and biodiversity impacts of large-scale biomass production, processing, and use of biobased industrial products relative to other alternatives; and

“(v) biomass gasification and combustion to produce electricity;

“(B) the analysis of, and strategies to enhance, the economic viability of biobased industrial products, including research on—

“(i) the cost of the required process technology;

“(ii) the impact of coproducts, including food, animal feed, and fiber, on biobased industrial product price and large-scale economic viability; and

“(iii) interactions between an emergent biomass refining industry and the petrochemical refining infrastructure; and

“(C) the field and laboratory research related to feedstock production with the interrelated goals of enhancing the sustainability, increasing productivity, and decreasing the cost of biomass processing, including research on—

“(i) altering biomass to make biomass easier and less expensive to process;

“(ii) existing and new agricultural and energy crops that provide a sustainable resource for conversion to biobased industrial products while simultaneously serving as a source for coproducts such as food, animal feed, and fiber;

“(iii) improved technologies for harvest, collection, transport, storage, and handling of crop and residue feedstocks; and

“(iv) development of economically viable cropping systems that improve the conservation and restoration of marginal land; or

“(4) Any research and development in technologies or processes determined by the Sec-

retary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, acting through their respective points of contact and in consultation with the Board, to be consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b) and priorities described in subsection (c)(2)(B).

“(e) TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION TRANSFER TO AGRICULTURAL USERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service and the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service shall ensure that applicable research results and technologies from the Initiative are adapted, made available, and disseminated through their respective Services, as appropriate.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this title, the Administrator of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service and the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service shall report to the committees of Congress with jurisdiction over the Initiative on the activities conducted by the Services under this subsection.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to funding provided for biomass research and development under the general authority of the Secretary of Energy to conduct research and development and demonstration programs (which may also be used to carry out this title), there are also authorized to be appropriated \$49,000,000 to the Department of Agriculture for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2005 to carry out this title.

“SEC. 8. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND FUNDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent administrative support and funds are not provided by other agencies under subsection (b), the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture may provide such administrative support and funds of the Department of Energy and the Department of Agriculture to the Board and the Advisory Committee as are necessary to enable the Board and the Advisory Committee to carry out this title.

“(b) OTHER AGENCIES.—The heads of the agencies referred to, or appointed under, paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 5(b) may, and are encouraged to, provide administrative support and funds of their respective agencies to the Board and the Advisory Committee.

“SEC. 9. REPORTS.

“For each fiscal year that funds are made available to carry out this title, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly transmit to Congress a detailed report on—

“(1) the status and progress of the Initiative, including a certification from the Board that funds authorized for the Initiative and distributed and used in a manner that is consistent with the goals of the Initiative; and

“(2) the general status of cooperation and research efforts carried out by each Secretary with respect to sustainable fuels, chemicals, and electricity derived from biomass, including a certification from the Board that the points of contact are funding proposals that are selected on the basis of merit, as determined by an independent panel of scientific and technical peers.

“SEC. 10. SUNSET.

“This Act and the authority conferred by this Act shall terminate on December 31, 2005.

“TITLE II—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ETHANOL RESEARCH PILOT PLANT

“There are authorized to be appropriated to construct a Department of Agriculture corn-based ethanol research pilot plant a total of \$14,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and subsequent fiscal years.”.

SEC. 2. TITLE.

Amend the title as to read: “To authorize research to promote the conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products, and for other purposes.”

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider the President's proposed FY 2001 budget for the U.S. Forest Service. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, February 29, 2000, beginning at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

Those who wish to submit written statements, should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Mark Rey, Professional Staff Member, at (202) 224-2878.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 29, 2000, in open session, to receive testimony from the unified commanders on their military strategy and operational requirements in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2001 and the future years defense program.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 29, 2000, to conduct a hearing on “the financial marketplace of the future.”

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 29, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an oversight hearing. The committee will consider the President's proposed budget for FY2001 for the U.S. Forest Service.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Tuesday, February 29 at 10:00 a.m. to hear testimony regarding Competition in the Medicare Program.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 29, 2000 at 10:30 am to hold a hearing.

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 29, 2000 at 2:30 p.m. to markup the Committee's letter to the Budget Committee regarding funding for Indian programs for FY 2001. The meeting will be held in the Committee room, 485 Russell Senate Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, February 29, 2000 at 1:00 p.m., in SD-226.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 29, 2000 at 2:00 p.m. to hold a closed hearing on intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 29 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct an oversight hearing. The subcommittee will consider the President's proposed budget for FY2001 for National Park Service programs and operations.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 29, 2000 at 9:30 a.m. in open session to receive testimony on the Department of Energy's fiscal year 2001 budget request for the Office of Environmental Management in review of the fiscal year 2001 defense authorization request and the future years defense program.

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

TRIBUTE TO STEVE HIGDON

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to fellow Kentuckian Steve Higdon on his recent success in becoming president and chief executive officer of Greater Louisville, Inc.

Steve Higdon grew up in Hikes Point and graduated from Trinity High School. He received a bachelor's degree in business administration from the University of Kentucky and began work with Yellow Freight Systems in Louisville after college.

Steve made his way to the top of the Louisville business world through hard work and determination. After his work at Yellow Freight Systems, he held several positions of leadership within the United Parcel Service (UPS), including economic development manager. Steve's work at UPS led to his involvement with Greater Louisville, Inc., and to his being hired as executive vice president for economic development and chief operating officer.

Many of Steve's colleagues have noted his extraordinary leadership skills. Steve's co-workers at UPS and colleagues within Greater Louisville, Inc. have all spoken of his drive and ambition, his work ethic and intelligence. From everything I've observed, Steve deserves all of these compliments—and more. He has taken on a huge responsibility in the Louisville community, and his past experience and success is a sign of good things to come for the city, its residents and its workers.

Steve also is involved in efforts to build a better Louisville community. He holds positions on the Workforce Investment Board, Housing Partnership Board, Kentucky Industrial Development Council, Industrial Development Research Council, and the Trinity High School Alumni association. This is further evidence that Steve's commitment to the community goes beyond mere business interests—he genuinely cares about Louisville's children and families.

Steve, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, thank you for your dedicated service to Louisville and to the people of Kentucky. I have every confidence in your ability to lead Greater Louisville, Inc. and its efforts to build great accomplishments and successes in the years to come.

Mr. President, I also ask that an article which ran in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Sunday, January 30, 2000, appear in the record following my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Jan. 30, 2000]

GREATER LOUISVILLE GREW NEW LEADER FROM THE INSIDE—STEVE HIGDON LOVES TO DEAL WITH PEOPLE

(By David Goetz)

Steve Higdon, the new man in charge of Louisville's economic future, speaks the lan-

guage of development in a broadcast-quality baritone. He moves seamlessly from discussions of work-force issues to business retention to the prospects of city-county merger.

But if you watch him speak as well as listen, you can catch glimpses in his gestures of the airport baggage handler he was not too many years ago. He seems to grab his words as he speaks them bracketing them between his hands or rolling them up in front of him. Then he hands them to you, or takes them to heart, or just places them here and there like a man sorting bundles.

Higdon, 37, is the new president and chief executive officer of Greater Louisville, Inc., a hometown guy whose love of long distances shaped a business career in shipping and distribution that never took him very far from home.

He's not too far removed in years or though from the college graduate of 1987 who found himself bossing men twice his age on the loading dock of Yellow Freight Systems at 35th and Duval streets in Louisville.

"It was the most stressful job I've ever had," Higdon recalled last week in his modest new office, a passable view of Sixth Street over his shoulder, business cards on his desk still identifying him in his former job as the non-profit corporation's head of economic development.

"I was very young and green, there were the hours, managing Teamsters whose average on the job was 25 to 30 years," Higdon continued. "The productivity goals were extremely tough."

He was young and it would have been easy to quit, Higdon said, but he had already developed a sense of having a career rather than just a job.

"I didn't know what the career was, but I knew I would have to be responsible," he said. "I knew I would have to work my way through it."

It was the beginning of a career that eventually placed Higdon with air carrier UPS and brought him into contact with the old Greater Louisville Economic Development Partnership.

There he garnered the notice and respect of entrepreneur Doug Cobb, who had signed on as president of Greater Louisville Inc., in 1997 when the partnership merged with the Chamber of Commerce to create a unified front for Louisville's business-support and economic-development efforts.

Cobb said he wasn't intentionally grooming a successor when he hired Higdon to run the development side of Greater Louisville Inc., in 1997.

"I called Steve because he had a good idea of what was going on" in Louisville, Cobb said. "But when you find out what people can do and you ask them to do more, which they do well, they just naturally grow into leadership."

Higdon is "maybe the most impressive executive I've ever worked with," Cobb said. "He's a great organizer. He knows how to figure out what needs to be done and get it done. He's good judge of talent."

Higdon has "a lot of the leadership characteristics that make the difference," said LG&E Energy Corp. executive Steve Wood, chairman of Greater Louisville, Inc.'s economic development committee.

"To be a successful executive, you have to out-work and out-think the competition, in this case, other jurisdictions competing for new business," Wood said. "I don't think you can outwork him. His energy level's extremely high, and he's as bright as they come."

Retired banker and civic leader Malcolm Chancey advocated a broader, national search for Cobb's successor, but he praised Higdon's energy and talent.

"If he has the right kind of support, he'll be successful," Chancey said. "I hope everybody will support him. I certainly will."

Higdon grew up one of four kids in a house off Klondike Lane near Hikes Point. His father was a photoengraver at the old Standard Gravure printing plant.

The Rev. David Zettel, a counselor at Trinity High School, remembers Higdon as bright, gregarious and outgoing. "He smiled a lot," Zettel said.

Higdon was "more social than most smart guys," and he had the ability to befriend any group, said friend Tom Scanlon, now president of ScanSteel Service Center Inc. in Louisville.

Scanlon remembers exchanging words with students from a rival school in the parking lot one night after a football game. Then Higdon walked over to them.

"What looked like it was going to turn into a fight, 30 minutes later we were sitting on the hood of their car drinking beer with them," Scanlon said. "He has a look in his eye and you trust him."

Higdon started out in accounting at the University of Kentucky but found marketing more to his taste. "It was exciting. It was fun. It was creative," he said. "You got these marketing problems and there were 30, 40, 50 different ways to come up with a solution."

He had never been on a plane before, but on a whim Higdon left a summer job before his senior year to fly with a co-worker to Europe. He visited 13 countries on about \$4 a day, he said, and discovered a personal maturity and a love of travel that have marked his career since.

His first job out of college was as a part-time baggage handler for Piedmont Airlines in Louisville—not for the \$6 an hour, Higdon said, but for the free flights, employees got if the planes weren't full.

"I flew 100,000 miles that year. We'd fly out to L.A. for ladies night at the Red Onion, fly to Miami for the Super Bowl, all we did was travel—it was so much fun," he said. "I've worked for an airline most of my life since. Travel is the spice of life."

Even the full-time jobs at Yellow Freight and Emery Worldwide that followed had a touch of the exotic for Higdon. "Every piece of freight had a destination or an origin in cities all over the world," he said.

He was a sales manager for the local office of Emery parent CF Airfreight when UPS won landing rights in Japan and hired him to run the Louisville office of its new UniStar cargo company. His charge was finding enough freight customers to fill the overnight package-delivery jets flying to and from Japan.

"I was one of the first people hired to a significant management position from outside UPS," Higdon said. "In less than two years this was the most profitable of their 40 offices in the U.S."

UPS later named Higdon the first marketing manager of its own air-cargo division and had him create its first air-passenger charter service.

"In a real sense I've been like a corporate entrepreneur," Higdon said. "Every job I've had (with UPS) was a new job. I never went into a position where I was replacing somebody."

Doug Kuelpman, a former boss at UPS, said Higdon "understands the business world and what has to be done. He has a knack."

"I never had to tell Steve more than once about doing something, even in areas where he may not have felt well-equipped going into it. He's the kind of guy who likes to put his head down and charge."

In 1995, UPS "loaned" Higdon to the development partnership to help recruit transportation-intensive businesses. Louisville Mayor Dave Armstrong was county judge-executive at the time and worked with Higdon in an unsuccessful attempt to lure a new Harley-Davidson manufacturing plant to the area.

"We were out of the picture altogether" when he and Higdon went to work on the project, but in the end, "we were barely edged out" by Kansas City, Armstrong said. "He did a great job with that."

Higdon concentrated on a strategy for attracting high-tech industries and recruited seven computer-repair firms with 700 jobs by the end of 1996.

But while he loved his work, Higdon said, "there was never a time I felt this is where I want to be." The following year he went to Cobb for advice on starting his own company.

Instead, Cobb hired Higdon to head the business-attraction efforts of what had become Greater Louisville Inc.

His first day on the job, Oct. 8, 1997, Higdon told Cobb that UPS was planning to expand its operations and was seriously considering Columbus, Ohio, as the site.

That conversation resulted in five months of intensive negotiations that ended with the announcement that the \$1 billion expansion and its 6,000 jobs were ticketed for Louisville.

As a former UPS insider, Higdon had "a good sense of what was going on" inside the company, Cobb said, and he played "a huge role" in the negotiations' success.

Higdon is credited with helping develop the innovative Metropolitan College concept that lets UPS package handlers work their night shifts while attending college.

When Cobb said last fall that he wanted to step down as president and CEO, the board of directors decided to look internally for a successor, said Ed Glasscock, chairman of the board's search committee. The aim was to maintain momentum and avoid a long adjustment period under a new executive.

They chose Higdon. "It's not fair to characterize it as Doug naming his successor. We asked Doug for his recommendations," Glasscock said. "You had a number of independent business people on the search committee who reviewed the job description and Steve's background. We felt he matched up, not because Doug said he was the perfect candidate. We came to that conclusion independently."

Choosing a successor internally is not unusual in corporations, Higdon said, and, under Cobb, Greater Louisville Inc. adopted the corporate model in its structure and thinking.

"That's why we're successful," he said. "The mentality is we're all running a business here."

Running a business—his own—is still on Higdon's mind, though it's been pushed into the indefinite future. He said he is committed to his new job for at least three years and that has its rewards.

"I love dealing with people more than anything," he said. "Since I was a kid I loved to be out among people." ●

IN MEMORY OF GEORGE A. ATHANSON

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on January 11, 2000, with the passing of George A. Athanson, the state of Connecticut lost a faithful and companionate public servant and one of its most colorful political figures in recent memory. Often called the "people's mayor," George was one of the longest serving and most beloved mayors in the history of Hartford, Connecticut. I would like to take a few moments to reflect on his many contributions to the city of Hartford.

George Athanson was a product of the city he came to love and serve so

well. A Hartford-born son of Greek heritage, he attended Hartford Public High School, where his intelligence and personal charm won him the admiration of his peers and teachers alike. He went on to Amherst College where he graduated cum laude with a degree in political science. Following a short stint in the Marines, George returned to academia, this time to the University of Chicago law school where he received a law degree in 1955. George would also earn a masters in international relations from the University of Connecticut in 1958.

George's love for his home town and affinity for learning lead him to teaching at the University of Hartford. As a professor of history and political science, George was known for a dramatic flair that enlivened his classes—a flair that George would bring to the mayor's office with his election in 1971. His magnetic personality, energy, creativity and verve for the dramatic contributed to his tremendous popularity and resulted in one of the longest mayoral tenures in Hartford's history, from 1971 to 1981.

He considered himself a liberal Democrat and was confident that government could play a role in solving social and economic problems. George was a colorful politician with a flamboyant style. While he was hard working, his efforts were often overshadowed by the creative and novel actions he undertook to promote the city. On one occasion, George rowed across the Connecticut River holding a state flag and dressed as George Washington to protest a General Assembly vote. On another occasion, he stepped into a boxing ring with a Republican opponent to raise money for charity. And in perhaps his best known act of political theater, George showed up to promote development at Brainard Airport in Hartford dressed as the Red Baron and climbed into the cockpit of a bi-plane for photographers.

It wasn't these dramatics that made George Athanson so popular, however, but his underlying dedication to the city of Hartford. He humanized the mayor's office. George was a man of great personal strength and he used his talent and energy to bring the city together. He built and maintained lines of communication among the city's diverse racial and ethnic communities and in the process became the people's mayor.

It was fitting that in his final days in office, George continued what had become a tradition during his tenure, the delivery of the annual New Year's poem. The poems were symbolic of the man who composed them—witty, humorous and full of political insight. With tears in his eyes, George delivered his last New Year's poem in 1981 entitled Ode to the People of Hartford, which read in part:

Those stunts for charity, I did my part
"Buffoon," critics said, but where's THEIR
heart?
Resolutions by the thousands, I've made my
mark

Now it's time for a stroll through the park.

Indeed, George did leave his mark. He will long be remembered as a political leader of great insight, compassion, wit, and enduring affection for the people he felt so privileged to serve. My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife of 37 years, Zoe, and their son Arthur. ●

CONGRATULATING THE COMMUNITY OF FILLMORE

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to offer my congratulations to the community of Fillmore, New York on the occasion of its sesquicentennial, and to wish them great success with their May 27 to 29 celebration of this milestone.

What is now Fillmore was originally a small settlement nestled into the corner where Cold Creek joins the Genesee River. The land was once part of the Caneadea Indian Reservation. By 1826, the Seneca Indians, who owned the land, had sold off all of the reservation. In 1850, during the Presidency of Millard Fillmore, the second New York State native to hold that distinguished office, a post office was established. Local lore has it that the citizens decided to name the settlement Fillmore in order to convince the government to establish the post office.

The first settlers were attracted to the area by timber, but the building of the Genesee Valley Canal Line connecting the Erie Canal to the Allegheny River brought an economic boom to all the areas along the line, including Fillmore. With its fertile soil, the Community eventually also became a farming area.

The citizens of Fillmore are proud of their backgrounds, their community, their State and their country. It is a community with a strong work ethic. It places a high priority on education and for years has supported a superior school system that is the envy of many larger communities. It is proud of the success of its young people, both those who leave and those who stay and believes that the values instilled by the citizens of the community is one of the reasons their young people are successful in their careers, be they farmers or educators in Fillmore, government workers in Washington, business leaders in Fillmore or across the country, or professors in America's great colleges and universities.

Fillmore has contributed many of its finest young men and women to serve this country in war and peace. All of them have served their country and their community with distinction and honor. During the Memorial Day weekend sesquicentennial celebration, Fillmore will remember with pride all of those service men and women who have served and are serving. It will pay special homage to those whose service required the ultimate sacrifice.

The community is planning for its future. It is hopeful of attracting new and modern businesses to the community. It is developing community

projects to improve key services and improve the environment. It intends to continue to improve its already outstanding public school by adding any needed facilities and continuing to attract outstanding teachers.

It is anticipating with excitement its next 150 years. ●

THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1996 TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 4 years ago, Congress passed a landmark measure, the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This bill was passed in an attempt to break down some of the regulatory barriers among various communications sectors. It is one of the sparks that ignited our booming new economy in this information technology age.

In New York especially, the 1996 law has created competition in local telephone networks, areas previously dominated by monopolies. After an 18 month marathon of hard work by the New York State Public Service Commission and a thorough review by the Federal Communications Commission, Bell Atlantic became the first Bell operating company in the country to offer long distance service. Already, nearly one million New Yorkers have exercised their right to choose a new local telephone company. Creative new packages of local/long distance and "all distance" telecom services are being offered by many different carriers. To date, there are more than 350 competitive local exchange carriers, CLECs, in the country that are able to provide local telephone service, furthering consumer choice options.

Competition and innovation is working as we intended with the Telecom Act, and our experience in New York is proof positive.

I commend Bell Atlantic, the newer carriers on the scene, and our own New York State Public Service Commission Chairman Maureen Helmer and her team for their hard work in bringing the benefits of competition to all New Yorkers. It has been well worth the effort, and provides a valuable road map to competition for other States. ●

TRIBUTE TO LLOYD REDMAN

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Lloyd Redman on the occasion of a special recognition of his commitment to Kentucky's youth.

Lloyd Redman has led a life that is certainly worthy of recognition. First and foremost, Lloyd is a dedicated family man. He and his wife of 55 years, Loretta, are the proud parents of two children, who have blessed them with three grandchildren and one great grandchild.

Lloyd also is a tried and true Kentuckian. He grew up in Kentucky and played basketball and football at Okalona High School. After high school

Lloyd played football for Western Kentucky University and the University of Louisville, where he received a bachelor of science degree in 1949, and a masters degree in 1955. Lloyd's football talent also earned him a place on the 1944 U.S. Navy team. Lloyd was skilled at baseball too, and served as captain of the U of L baseball team in 1949. He gave a great deal of his time and energy playing and coaching sports in Kentucky. Lloyd has coached at Okalona High School, Southern High School, and Durrett High School and was named "Jefferson County Football Coach of the Year" in 1959. He also coached football, basketball and softball at The Cabbage Patch for eleven years. Lloyd currently works with the Cabbage Patch Settlement House in Louisville to help provide athletic, arts and educational programs for children.

While Lloyd obviously loves youth athletics, he is equally as concerned for the educational well-being of Kentucky's children. He received administration certification from Eastern Kentucky University in 1962, and served in numerous administrative positions within the Jefferson County school system including director of adult education and administrative problems, assistant and associate superintendent, and he currently serves as a consultant at the Kentucky State Department of Education.

Lloyd Redman has had a positive influence on Kentucky's youth throughout his many years as administrator, coach, and mentor—and I am certain his concern for and service to the community and its children will not end here. Lloyd, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, thank you for your service and congratulations on your worthy efforts. ●

IN RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to inform my colleagues of the recent achievement of a friend and former member of this body, Senator Alan Cranston. On Tuesday March 14, 2000, in San Francisco, Senator Cranston will receive the prestigious W. Averell Harriman Award from the Lawyers Alliance for World Security for his tireless efforts to achieve a safer, more peaceful world.

Alan Cranston served the people of California in the United States Senate, in the seat I now occupy, for 24 years. During this time he distinguished himself as one of this institution's most passionate and effective voices for the rights of ordinary people. From protecting a woman's right to choose, to fighting for adequate and affordable housing, to making certain our veterans are treated with the respect they deserve, Senator Cranston devoted his career to making this nation a stronger, more decent place.

One of the most important ways he set about making his vision for a better America a reality was by not limiting his efforts to these shores alone.

Alan Cranston is very much a citizen of the world. Having witnessed the devastation of war in Europe and Japan, he has always acted on the belief that America's future cannot be guaranteed unless the world's is. And nothing threatens global security more than the continuing prevalence and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

There are few people who are more dedicated to the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons than Alan Cranston. So deeply does he feel about this issue that he has made it his life's work. In 1995, with the guidance of President Mikhail Gorbachev and others, he launched the Nuclear Weapon Elimination Initiative. From this initial blueprint sprang the Global Security Institute. As its president, Senator Cranston and GSI are committed to educating the people of the world and their leaders about the enormous threats posed by nuclear weapons.

It is for his work with GSI, and indeed his literal lifetime of commitment to global peace, that Senator Cranston so richly deserves the W. Averell Harriman Award. Few men or women have done so much to secure a safe future for all the people of the world.●

RETIREMENT OF ROBERT DONOVAN

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the 33 years of dedicated government service of Mr. Robert Donovan of Connecticut. His retirement from the Department of Housing and Urban Development on February 3, 2000 marks the end of a distinguished and highly esteemed career in public service.

In September of 1968, Mr. Donovan began his career with the Department of Housing and Urban Development as a Housing Intern in the Philadelphia Office. Two years later he moved to Hartford, Connecticut to become an Urban Renewal Representative. Over the next thirty years Mr. Donovan's dedication and commitment guided him through various roles within the Department, such as the Director of the Housing Management Division and the Director of the Multifamily Housing Division. He retired as a member of the leadership team of the Connecticut Multifamily Program Center.

For the better part of his adult life, Bob worked on behalf of countless Connecticut families. He believed that a safe, affordable home should be attainable for those who are committed to working for it. A home is more than just bricks and boards, it represents an opportunity for betterment and is the foundation for success. Bob's efforts day in and day out made that opportunity a possibility for Connecticut's citizens.

In each role that he assumed, be it representative or director, Bob remained responsive to the people he served. As a result, Bob has received a number of performance awards and accolades throughout his HUD career. He

has displayed a talent for leadership and a strong dedication to service—qualities that will be missed now that he embarks upon the next chapter of his life.

It is my pleasure to add my voice to the many others who have recognized Bob's contribution to the Connecticut community. On behalf of the people of Connecticut, I am proud to thank Bob for thirty-three years of devoted service and I wish him well in his future endeavors.●

WTO APPELLATE DECISION ON FOREIGN SALES CORPORATIONS

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to address a very serious development in foreign trade. It is a development which hurts American interests. It has been brewing for quite some time, and it finally came to a head last week in Geneva. A World Trade Organization (WTO) appeals panel ruled against us in a case the European Union brought against American tax law.

The ruling was not a complete surprise. A few months ago, the WTO ruled that our laws for Foreign Sales Corporations, usually known as FSC's, are illegal export subsidies. We appealed that decision. We lost the appeal. The WTO said that we have until October 1 of this year to come into compliance with the ruling.

Why is the WTO dealing with this case to begin with? Why isn't it sticking to its mandate, which is international trade, and stay out of tax matters?

The EU brought this case to the WTO 2 years ago. In doing so, Europe broke an agreement with us that dates back to 1981. Congress passed the FSC in 1984. I remember very well all the work that we put into crafting the rules to place U.S. exports on a more equal footing with European competition. In crafting the rules, we relied on that 1981 understanding with the EU. It confirmed that foreign source income need not be taxed, and that failing to tax such income is not a subsidy. European exporters are not taxed on such income, and they enjoy value added tax rebates on exports as well.

This case is just another step in a European Union campaign which undermines the world trading system.

We saw it very clearly last year in the run-up to the Seattle ministerial. EU leaders tried in every way they could to avoid coming to the table to talk seriously about their number one problem: agriculture.

First, they started a public relations campaign to downplay expectations. In a number of meetings, they hinted that the Seattle talks would probably fail. Second, they tried to overload the negotiating agenda. They wanted to turn the trade talks into such a complex undertaking that we would never get to the real problem: EU agriculture. Third, they stalled in Geneva, so there wasn't any agreement on the scope of

agriculture talks in Seattle. In 1995, they agreed to start agriculture talks in January 2000. But they wanted to put off getting down to business for as long as possible.

They are still trying to put it off. Putting it off hurts American farmers and agro-business. Putting it off hurts developing countries. Putting it off even hurts Europe itself in the long term. It just undermines confidence in the world trading system.

This FSC case makes things worse. Let's be very clear on what's going on here. We can set aside the European rhetoric about "respecting international obligations" in tax policy. That's not what this case is about. If the EU were serious about "respect for international obligations," it would take a close look at the tax policies of its members. This case is not about respecting international obligations.

This case is not about tax policy. If the EU were seriously concerned about the trade effects of tax policy, it wouldn't file a case in the World Trade Organization. That's no way to fix an international tax problem. Instead, it would seek multi-party talks in an organization like the OECD or the UN. But the EU doesn't really care about tax policy in this case.

This case is not even about money. The EU has no real commercial interest at stake here. They haven't demonstrated any appreciable adverse impact on European companies from US tax laws. In fact, a number of European companies benefit from FSC! They have domestic subsidiaries in the United States, and these subsidiaries have set up Foreign Sales Corporations.

So what is this case about? It's about revenge. Pure, simple revenge. The Eurocrats want revenge for losing WTO disputes with the United States over bananas and beef. That's an open secret. Everyone knows where this case came from. It didn't come from European manufacturers facing unfair competition from US firms because of FSC. It didn't come from European banks. Or from European consumers. Or from European farmers. It didn't come from the members states. It came from EU bureaucrats, the gnomes of Brussels.

They were angry over losing the beef and banana disputes with the United States. The cases were long and hard. They took years. The EU fought us all the way. They lost at every turn, because we were in the right. When they refused to correct their illegal policies, the WTO authorized us to retaliate legally. And we did.

For revenge, the Eurocrats wanted to poke us in the eye, and show us that they could hurt us. So they took this case, which had been sitting on their shelf for years. They dusted it off and sent it to the WTO, despite our 1981 agreement with them on tax policy.

Well, they're playing with fire. Using the WTO as an instrument of revenge is dangerous for them, and dangerous for us. The WTO is a five-year old child. Its

dispute settlement system is still young and fragile. The FSC case strains its resources, which are limited. But more important, the FSC case strains the political acceptability of the WTO system.

The political leaders of the EU should not have let this case go forward. It was a bad judgement on their part. Now it is in their interest and in the interest of the world trade system for them to settle this case amicably and fast. It will take wisdom and courage for them to do so. I hope they find that wisdom and courage.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN C. SCHNABEL

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the work of John C. Schnabel, who retired after fourteen years of service from the Wisconsin Association of County Veteran's Service Officers. He began his career with the Wisconsin Association of County Veteran's Service Officers in 1989 as the Secretary of the organization. During that time he used his personal laptop computer to electronically record Association records. This included researching and organizing a history of all CVSOs and Assistant CVSOs. He also developed and printed the first handbook for Association Officers so that policies, procedures and other information were easily transferred from one secretary to the next. John Schnabel was effective in his career as Secretary of CVSO and went on to become Second Vice President in 1994, First Vice President in 1995 and President in 1996. Schnabel has been the Langlade County Veteran's Services Officer for the last 14 years and is the first service officer from the county to be elected president of the organization.

During his time as president he became instrumental in the establishment of the Advocacy Award as well as the state representative to coordinate access to VA OnLine, initiating sites for CVSOs and WDVA. He has worked on many Ad Hoc committees regarding computer operations and program development. He most recently acted as a member of an Ad Hoc committee to establish long term goals and training for the CVSO association. During his tenure, Schnabel was also named a recipient of the Citation for Meritorious Service, awarded by the American Legion's National Veteran's Affairs and Rehabilitation Commission in Washington, D.C.

The staff and veteran clients of the Langlade County Veteran's Service Office and the Wisconsin Association of County Veterans Service Officers will miss John's wonderful advocacy work greatly. However, Nancy, his wife of 36 years will enjoy spending more time with him.●

ALEISHA CRAMER

● Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President—I would like to take this opportunity to com-

mend an outstanding student athlete from my home state of Colorado. Aleisha Cramer of Green Mountain High School has been named the 1999-2000 Gatorade National High School Girls Soccer Player of the Year. Aleisha's hard work and dedication earned her the prestige of being the number one soccer player of 246,000 high school girls across the country.

Ms. Cramer's athletic accomplishments include being the Parade Player of the Year, the National Soccer Coaches of America's Player of the Year as well as being accepted on the U.S. Women's National Team. Aleisha has lead her team to the State Finals for three consecutive years, winning the championship in 1997 and 1999. Not only is Aleisha an amazing athlete, she is honor student with a 4.0 grade point average, a member of the student senate and a volunteer for church and school groups.

It is an honor for me to recognize the achievements of this amazing young woman. Aleisha leads by example and her work ethic, talent and civic duties have made her a role model that any student can look up to. Aleisha Cramer has proved what hard work as a student, athlete and community member can accomplish.

Again, I would like to congratulate Aleisha Cramer, the 1999-2000 Gatorade National High School Girls Soccer Player of the Year, for her accomplishments. She has made the State of Colorado and this nation proud.●

GRACE TOWNS HAMILTON (1907-1992)

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, "A political leader who changes his stances to fit the times is often called a politician in the dirtiest sense of the word. One who refuses to change, who remains with her lifelong ideals, is often called reactionary and stubborn. But such a person may also be seen as possessing both honesty and intrigue." So spoke Alton Hornsby, Morehouse College historian in 1990 as the city of Atlanta remembered one of its greatest treasures, Grace Towns Hamilton.

Grace Towns was quite simply, a legend in her own time. Born in Atlanta in 1907, Grace entered this world during a time of severe racial tension. In fact, her birthday came only 5 months after a ferocious racial massacre in Atlanta. For whites, the first decades of the twentieth century were the "Progressive Era." For blacks, it was indeed a most dismal era. The end of Reconstruction had left blacks as an often despised and almost always disenfranchised class made up largely of dependent laborers with little land and even less rights. Atlanta University (AU), on the city's western reaches, seemed an island of tranquility in the South, where blacks experienced the worst of the racial oppression and exclusion. Grace Towns' father was a professor at AU and she was able to enjoy a sheltered existence

where both the student body and the faculty were integrated.

Grace Towns flourished while growing up at AU. Once she matriculated as a collegiate there, Grace became active in the Interracial Student Forum. She took this advantage of the opportunity to discuss a wide range of topics, including those which were most racially sensitive. For her, this was a forum to bring black and white students together. While she was editor of the AU student newspaper, the Scroll, Grace wrote of the forum, "the Forum has given us contact. We have heard each other's music, and talked as fellow students."

After graduating from AU in 1927, Grace Towns went on to pursue a master's degree in psychology at Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. During her college years, she became involved with the YWCA. The Atlanta chapter had a burgeoning student movement that took a divergent approach on race that was less cautious than its parent organization at the time. It was interracial far before the first "Negro" was appointed to the board. After she graduated, the National YWCA offered her a secretarial job in one of its Negro branches. A favorite psychology professor at AU had a high regard for the psychology department at Ohio State and seeing as how the YWCA job would make it possible to finance her post-graduate education at the same time, Grace decided to go.

Grace Towns later admitted that there was no way she could have been prepared for what she faced in Ohio. The cocoon of Atlanta University ill-prepared her for the shock that awaited her in the Ohio capital city. Bared from movies, restaurants, hotels, even public restrooms, Towns felt accepted only within the confines of the Ohio State psychology department. Even the YWCA, which in Atlanta had seemed so dedicated to the rights of all women, without regard to the color of their skin, had its barriers and limitations. The prejudice and violent attitude towards blacks at the time made the goals and the religious and moral precepts professed by the organization a challenge that the "Y" often failed to meet.

These factors combined to make Grace Towns not sorry to leave Columbus, Ohio in the summer of 1928. She returned to Atlanta to finish the written requirements for her master's from Ohio State, having already finished the course work. After receiving the degree in 1929, she went on to teach at the Atlanta School of Social Work and also at Clark College in Atlanta. She married the love of her life, Henry Cooke Hamilton, in the summer of 1930. They moved shortly thereafter to Memphis where her husband had taken a job doing triple duty as dean, registrar and professor of education.

Grace Hamilton continued teaching, even through the first months of her pregnancy with her first daughter Eleanor, born in March of 1931. She had

taken a position at LeMoyne Junior College and resumed teaching at LeMoyne while Eleanor was still young. She continued to teach there, although circumstances compelled her to undertake courses that she did not feel qualified to teach. In 1934, this frustration came to a head when gender issues and the Great Depression forced LeMoyne to terminate her employment. After volunteering with the NAACP and the YWCA, Grace took a position with the Works Progress Administration (WPA) conducting a survey on The Urban Negro Worker in the United States 1925-1936.

In 1941, the Hamilton family returned to Atlanta where Grace's husband became principal of Atlanta University's Laboratory High School. Grace had never set out to be a leader, but at this point she was thirty-four years old, had an advanced education degree, and had worked steadily at professional jobs for more than a decade. She knew the value of community activism and education and set out to take part in the fight. This led her to the Atlanta Urban League.

From 1943 until 1960, Grace Hamilton served as the Executive Director of the Atlanta Urban League. During her tenure, she shaped the path of the League to better serve Atlanta, which was increasingly being seen as the South's "hub city." She moved the focus away from the national organization's emphasis on philanthropy and job procurement to a more Atlanta-focused program of housing, equality in school funding, voter registration and better medical care. Her biographers, Lorraine Nelson Spritzer and Jean B. Bergmark, wrote of her legacy that it ". . . was better appreciated by whites than blacks. The white world glorified her, clothing her in virtue without flaws. The black community viewed her with greater ambivalence, seeing blemish as well as the best and came closer to discerning the real and important person she was, probably because she was truly one of their own."

After Mrs. Hamilton resigned in 1960, she set out on her path to political success. She ran in a special off-year election in 1965 which brought her and six other black Democrats into the Georgia state legislature. The first black woman in the Georgia State Legislature, Hamilton was called "Atlanta's only real integrationist," "a leader," and a "bridge-builder." It was here where she made her most lasting contribution to her city and state, and all agreed she was that rare person who gave politics a good name. I remember fondly serving with her while I was in the Georgia state senate from 1970 until 1974.

While serving in the state legislature, Grace Hamilton sought to strengthen local government, particularly the Mayor's role. She also worked towards equal justice for blacks, and the elimination of wasted tax dollars by seeking consolidation of Georgia's numerous counties. In 1971, she persuaded

her colleagues in the Legislature to approve a sales tax increase to finance a city-wide rail and subway system—now known in Atlanta as MARTA, a crown jewel among the nation's urban mass transit systems. Her time in the Legislature was infinitely successful and in 1984, at the age of 78 she began to consider retirement. She decided for "one last go-around" but failed to detect the political risk she faced. She was defeated by a 26 year-old graduate student in public administration at Georgia State named Mable Thomas. After almost twenty years in public office, Grace Hamilton set out for the next phase of life.

Grace Hamilton lived on another eight years, overseeing the care of her ailing husband and guiding the search for a suitable depository for her papers and effects. She collected numerous accolades and awards before she finally succumbed to illness in 1992, survived by her daughter Eleanor.

As we come to the end of Black History Month, I respectfully submit this insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in honor of one of my personal heroes, Grace Towns Hamilton. Her service has been an inspiration to me and many others who have known her. I am proud of her legacy in Georgia and pleased to have this opportunity to share it. I would also like to thank Mrs. Hamilton's biographers, Lorraine Nelson Spritzer and Jean B. Bergmark, for their contribution to Grace's legacy—Grace Towns Hamilton and the Politics of Southern Change.

Thank you Mr. President. ●

JAKE D. ROBEL

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to extend my heartfelt sympathies to the family of 6-year-old Jake D. Robel of Blue Springs, Missouri.

One week ago Jake died after being dragged for almost five miles at high speed by a man who had stolen Jake's mother's car in Independence, Missouri.

Jake's mom had stopped at a sandwich shop to run in and pick up her order. She left her car running and Jake was waiting in the car.

This town and area should be safe. Many would say tragedies like this one happen everywhere else, but not here. In this area, there are people who always leave their car doors unlocked and their keys in the ignition. Many leave their homes unlocked and have no idea where to find the house key.

Unfortunately, that sense of security is now shattered.

In those few moments it took Jake's mom to run into the sandwich shop, an assailant jumped in her vehicle and sped away. Jake, with his mother's help, tried to escape from the vehicle, but became entangled in the seat belt. In a heartbeat, the car door closed—with Jake tangled in the seat belt—being dragged behind.

I can't imagine the loss felt by the family and friends of Jake Robel. How-

ever, I want to join with the countless families in Missouri and across the nation in sending my thoughts and prayers to those in grief.

Mr. President, in addition, it is important to recognize the bravery, heroism, and citizenship of those that tried to come to Jake's rescue.

The man who stole the car took off on Interstate 70 at high speed. All along the way, people honked and shouted from their cars for him to stop. The driver was stopped and apprehended, not by the police, but by approximately four gentlemen who managed to surround the vehicle after the man left I-70 and turned onto a busy street in Independence, Missouri. The man tried to escape on foot, but was stopped by these heroes who tied his feet together and sat on him until the police arrived. These men acted swiftly and responsibly.

Once again, Mr. President, my thoughts and prayers go out to the family of Jake Robel as well as to all those who witnessed such a tragedy. I also want to recognize the gentlemen who apprehended the driver. These honorable citizens have shown us firsthand that heroes do exist. ●

RETIREMENT OF CHIEF ANGELO TOSCANO

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am delighted to rise today to pay tribute to a well-respected and remarkable officer, Chief Angelo Toscano, whose retirement from the Wilton Police Force marks the end of 43 years as a Connecticut law enforcement officer. Day in and day out, Chief Toscano ensured that safety and peace prevailed in the Wilton community. I am honored to extend thanks and appreciation to him. On behalf of the people of Wilton and the entire state of Connecticut, whom I am privileged to represent in the United States Senate.

Chief Toscano was born and raised in Darien, Connecticut. After graduating from Darien High School he attended Norwalk Community College and the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy. In 1957, after serving in the United States Marine Corps for three years, he began his career in law enforcement as a patrolman. His dedication earned him the respect of his colleagues, and his leadership propelled him up the ranks—from patrolman, to sergeant, to detective, and finally, to Chief of Police.

Throughout his career in public service, Chief Toscano remained on the cutting edge of law enforcement techniques, always believing that there was more for him to learn. Chief Toscano continued his training up until the very end of his career, including participation in the Connecticut Police Academy, the Darien Power Squadron, and a wide range of F.B.I. training programs.

Chief Toscano embodied everything a community could hope for in a Chief of Police. He was a veteran of the streets

whose years of experience became the source of his good judgment and dependability. He was a well-trained cop whose background and skill ensured that, as Chief, he led with a steadfast and reliable hand. Moreover, Chief Toscano was an innovative leader, with the uncanny ability to incorporate his specialized skills with his personal insight and creativity. Under his leadership, the Wilton Police Force introduced such initiatives as D.A.R.E. and C.O.P.S., as well as the installation of defibrillators into every patrol car.

The job of a chief of police is a demanding task that requires strength of character and good judgment. One need not look far for proof of Chief Toscano's success and ability, for it is visible in the safety that Wilton residents relish everyday.

Today, it is my pleasure to join the Town of Wilton and the State of Connecticut in thanking Chief Toscano for his many years of dedicated service and wishing him well in the future. ●

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following armed services nominations on the Executive Calendar: 415, 416, 418 through 422, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk.

I finally 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 this point in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations, considered and confirmed, are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sylvia V. Baca, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

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. William N. Searcy, 9559

IN THE ARMY

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 major general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Kevin C. Kiley, 4471

Brig. Gen. Darrel R. Porr, 8386

IN THE NAVY

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. Gordon S. Holder, 2235

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers 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. Ralph S. Clem, 2429

Brig. Gen. John M. Danahy, 2107

Brig. Gen. Joseph G. Lynch, 4963

Brig. Gen. Jeffrey M. Musfeldt, 8617

Brig. Gen. Robert B. Siegfried, 5248

To be brigadier general

Col. Gerald A. Black, 3573

Col. Richard B. Ford, 5811

Col. Jack C. Ihle, 1006

Col. Keith W. Meurlin, 1682

Col. Betty L. Mullis, 0954

Col. Scott R. Nichols, 8603

Col. David A. Robinson, 7497

Col. Richard D. Roth, 8023

Col. Randolph C. Ryder, Jr., 0160

Col. Joseph L. Shafer, 8844

Col. Charles E. Stenner, Jr., 3274

Col. Thomas D. Taverney, 6191

Col. James T. Turlington, 4611

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Curtis M. Bedke, 9014

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. David E. Clary, 9098

Col. Michael A. Collings, 3659

Col. Scott S. Custer, 2467

Col. Daniel J. Darnell, 0600

Col. Duane W. Deal, 0812

Col. Vern M. Findley II, 2123

Col. Douglas M. Fraser, 7505

Col. Dan R. Goodrich, 2370

Col. Gilbert R. Hawk, 6206

Col. Raymond E. Johns, Jr., 3483

Col. Timothy C. Jones, 7733

Col. Perry L. Lamy, 4559

Col. Edward L. Mahan, Jr., 6388

Col. Roosevelt Mercer, Jr., 3054

Col. Gary L. North, 9194

Col. John G. Pavlovich, 9032

Col. Allen G. Peck, 1135

Col. Michael W. Peterson, 5177

Col. Teresa M. Peterson, 1094

Col. Gregory H. Power, 4129

Col. Anthony F. Przybylski, 7898

Col. Ronald T. Rand, 8658

Col. Steven J. Redmann, 1838

Col. Loren M. Reno, 7129

Col. Jeffrey R. Riemer, 4731

Col. Jack L. Rives, 0540

Col. Marc E. Rogers, 4472

Col. Arthur J. Rooney, Jr., 6482

Col. Stephen T. Sargeant, 1024

Col. Darryl A. Scott, 3767

Col. James M. Shames, 8898

Col. William L. Shelton, 0678

Col. John T. Sheridan, 8566

Col. Toreaser A. Steele, 6197

Col. James W. Swanson, 6954

Col. George P. Taylor, Jr., 9111

Col. Gregory L. Trebon, 3693

Col. Loyd S. Utterback, 9704

Col. Frederick D. VanValkenburg, Jr., 4600

Col. Dale C. Waters, 4174

Col. Simon P. Worden, 2998

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning Joseph G. Baillargeon, Jr., and ending David L. Phillips, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 16, 1999.

Air Force nomination of Mark K. Wells, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 1, 2000.

Air Force nominations beginning William P. Braham, and ending Kenneth C.Y. Yu,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of nulldate.

Air Force nominations beginning Laraine L. Acosta, and ending Roger A. Wujek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2000.

Air Force nominations beginning Synaya K. Balanon, and ending Edward K. Yi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2000.

Air Force nominations beginning Charles G. Beleny, and ending Kristen A. Fultsganey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 7, 2000.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning Richard T. Brittingham, and ending William D. Stewart, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 16, 1999.

Army nominations beginning Stephen C. Alsobrook, and ending Henry E. Zeranski, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 16, 1999.

Army nomination of Andre H. Sayles, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 1, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Thomas E. Ayres, and ending Joel E. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Wayne E. Caughman, and ending Calvin B. Wimbish, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 7, 2000.

Army nomination of Jeffrey S. MacIntire, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 2000.

Army nominations beginning John J. Fitch, and ending *Timothy L. Watkins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 2000.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nomination of Joseph B. Davis, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 16, 1999.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Michael C. Albo, and ending Richard W. Yoder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2000.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Christopher F. Ajinga, and ending Joan P. Zimmerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 2000.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Joe H. Adkins, Jr., and ending Christopher M. Zuchristian, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 2000.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning Terry C. Pierce, and ending Frank G. Riner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 16, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Brad Harris Douglas, and ending Marc A. Stern, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 16, 1999.

Navy nominations beginning Dean J. Giordano, and ending William K. Nesmith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 7, 2000.

Navy nominations beginning David R. Allison, and ending Steve R. Wilkinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 7, 2000.

Navy nominations beginning Raquel C. Bono, and ending Mil A. Yi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2000.

Navy nomination of Rabon E. Cooke, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 2000.

Navy nomination of Amy J. Potts, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 2000.

STATEMENT ON THE NOMINATION OF SYLVIA V. BACA

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am very pleased today that the Senate has confirmed New Mexican Sylvia Baca for Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management. I have been working hard to see this day, and I am glad the Senate has finally confirmed this worthy individual.

Ms. Baca is a native New Mexican who has worked for the Department of Interior for over four years, and has been Acting Assistant Secretary since November of 1998. Since January of 1995, she served as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management.

Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management has direct supervisory responsibility for three principal bureaus of the Department of the Interior: The Bureau of Land Management, the Minerals Management Service, and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement. In 1997, she served as Acting Director for the Bureau of Land Management. In such capacity, she was responsible for direct management of 10,000 employees, a budget of \$1.2 billion, and the maintenance of 270 million acres of public lands and 570 million acres of subsurface minerals.

Ms. Baca previously served the state of New Mexico with distinction as a Senior Fiscal Analyst for the state Legislative Finance Committee for five years. Ms. Baca served as Director of Finance and Management for the City of Albuquerque immediately before leaving for Washington, D.C. Some of you may know that I served as what was then the equivalent of Mayor of Albuquerque, New Mexico's largest city. I can assert that administering the operating budget and administering city employees is a big job.

Sylvia Baca has a tremendous tie to the land. Sylvia, whose New Mexico ranching family history dates back to Spanish colonial times, is one of the many distinguished New Mexicans who have served the Interior Department. I am sure she will continue to work with distinction and serve well managing our federal public lands. Based upon her experience and commitment, I trust she will do a good job for the people of the United States. She has demonstrated that she has the administrative skills and experience needed to do this job well.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

NATIONAL SUSTAINABLE FUELS AND CHEMICALS ACT OF 1999

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 310, S. 935.

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

The clerk will state the bill by title. The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 935) to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to authorize research to promote the conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment to strike all after enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products offers outstanding potential for benefit to the national interest through improved strategic security and balance of payments, healthier rural economies, improved environmental quality, near-zero net greenhouse gas emissions, technology export, and sustainable resource supply;

(2)(A) biomass is widely available at prices that are competitive with low cost petroleum; and

(B) the key technical challenges to be overcome in order for biobased industrial products to be cost competitive are finding new technology and reducing the cost of technology for converting biomass into desired biobased industrial products;

(3) biobased fuels, such as ethanol, have the clear potential to be sustainable, low cost, and high performance fuels that are compatible with both current and future transportation systems and provide near zero net greenhouse gas emissions;

(4) biobased chemicals—

(A) can provide functional replacements for essentially all organic chemicals that are currently derived from petroleum; and

(B) have the clear potential for environmentally benign product life cycles;

(5) biobased power can provide environmental benefits, promote rural economic development, and diversify energy resource options;

(6) many biomass feedstocks suitable for industrial processing show the clear potential for sustainable production, in some cases resulting in improved soil fertility and carbon sequestration;

(7)(A) grain processing mills are biorefineries that produce a diversity of useful food, chemical, feed, and fuel products; and

(B) technologies that result in further diversification of the range of value-added biobased industrial products can meet a key need for the grain processing industry;

(8)(A) cellulosic feedstocks are attractive because of their low cost and widespread availability; and

(B) research resulting in cost-effective technology to overcome the recalcitrance of cel-

lulosic biomass would allow biorefineries to produce fuels and bulk chemicals on a very large scale, with a commensurately large realization of the benefit described in paragraph (1);

(9) research into the fundamentals to understand important mechanisms of biomass conversion can be expected to accelerate the application and advancement of biomass processing technology by—

(A) increasing the confidence and speed with which new technologies can be scaled up; and

(B) giving rise to processing innovations based on new knowledge;

(10) the added utility of biobased industrial products developed through improvements in processing technology would encourage the design of feedstocks that would meet future needs more effectively;

(11) the creation of value-added biobased industrial products would create new jobs in construction, manufacturing, and distribution, as well as new higher-valued exports of products and technology;

(12)(A) because of the relatively short-term time horizon characteristic of private sector investments, and because many benefits of biomass processing are in the national interest, it is appropriate for the Federal Government to provide precommercial investment in fundamental research and research-driven innovation in the biomass processing area; and

(B) such an investment would provide a valuable complement to ongoing and past governmental support in the biomass processing area; and

(13) several prominent studies, including studies by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology and the National Research Council—

(A) support the potential for large research-driven advances in technologies for production of biobased industrial products as well as associated benefits; and

(B) document the need for a focused, integrated, and innovation-driven research effort to provide the appropriate progress in a timely manner.

SEC. 3. CONVERSION OF BIOMASS INTO BIOBASED INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS.

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subtitle N—Conversion of Biomass Into Biobased Industrial Products

"SEC. 1490. DEFINITIONS.

"In this subtitle:

"(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term 'Advisory Committee' means the Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Technical Advisory Committee established by section 1490C.

"(2) BIOBASED INDUSTRIAL PRODUCT.—The term 'biobased industrial product' means any power, fuel, feed, chemical product, or other consumer good derived from biomass.

"(3) BIOMASS.—The term 'biomass' means any organic matter that is available on a renewable or recurring basis (excluding old growth timber), including dedicated energy crops and trees, wood and wood residues, plants (including aquatic plants), grasses, agricultural crops, residues, fibers, and animal wastes and other waste materials.

"(4) BOARD.—The term 'Board' means the Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Board established by section 1490B.

"(5) INITIATIVE.—The term 'Initiative' means the Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Research Initiative established under section 1490D.

"(6) POINT OF CONTACT.—The term 'point of contact' means a point of contact designated under section 1490A(d).

"(7) PROCESSING.—The term 'processing' means the derivation of biobased industrial products from biomass, including—

"(A) feedstock production;

"(B) harvest and handling;

“(C) pretreatment or thermochemical processing;

“(D) fermentation;

“(E) catalytic processing;

“(F) product recovery; and

“(G) coproduct production.

“SEC. 1490A. COOPERATION AND COORDINATION IN SUSTAINABLE FUELS AND CHEMICALS RESEARCH.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy shall cooperate with respect to, and coordinate, policies and procedures that promote research and development leading to the production of biobased industrial products.

“(b) *PURPOSE.*—The purpose of the cooperation and coordination shall be to—

“(1) understand the key mechanisms underlying the recalcitrance of biomass for conversion into biobased industrial products;

“(2) develop new and cost-effective technologies that would result in large-scale commercial production of low cost and sustainable biobased industrial products;

“(3) ensure that biobased industrial products are developed in a manner that enhances their economic, energy security, and environmental benefits; and

“(4) promote the development and use of agricultural and energy crops for conversion into biobased industrial products.

“(c) *AREAS.*—In carrying out this subtitle, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with heads of appropriate departments and agencies, shall promote research and development to—

“(1) advance the availability and widespread use of energy efficient, economically competitive, and environmentally sound biobased industrial products in a manner that is consistent with the goals of the United States relating to sustainable and secure supplies of food, chemicals, and fuel;

“(2) ensure full consideration of Federal land and land management programs as potential feedstock resources for biobased industrial products; and

“(3) assess the environmental, economic, and social impact of production of biobased industrial products from biomass on a large scale.

“(d) *POINTS OF CONTACT.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—To coordinate research and development programs and activities relating to biobased industrial products that are carried out by their respective Departments—

“(A) the Secretary of Agriculture shall designate, as the point of contact for the Department of Agriculture, an officer of the Department of Agriculture appointed by the President to a position in the Department before the date of the designation, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and

“(B) the Secretary of Energy shall designate, as the point of contact for the Department of Energy, an officer of the Department of Energy appointed by the President to a position in the Department before the date of the designation, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(2) *DUTIES.*—The points of contact shall jointly—

“(A) assist in arranging interlaboratory and site-specific supplemental agreements for research, development, and demonstration projects relating to biobased industrial products;

“(B) serve as cochairpersons of the Board;

“(C) administer the Initiative; and

“(D) respond in writing to each recommendation of the Advisory Committee made under section 1490C(c)(2).

“SEC. 1490B. SUSTAINABLE FUELS AND CHEMICALS BOARD.

“(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established the Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Board to coordinate programs within and among departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the purpose of promoting the use of biobased industrial products by—

“(1) maximizing the benefits deriving from Federal grants and assistance; and

“(2) bringing coherence to Federal strategic planning.

“(b) *MEMBERSHIP.*—The Board shall consist of:

“(1) The point of contact of the Department of Agriculture designated under section 1490A(d)(1)(A), who shall serve as cochairperson of the Board.

“(2) The point of contact of the Department of Energy designated under section 1490A(d)(1)(B), who shall serve as cochairperson of the Board.

“(3) A senior officer of each of the following agencies who is appointed by the head of the agency and who has a rank that is equivalent to the points of contact:

“(A) The Department of the Interior.

“(B) The Environmental Protection Agency.

“(C) The National Science Foundation.

“(D) The Office of Science and Technology Policy.

“(4) At the option of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, other members appointed by the Secretaries (after consultation with members described in paragraphs (1) through (3)).

“(c) *DUTIES.*—The Board shall—

“(1) coordinate research, development, and demonstration activities relating to biobased industrial products—

“(A) between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Energy; and

“(B) with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

“(2) provide recommendations to the points of contact concerning administration of this subtitle.

“(d) *FUNDING.*—Each agency represented on the Board is encouraged to provide funds for any purpose under this subtitle.

“(e) *MEETINGS.*—The Board shall meet at least quarterly to enable the Board to carry out the duties of the Board under subsection (c).

“SEC. 1490C. SUSTAINABLE FUELS AND CHEMICALS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

“(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established the Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Technical Advisory Committee to—

“(1) advise the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, and the points of contact concerning—

“(A) the technical focus and direction of requests for proposals issued under the Initiative; and

“(B) procedures for reviewing and evaluating the proposals;

“(2) facilitate consultations and partnerships among Federal and State agencies, agricultural producers, industry, consumers, the research community, and other interested groups to carry out program activities relating to the Initiative; and

“(3) evaluate and perform strategic planning on program activities relating to the Initiative.

“(b) *MEMBERSHIP.*—The Committee shall consist of the following members appointed by the points of contact:

“(1) An individual affiliated with the biobased industrial products industry.

“(2) An individual affiliated with a college or university who has expertise in biobased industrial products.

“(3) 2 prominent engineers or scientists from government or academia who have expertise in biobased industrial products.

“(4) An individual affiliated with a commodity trade association.

“(5) An individual affiliated with an environmental or conservation organization.

“(6) An individual associated with State government who has expertise in biobased industrial products.

“(7) At the option of the points of contact, other members.

“(c) *DUTIES.*—The Advisory Committee shall—

“(1) advise the points of contact with respect to the Initiative; and

“(2) evaluate whether, and make recommendations in writing to the Board to ensure that—

“(A) funds authorized for the Initiative are distributed and used in a manner that is consistent with the goals of the Initiative;

“(B) the points of contact are funding proposals under this subtitle that are selected on the basis of merit, as determined by an independent panel of scientific and technical peers; and

“(C) activities under this subtitle are carried out in accordance with this subtitle.

“(d) *MEETINGS.*—The Advisory Committee shall meet at least quarterly to enable the Advisory Committee to carry out the duties of the Advisory Committee under subsection (c).

“SEC. 1490D. SUSTAINABLE FUELS AND CHEMICALS RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, acting through their respective points of contact and in consultation with the Board, shall establish and carry out a Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Research Initiative under which competitively-awarded grants, contracts, and financial assistance are provided to, or entered into with, eligible entities to carry out research on biobased industrial products.

“(b) *PURPOSES.*—The purposes of grants, contracts, and assistance under this section shall be to—

“(1) stimulate collaborative activities by a diverse range of experts in all aspects of biomass processing for the purpose of conducting fundamental and innovation-targeted research and technology development;

“(2) enhance creative and imaginative approaches toward biomass processing that will serve to develop the next generation of advanced technologies making possible low cost and sustainable biobased industrial products;

“(3) strengthen the intellectual resources of the United States through the training and education of future scientists, engineers, managers, and business leaders in the field of biomass processing; and

“(4) promote integrated research partnerships among colleges, universities, national laboratories, Federal and State research agencies, and the private sector as the best means of overcoming technical challenges that span multiple research and engineering disciplines and of gaining better leverage from limited Federal research funds.

“(c) *ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—To be eligible for a grant, contract, or assistance under this section, an applicant shall be—

“(A) a college or university;

“(B) a national laboratory;

“(C) a Federal research agency;

“(D) a State research agency;

“(E) a private sector entity;

“(F) a nonprofit organization; or

“(G) a consortium of 2 or more entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

“(2) *ADMINISTRATION.*—After consultation with the Board, the points of contact, on behalf of the Board, shall—

“(A) publish annually 1 or more joint requests for proposals for grants, contracts, and assistance under this section;

“(B) establish a priority in grants, contracts, and assistance under this section for research that—

“(i) demonstrates potential for significant advances in biomass processing;

“(ii) demonstrates potential to substantially impact scale-sensitive national objectives such as sustainable resource supply, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, healthier rural economies, and improved strategic security and trade balances; and

“(iii) would improve knowledge of important biomass processing systems that demonstrate potential for commercial applications;

“(C) require that grants, contracts, and assistance under this section be awarded competitively, on the basis of merit, after the establishment of procedures that provide for scientific peer review by an independent panel of scientific and technical peers; and

“(D) give preference to applications that—

“(i) involve a consortium of experts from multiple institutions; and

“(ii) encourage the integration of disciplines and application of the best technical resources.

“(d) USES OF GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND ASSISTANCE.—A grant, contract, or assistance under this section shall be used to conduct—

“(1) research on process technology for overcoming the recalcitrance of biomass, including research on key mechanisms, advanced technologies, and demonstration test beds for—

“(A) feedstock pretreatment and hydrolysis of cellulose and hemicellulose, including new technologies for—

“(i) enhanced sugar yields;

“(ii) lower overall chemical use;

“(iii) less costly materials; and

“(iv) cost reduction;

“(B) development of novel organisms and other approaches to substantially lower the cost of cellulase enzymes and enzymatic hydrolysis, including dedicated cellulase production and consolidated bioprocessing strategies; and

“(C) approaches other than enzymatic hydrolysis for overcoming the recalcitrance of cellulosic biomass;

“(2) research on technologies for diversifying the range of products that can be efficiently and cost-competitively produced from biomass, including research on—

“(A) metabolic engineering of biological systems (including the safe use of genetically modified crops) to produce novel products, especially commodity products, or to increase product selectivity and tolerance, with a research priority on the development of biobased products that can compete in performance and cost with fossil-based products;

“(B) catalytic processing to convert intermediates of biomass processing into products of interest;

“(C) separation technologies for cost-effective product recovery and purification;

“(D) approaches other than metabolic engineering and catalytic conversion of intermediates of biomass processing;

“(E) advanced biomass gasification technologies, including coproduction of power and heat as an integrated component of biomass processing, with the possibility of generating excess electricity for sale; and

“(F) related research in advanced turbine and stationary fuel cell technology for production of electricity from biomass; and

“(3) research aimed at ensuring the environmental performance and economic viability of biobased industrial products and their raw material input of biomass when considered as an integrated system, including research on—

“(A) the analysis of, and strategies to enhance, the environmental performance and sustainability of biobased industrial products, including research on—

“(i) accurate measurement and analysis of greenhouse gas emissions, carbon sequestration, and carbon cycling in relation to the life cycle of biobased industrial products and feedstocks with respect to other alternatives;

“(ii) evaluation of current and future biomass resource availability;

“(iii) development and analysis of land management practices and alternative biomass cropping systems that ensure the environmental performance and sustainability of biomass production and harvesting;

“(iv) land, air, water, and biodiversity impacts of large-scale biomass production, processing, and use of biobased industrial products relative to other alternatives; and

“(v) biomass gasification and combustion to produce electricity;

“(B) the analysis of, and strategies to enhance, the economic viability of biobased industrial products, including research on—

“(i) the cost of the required process technology;

“(ii) the impact of coproducts, including power and heat generation, on biobased industrial product price and large-scale economic viability; and

“(iii) interactions between an emergent biomass refining industry and the petrochemical refining infrastructure; and

“(C) the field and laboratory research related to feedstock production with the interrelated goals of enhancing the sustainability, increasing productivity, and decreasing the cost of biomass processing, including research on—

“(i) altering biomass to make biomass easier and less expensive to process;

“(ii) existing and new agricultural and energy crops that provide a sustainable resource for conversion to biobased industrial products while simultaneously serving as a source for coproducts such as food, animal feed, and fiber;

“(iii) improved technologies for harvest, collection, transport, storage, and handling of crop and residue feedstocks; and

“(iv) development of economically viable cropping systems that improve the conservation and restoration of marginal land.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any other amounts that are authorized to be appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$49,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005.

“SEC. 1490E. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND FUNDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent administrative support and funds are not provided by other agencies under subsection (b), the Secretary of Energy shall provide such administrative support and funds of the Department of Energy to the Board and the Advisory Committee as are necessary to enable the Board and the Advisory Committee to carry out this subtitle.

“(b) OTHER AGENCIES.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the heads of the agencies referred to, or appointed under, paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 1490B(a) may, and are encouraged to, provide administrative support and funds of their respective agencies to the Board and the Advisory Committee.

“SEC. 1490F. REPORTS.

“For each fiscal year that funds are made available to carry out this subtitle, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly transmit to Congress a detailed report on—

“(1) the status and progress of the Initiative, including a certification from the Board that funds authorized for the Initiative are distributed and used in a manner that is consistent with the goals of the Initiative; and

“(2) the general status of cooperation and research efforts carried out by each Secretary with respect to sustainable fuels, chemicals, and electricity derived from biomass, including a certification from the Board that the points of contact are funding proposals that are selected on the basis of merit, as determined by an independent panel of scientific and technical peers.

“SEC. 1490G. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ETHANOL RESEARCH PILOT PLANT.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to construct a Department of Agriculture corn-based ethanol research pilot plant a total of \$14,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and subsequent fiscal years.”

SEC. 4. USE OF CONSERVATION RESERVE LAND FOR RECOVERY OF BIOMASS USED IN ENERGY PRODUCTION.

Section 1232(a)(7) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) by striking “except that the Secretary may permit harvesting” and inserting “except that the Secretary—

“(A) may permit—

“(i) harvesting”;

(2) by striking “emergency, and the Secretary may permit limited” and inserting “emergency; and

“(ii) limited”;

(3) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) shall approve not more than 18 projects under which crops on land subject to the contract may be harvested for recovery of biomass used in energy production if—

“(i) no acreage subject to the contract is harvested more than once every other year;

“(ii) not more than 25 percent of the total acreage enrolled in the program under this subchapter in any crop reporting district (as designated by the Secretary), is harvested in any 1 year;

“(iii) no portion of the crop is used for any commercial purpose other than energy production from biomass;

“(iv) no wetland, or acreage of any type enrolled in a partial field conservation practice (including riparian forest buffers, filter strips, and buffer strips), is harvested;

“(v) the owner or operator agrees to a payment reduction under this section in an amount determined by the Secretary;

“(vi) the owner or operator agrees to commission and submit to the Secretary a study and report, to be conducted and written by a third party approved by the Secretary, on the impact of the biomass production and harvesting on wildlife; and

“(vii) the owner or operator agrees to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary, in consultation with the State technical committee for the State and appropriate conservation and wildlife advocates, may establish to ensure that the production and harvesting of biomass crops minimize disturbance of wildlife habitat and are otherwise consistent with the purposes of the program established under this subchapter, with any biomass harvesting project permitted to harvest at least 50,000 acres per year.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2862

(Purpose: To provide a substitute)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], for Mr. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 2862.

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

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to recommend that the Senate pass S. 935.

At a time when American farmers and rural communities are having a difficult time making ends meet, it is appropriate for the Senate to support this initiative that holds great promise for agriculture, strengthens America's energy security and helps clean America's air and water while dramatically reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Early civilizations relied on plants and trees for all their energy and food needs. With the passage of time and technological advancement, however, an increasing share of the world's energy demands shifted from plants and trees toward fossil fuels. Time and technology march on, and today we witness the beginning of a revolution from non-renewable fossil fuels toward

renewable resources that can help meet the energy demands of a world now numbering six billion people. Ironically, plants and trees are once again being valued as raw material for energy production because they contain an enormous store of energy freely delivered by the sun.

Using nature's renewable raw material for production of needed fuels, chemicals and energy is not a new idea. What is new, however, is a better understanding of chemistry and molecular biology which has led to the development of advanced biotechnologies and processing techniques for efficiently converting plants to energy. With these advances, it is now possible to envisage a future where the world's thirst for additional sources of energy is fueled by biomass.

Biobased fuels are our best means of reducing American dependence on imported oil. Reliance on the unstable states of the Middle East adversely impacts American strategic security, and massive oil imports skew our balance of payments. Fuels and chemicals derived from biomass will reduce our dependence on Middle Eastern oil without necessitating a rebuilding of the existing gasoline infrastructure. With the need for affordable energy rising as population grows, the Middle East will control nearly three-quarters of the world's oil this century. We have stark options: submit to increased influence of foreign oil cartels; wrangle over pipeline routes to new oil supplies at the ends of the Earth, such as the Caspian region; or, support research that could lead to a revolution in the way we produce energy.

In addition to fuels, biobased chemicals have the potential to replace essentially all chemicals currently derived from petroleum, and they are often endowed with superior performance characteristics. The manufacturing of biobased products is generally more environmentally friendly than analogue petrochemical processes.

Fuels, cloth fibers, plastics and adhesives are already produced from corn; the new genetic engineering techniques will make it possible to use entire plants, rather than just the tiny portion of edible grains. With sound land use policies, local crops that enrich the soil, prevent erosion and improve local environmental conditions can be planted and then harvested for co-production of food, fuel, chemicals, electricity and materials. Rural communities will be strengthened through the diversification of marketable agricultural products and farmers will have expanded sources of income.

Before we are able to reap the outstanding benefits offered through utilization of America's sustainable biomass resource, costs of the new conversion technology must be significantly reduced. Research offers the only systematic means for creating the innovations and technical improvements that will lower the costs of biomass processing. Given the relatively short-term

horizon characteristic of private sector investments, and because many benefits of biomass processing are in the public interest, the Federal government has a compelling mandate to fund the necessary innovation-driven research that will result in cost effective technologies for biomass conversion.

Although government sponsored research programs have been largely responsible for demonstrating the potential of biomass conversion technology, coordination among key Federal agencies is disjointed and funding levels are declining. The Biomass Research and Development Act is designed to address these shortcomings. America's leading technical experts from universities, national laboratories and the private sector will be brought together in a dynamic research initiative with the purpose of overcoming technical barriers to low cost biomass conversion.

At a time when political compromise seems elusive and progress on environmental and energy issues often seems slow, I am convinced that the idea of encouraging human ingenuity to create a sustainable resource for clean fuels and chemicals represents a remarkable opportunity for consensus. Working together we can promote research that will improve our national security and balance of payments, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and strengthen rural economies.

Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Joseph Michels, my science policy adviser, for the excellent advice he has provided me on this issue. Dr. Michels is leaving my staff to assume an important post at Princeton University. I shall miss him.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

JURISDICTIONAL CLARIFICATION

• Mr. LUGAR. I would like to enter into a colloquy with my distinguished colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI, Chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I want to inform my colleague that any action taken by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry in relation to S. 935 is not an attempt to encroach on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Further, the fact that S. 935 was reported from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry does not affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources over energy matters, including biofuels and bioenergy. Specifically, USDA biomass research and development programs remain within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and DOE biomass research and development programs remain within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank my colleague, the Chairman of the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, for addressing this matter and clarifying our understanding that this

legislation does not alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

I would also like to note that the authorization of appropriations contained in section 3 of S. 935 clarifies that money may be appropriated for the biomass research and development activities described in the bill pursuant to the existing general authority of the Secretary of Energy to fund biomass research and development, and does not create a new specific level of authorization for this program.

Mr. LUGAR. I agree and thank the Senator from Alaska.●

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the committee substitute, as amended, be agreed to, the bill be read the third time and passed, the amendment to the title be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 2862) was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 935), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

To authorize research to promote the conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products, and for other purposes.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2000

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 1. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume debate on the pending Robb amendment to S. 1134, the education savings account bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the Robb amendment regarding school construction at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow. Following 30 minutes of debate, at approximately 10 a.m., the Senate will proceed to a vote on or in relation to the amendment. Senator ABRAHAM's amendment regarding computers will be introduced following the Robb vote. Other amendments will be offered and debated during tomorrow's session and therefore Senators can expect votes throughout the day.

Senators should be aware that an agreement to have all first-degree

amendments offered by 5 p.m. tomorrow is being discussed in an effort to complete action on this legislation as early as possible this week.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator REED of Rhode Island.

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

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

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

Mr. REED. I ask to speak pursuant to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

EDUCATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will speak this evening on an issue of great importance to the country and every family in America. That is the issue of education.

For the past 4 months, the Republicans and Democrats on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee have been working to come up with a bipartisan approach to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Sadly, those efforts have collapsed and we are being presented with a Republican bill, the Straight A's Act, which is essentially a block granting of critical programs and the amassing of Federal resources to be distributed with little accountability by the States.

This issue is of great importance because education is what I believe is fueling the great economic progress we are making today. The 5-percent growth in productivity in the last quarter recognizes the combination of American technology, which is a product of our ideas, our education, and the skills and talents of the American people that have been forged in the classrooms of America.

Just as importantly, this recognition of the centrality and importance of education is shared by every American because they the mothers and fathers of this country, recognize that the future of their families, the future of their children, are dependent almost exclusively on how well they are educated. As a result, we cannot take lightly the proposals that are before the Senate with regard to the educational policy of the United States.

There are some who do not think the National Government has a role in edu-

cation. I disagree. We recognize, of course, the primacy of States and localities in terms of forging educational policy, but we do have a role at the national level. We have a role of providing both encouragement and support for local innovation and also support to overcome local inertia.

We have seen that played out throughout our history. We have seen a situation where years ago the States were inattentive to the needs of low-income students, particularly minority students. That is one of the primary impulses for the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have seen in the past where States were indifferent to the education of students with disabilities, and we acted properly and appropriately to do that. So we do have this national role and we have to carry it out conscientiously, recognizing that public education is the bulwark of our society and our country.

Ninety percent of our students attend public schools. Public schools offer not only educational benefits but are the devices that bring us together, the common ground, the area in which one can enter and prepare to seize the opportunities of life without regard to race, creed, or ethnicity.

It is this public education system that we must enhance, reform, and reinvigorate. I argue that the approach to do that is not through block grants. The approach is a careful consideration of the appropriate Federal initiatives, both in terms of resources and in terms of programs, that will help stimulate reform at the local level and help overcome the inertia and the political gridlock we see every day at the localities and at the States just as they see on certain issues in Washington.

Again, I yield, as do all my colleagues, that the Federal Government is the junior partner in this partnership for education in America. We supply roughly 7 percent of all the resources; the States, the cities, and the towns supply 93 percent of the resources. However, we can do much, particularly in the area of focusing assistance on the neediest children and also, as I said before, to help invigorate our school system, to help accelerate reform.

Money isn't everything; it is vitally important, but we also need a sense of direction or purpose, of national statements about what is critical to the Nation as well as critical to localities and to States. That, too, is part and parcel to our deliberations about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

We should be providing resources for local communities. One of the problems with the educational policy in the United States is it is tied so closely to property tax that we can witness situations where good school systems, particularly school systems in urban areas that were models of efficiency and expertise decades ago, have fallen on hard times because their property base has evaporated. People have moved to the suburbs; the industries have left the

central city and moved out. We can help, and we do that principally through title I programs.

Again, as we help with resources at the local level, we cannot give up the idea also that we have to provide this spark of innovation, the spark of reform that is so critical to the efforts. I believe also that this is recognized by many people at the State and local level, that our Goals 2000 initiative several years ago helped essentially start a reform process that was inchoate at the State and local level and many places that needed resources, even if there was a sense of reform. This effort, this identification of reform together with resources helped stimulate productive efforts that are improving the quality of education. But I also would say we have a long way to go before we can satisfy ourselves that every student in America, every child in America, has access to excellent public schools. That should be our goal, a goal we must insist upon.

Again, I am disappointed that efforts over the last several months to try to forge bipartisan compromise on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have failed, apparently, for the moment. Tomorrow in the committee we begin to debate a legislative proposal that is simply abdicating the responsibilities of the National Government to the States without any real accountability. That is a wrong approach.

We have seen that because we have seen what the States have done in contrast to what the Federal Government has done in some critical areas of concern. I am not trying to suggest there is any type of nefarious plot at the States, but we all have to recognize they are under very special pressures in terms of allocating funds, in terms of local problems, a host of local issues that complicate their politics, and we have an opportunity sometimes to avoid those internecine fights that go on and provide direction that they welcome and they, in fact, in many cases expect.

One aspect of this debate about Federal versus State perspectives is a report prepared by the General Accounting Office in 1998. It was found Federal aid was seven times more targeted to poor students than State programs overall. It found our effort to reach out and help low-income students was disproportionately greater than State efforts. I think you have to ask yourself, logically, had we not acted in 1965 with title I, and in Congresses subsequent to that date to help out low-income students, both in center-city areas and in rural areas, would they enjoy the limited success they have had to date? I am not suggesting we succeeded in that arena.

I suggest you might find that same proportion of funding, those who are politically powerful in States, those suburban areas, those areas that themselves with property tax can fund schools, would do much better. In fact,

our situation in center-city and rural areas would be much more severe without specified targeted Federal assistance—not a block grant, specified targeted Federal assistance.

I should point out in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—I was a Member of the other body at that time—we were aware of some of the shortcomings and limitations and inhibitions in the title I program, and we made changes to streamline it and make it more effective, as we did with several other programs. The results from the last few years seem to suggest this combination of more programmed and efficient Federal support, together with State initiatives, have led to real improvements. We want to continue that partnership and certainly those improvements.

There is another aspect, too, that affects the State and Federal Governments. I think sometimes we sit back and say: The States have it right; they know how to allocate and distribute funds. It turns out in over one-third of the States in these United States, people are suing the States claiming they are unfairly distributing their school aid. If we are going to turn around and give moneys to such a State without real accountability, without real direction, we, frankly, are running right into the teeth of those suits that are saying the States do not know how to spend their money fairly, wisely, or well; they are disadvantaging large parts of the population.

I think there are many reasons why we can argue with great credibility and force that Federal programs and Federal resources, national policies, can complement, supplement, help States do things that, because of politics, because of resource limitations, because of a host of reasons, they would not do of their own volition.

There is another issue, too, and it becomes, frankly, an issue that is much more specific to us today than it was 10 years ago or 20 years ago. We are in a global economy. Our competition is no longer between Rhode Island and South Carolina or Pennsylvania and Utah. It is between students in Singapore and in Japan and around the world versus American students. To suggest at this time there is not a national need for some direction, some support, some help to States to move forward their educational process is to disregard the global nature of the world we face today.

There are examples, frankly, of where we have acted successfully with federally directed programs to set national policies with national resources to facilitate State reform. One I mentioned previously is Goals 2000. I participated in the drafting of this legislation in 1994. I would have liked to have gone much further in terms of accountability, in terms of many other things. But the sense of the Congress and the administration was let's get into the States' resources with a direction to

begin to start reforming or helping their reform efforts. That took place. In fact, it has been acknowledged that Goals 2000 has been a force for reform in places such as Texas and Georgia and Vermont and elsewhere. Indeed, in 1998, in another GAO report, State and local officials stated:

Goals 2000 funding provided valuable assistance and that, without this funding, some reform efforts would not have been accomplished or would not have been accomplished as quickly.

Again, had we simply back in 1994 said take this money and do what you like, without some structure, some framework, it would not have been as successful, I believe, as it has been to date.

There is another area where we can play a critical role—it is a role we have played in the past—and that is educational technology. National investment in educational technology since 1994, in programs such as the Technological Literacy Challenge Fund and the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants, as well as the E-Rate, have led to a dramatic increase in the number of schools connected to the Internet. Again, these are very specific targeted national programs. Between 1994 and 1998, Internet access in public schools increased from 35 to 89 percent of schools. The percentage of public school instruction rooms with Internet access also increased during this time period from 3 percent in 1994 to 51 percent in 1998.

High poverty schools, which have long lagged behind wealthier schools in Internet access, were as likely to have Internet access as low-poverty-level schools by the fall of 1998 because of these initiatives—again, appropriate. We are not supplanting State and local efforts, but we are identifying a national need to wire up to the Internet the children in the classroom, providing resources, direction. It gets done. It succeeds.

There is still a need, in fact, for additional effort in that regard. That is why we are missing a real opportunity in this reauthorization to build upon the success of our technology initiatives. In fact, the gap between high- and low-poverty schools and the percentage of classrooms with Internet access does not seem to be stabilized. It seems to be a widening; there is a bit of widening at the gap. We have to continue to work to make sure that gap does not exist.

My colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, is often quoted talking about the digital divide; the fact that affluent students enjoy computer access at home and in classrooms. Low-income students do not have that opportunity. In the information age that digital divide could be decisive. So we have an opportunity to work now to build on prior success to ensure we truly close the digital divide.

There is another area—this one, I think, is very emblematic of the dangers of reflexively shifting from tar-

geted programs to block grants—and that is school libraries. In 1965, Congress enacted legislation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which included specific provisions to assist school libraries to buy library material, principally books. But in 1981, with the advent of the Reagan administration, this specific program was thrown into a large block grant.

Now what has happened? What happened is all the material that was bought in 1965 through the late 1960s and 1970s is still on the shelves and has not been replaced because when this library program was thrown into a block grant, local pressures took out the support to buy library books. It always seemed there was something else to crowd it out, some other immediate problem. As a result, what I believe is a strong national thought that children in our schools should have up-to-date, modern library books has withered away, and we can see the proof on the shelves of school libraries throughout this country.

When I was talking about this issue several years ago, a librarian in a school in Arizona sent me a book. The title was "The Constitution of the United States," by James Beck. But what I thought was interesting is that there was a foreword by the President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge. The book was written in 1924 and was still on the shelves in 1993.

I went to law school. I think there were a couple of amendments to the Constitution after 1924.

I would be hard pressed if I were a student in that school in Arizona to confirm or deny that fact.

There is another book found in Boston entitled "Planets, Stars, and Space" which noted:

Of course, the trip (to the moon) cannot yet be made. . . . It may be necessary to establish a giant artificial moon or satellite a thousand miles or so above the earth, from which to launch the moon rocket.

That is copyright 1957, and that was in a school library recently.

From my own home State, there was in a school library a book entitled "Ms. MD" which stated only men could enroll in Brown Medical School, and the tuition—this really dates it—was \$2,800 a year.

The effort to block grant the library program led to the deterioration and destruction of the library program, and as a result there are thousands of schools across the country that have books so out of date that if parents saw them, they would recall their child.

I hope we can change it. In this authorization, contrary to block grant, we can try to develop another library approach to assist libraries in buying not just books but CDs and all the media we need for an information age.

The other presumption is—in addition to the fact there is a presumption in some quarters that the States know how to spend the money—all of the successes are because of local initiatives. The reality is there are too many

failing schools in America, and the people directly responsible for these schools—we all admit it here—are the States and localities. I think that somewhat undercuts this notion of infallibility at the local level and supports the notion that at the national level, our ideas and our initiatives and complementary activities have a place and a purpose.

There are about 8,000 schools across the country which are failing their own standards set by their States—not national standards but State standards. Ask yourself: What is happening? Why are these schools not being reformed?

What has happened in our proposal, and I hope we can deal with it in the ESEA, is we are asking for more accountability by the States. We are asking them to tell us: What are you going to do about these 8,000 schools? How are you going to fix them? Do you need additional resources?

We are not trying to be prescriptive—one way to do it—but we want accountability. That, too, is going to be decisively lost if we simply turn over large block grants to Governors and say do what you will because doing what they will has led to 8,000 schools across this country failing their students, failing the parents, and failing the Nation. We should not tolerate that.

There is another area that is important that represents, in many cases, the clash of conflicting priorities at the local level and results in a poor educational environment for students. That is the issue of school modernization. There are schools in this country that are literally falling apart or so out of date that they impair the educational experience of children.

There are schools in my communities in Rhode Island that were built in 1876 and in 1898. In 1876, George Armstrong Custer lost a battle at the Little Big Horn. Much has changed since then, except children are still walking and busing to this school in a community in Rhode Island.

In the wintertime, the way they regulate the heat is they open the windows because once they turn that boiler on, it gets so hot that the only thing they can do to cool it down to room temperature is to open the windows. There is a trailer outside, but the trailer is not a good place to put computers because it is not fully air conditioned, not well ventilated. This is one example. These examples are replete throughout the entire country.

In Rhode Island, 81 percent of schools report a need to upgrade or repair a building to good overall condition. Again, this is an area where national assistance can be very helpful. There is not a weekend—and I go home every weekend—where I do not run into someone—a parent, a school committee person—who says: You know what, we sure could use some help fixing up our schools.

This is not some plot hatched in Washington, DC, to take over elementary and secondary education. This is

what people intimately involved in elementary and secondary education in our communities want us to do, but we will not be able to do it if we simply bundle up the money in a block grant and give it to the Governors.

I talked a good bit about some of the problems we have in our school system, some of the problems we have in terms of our response in the Senate to these issues. But I would be remiss if I did not mention some of the good news because of our efforts over the last several years.

It turns out that high school students are taking tougher mathematical and science courses because this notion of increased standards which began with the Governors' conference years ago and certainly were highlighted by the efforts of President Clinton, certainly underscored by the Goals 2000 Act, certainly reemphasized in the last reauthorization, this is leading to students taking tougher mathematical and science courses.

These increased participation rates are cutting across different lines of income, ethnicity, and race, which are very good signs for our country. Student mathematical achievement is improving. Between 1982 and 1986, students improved their achievement in mathematics, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

There is some good news, and it is the result not of the absence of the National Government from policy or solely because of the presence of national programs; it is because of this partnership that has been worked out, somewhat fluidly and sometimes roughly, over several decades between local initiatives and national complementary initiatives.

I could go on about student achievement. It is improving but not enough. Certainly, in international comparisons, we are not where we want and must be.

The other item is we have seen some of these improvements in math and science and some in part—I do not want to overstate this—might be attributable to a specific Federal national initiative, and that is the Eisenhower Professional Development Program established in 1984 to increase the quality of math and science teaching by giving math and science teachers opportunities to develop their expertise and understanding and to develop their techniques to teach; again, part of what I hope is good news about improving mathematical scores in this country.

Had we been presented with a bill in the HELP Committee which would have given us the opportunity to talk seriously about issues of programmatic content and national priorities, there are some things I would have liked to emphasize. I will mention them.

First, we have to improve the quality of teaching in the United States. We just had an amendment by my colleague, the Senator from Maine, Ms.

COLLINS. It was a very good amendment because it talked about allowing teachers to get more tax benefits for their investment in professional development, for taking courses in graduate school, and buying material. That is a good effort. Frankly, that is just the surface.

If we want to improve the performance of teachers in our schools, we have to go into the classroom. We do not have to send the teachers necessarily to graduate school. We have to go into the classroom. We have to embed professional development as part of the daily life of the school. That is not being done across this country.

What we have in many places is what I experienced as a child when I went to school, and that is the proverbial teacher's institute. It was the one day we celebrated because there was no school or no holiday. They just took the day off. Teachers went to a big conference center, listened to a speaker, chatted about all sorts of things, and that was professional development.

It does not work that way, particularly nowadays. They have to make professional development part and parcel of the school. They have to have senior teachers and principals involved in the professional development of their teachers. They have to have the flexibility to get substitute teachers into the classroom so teachers can get out and observe other teachers teaching. This is a national priority.

We should be able to give the States both financial assistance and a sense of direction about the best techniques, if you will, give them a spectrum, a menu of things from which they can choose. But we cannot do that if our fixation is just ship the money down to the Governor. We have to improve the quality of professional development.

A 1998 study in California found that the more teachers were engaged in ongoing curriculum-centered professional development, holding school conditions and student characteristics constant, the higher the students' mathematical achievements.

We know from the data, if you can embed professional development, put it in the life of the school, you can improve performance. That is what it is all about, not winning debating points but ensuring that the performance of students in the classrooms of this country improves and improves dramatically.

The teachers themselves recognize this. One in five talk about the fact they need more professional development, that what is being required of them by the States is inadequate. In fact, I believe the statistic would probably be higher if you pressed and probed more. So that is an area to which I would like to be able to devote attention. I am sure I will offer an amendment in the committee, but it is starkly different than the approach of simply shrugging our shoulders and saying: Let the Government figure it out.

We have ideas. We have an obligation to take what we see across this country and try to move States forward to do something that would improve the quality of education.

There is another area that is important. That area is parental involvement. The national PTA did a survey of public school parents and found that 91 percent believe it is "extremely important" for parents to be involved in their children's school, but more than half of the parents stated that schools need direction about how to make parents true partners in their children's education.

The overwhelming view of parents is they need to be more involved in the school. But a significant number say the schools are deaf to their concerns. They do not have the programs or the attitudes or the policies that will get parents into the schools.

This is particularly the case when you get to areas where there are low-income students because the reality is many times their parents have an unsuccessful educational experience. It is not as if school was a good place for them. There are also practical problems in many urban areas, and some rural areas, about language difficulties, about reaching out to parents in their own language to get them involved in the lives of their children. We have not, as a nation, been able to develop the kinds of policies and programs that assist States and localities in making parents real partners in their children's education. I hope we could do that. I hope we could do that by using ESEA to start thinking about ways we can jump-start parental involvement at the local level.

Again, you can always fall back to the point: Why is this not happening if the States have the vision, the resources, and the commitment to do it? Why should we tolerate it continuing in such a deplorable way if there is a lack of resources, vision, or commitment at the local level when we know it should and must be done?

As I mentioned, I would love very much to be able to take out some of those antiquated books on the library shelves of America and replace them with modern books that talk about the fact that we have landed on the Moon, that include all the amendments of the U.S. Constitution. Again, we will not be able to do that if we are simply block granting our educational dollars.

There is also a program that is based upon one State's experience helping another State. The States have long been described as laboratories of innovation and experiment. But I think we have a job, and that is to disseminate all that good work, making it available throughout the Nation, giving other States the incentive or the ideas or the resources to put in place what some States have succeeded so well in doing.

One program in Rhode Island is called the Child Opportunity Zones, COZs. These are places within schools that bring together all sorts of social

services, mental health services, child care services, and social work services. It is designed to assist the family, recognizing that the success of a child is dependent not only on his or her innate talent, and the teachers and the facilities, but also in the support and the participation of the whole family. If the family has problems, that child will likely have problems. Indeed, one of the things that has changed since my education is that family life in so many parts of this country has been terribly complicated by social problems, health care problems, issues that are not educational but decisively impact on the ability of a young child to learn.

I am encouraged that the President has sent up his budget proposing increases in Head Start. I have colleagues such as CHRIS DODD who are working valiantly to improve early childhood education. All of these things coming together recognize the fact that today, in so many places, it is not the educational problems holding children back; it is the health problem; it is the mental health problem; it is a host of problems that are outside the strict purview of what we used to think of as educational policy.

This COZ program is very successful in Rhode Island. It brings these disciplines to one place in the school. It gives families easy access to all of these disciplines.

Once again, this is an example of how the experience of one State—highlighted, illustrated, and disseminated by national legislation—can benefit the entire country. I would like very much to be able to work on that.

Finally, we come back to a major issue which will preoccupy all of us. That is this issue of accountability. Block grants, without accountability, are an abdication of our responsibility not only to have good educational policy but to the taxpayers. We cannot hand over millions of dollars with the assumption that States and localities are doing it right, when we know in some cases they do not invest enough in low-income education, that in some cases States and localities will not provide the kind of innovative change that is necessary for this new century.

We have to work hard to ensure we have accountability standards that work. I know Senator BINGAMAN has been a champion of this issue in the Senate. I worked with him as a Member of the other body in our reauthorization of the prior Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I anticipate, if we have a chance—and I hope we do—that both in committee and on the floor we will push hard for accountability. So we have a lot of work to do. It is national work. We simply cannot walk away from it.

Unfortunately, the approach that I see the Republican majority taking is effectively walking away from it, to hand it off to the States, to step back and say it is not our job, not our role, when, in fact, we can and should be a

partner, the junior partner but a partner, in this effort to improve education throughout the United States.

We have made progress. Statistics are encouraging in relation to student performance, but we will give up this progress, I fear, if we do not innovate, if we do not continue to support local initiatives, and if we do not continue to try to overcome the local inertia that leads to 8,000 failing schools, that leads to a malapportionment of dollars between poor students and more affluent students.

It is a national role that we have long had. It is increasingly a national priority, as we face a world of international competition, as we face a world where the future of our families literally depends upon the quality of the education that our children receive.

I hope that in this great debate we will, in fact, be able to talk about libraries, talk about child opportunity zones, talk about improving the accountability, and talk about how we can put technology into classrooms, not simply to walk away from this issue with the assumption that the States can and will do it.

CONGRATULATING AND THANKING
CHAIRMAN ROBERT F. BENNETT
AND VICE CHAIRMAN CHRISTOPHER J. DODD AND THE MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE YEAR 2000 TECHNOLOGY PROBLEM

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 264, submitted earlier by Senators LOTT, DASCHLE, MOYNIHAN, STEVENS, and BYRD.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 264) congratulating and thanking Chairman Robert F. Bennett and Vice Chairman Christopher J. Dodd for their tremendous leadership, poise, and dedication in leading the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem and commending the members of the Committee for their fine work.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem prepares to release its final report and disband today, I think it is only appropriate to thank our Chairman ROBERT F. BENNETT and Vice Chairman CHRISTOPHER J. DODD for the tremendous job that they did. They assembled the committee, held hearings to measure the problem, and in the end led the nation and world in ameliorating it. Well done.

We are told that nothing is more permanent than "temporary," especially with regard to congressional committees. But our special committee did its job, in the time allotted—under Senate Resolution 208, the committee was to

last from April 2, 1998 to February 29, 2000—and now it will be no more.

I am pleased to join the Democrat leader, Senator DASCHLE, and others in introducing a resolution that congratulates and thanks the chairman and vice chairman for their fine leadership and work.

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 264) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 264

Whereas Senator Robert F. Bennett and Senator Christopher J. Dodd had the foresight to urge Majority Leader Lott and Senator Daschle to establish the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem under Senate Resolution on April 2, 1998;

Whereas under Chairman Bennett's and Vice Chairman Dodd's leadership, the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem always acted in a bipartisan manner;

Whereas Chairman Bennett and Vice Chairman Dodd presided over 35 hearings on various aspects of technology infrastructure including utilities, health care, telecommunications, transportation, financial services, Government involvement, and litigation;

Whereas the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem became the central repository for Y2K computer problem information both nationally and internationally;

Whereas Chairman Bennett and Vice Chairman Dodd guided the Senate in working with the White House, the House of Representatives, the United Nations, and other international organizations, and the private sector in addressing the Y2K computer problem;

Whereas under Chairman Bennett's and Vice Chairman Dodd's leadership, the Committee issued 3 excellent reports that quickly became the authoritative source on the progress of the Federal Government, the private sector, and foreign countries on the Y2K computer problem;

Whereas Chairman Bennett, Vice Chairman Dodd and the Committee helped the Federal Government, industry, nations, and global enterprises learn that by working together we can solve the kinds of technology problems we will likely face in the 21st century;

Whereas Chairman Bennett and Vice Chairman Dodd always conducted hearings in a thoughtful and judicious manner, with the intent of addressing key issues so that the Senate could better evaluate and solve the problem;

Whereas because of Chairman Bennett's and Vice Chairman Dodd's initiative, the Nation and the world began to take the Y2K computer problem seriously and worked to resolve the problem; and

Whereas due to Chairman Bennett's and Vice Chairman Dodd's tremendous leadership, dedication, and the work of the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, the first potential catastrophe of the new century was avoided: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates and thanks Chairman Robert F. Bennett and Vice Chairman Christopher J. Dodd—

(1) for their tremendous leadership in addressing a massive and pervasive problem; a problem that was largely unknown, but thanks to Chairman Bennett and Vice Chairman Dodd was studied, evaluated, and resolved;

(2) for presiding over the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem which did its work in a bipartisan and fair manner; and

(3) for helping the Government and the Nation minimize the Y2K computer problem.

Mr. REED. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 1, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 29, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SYLVIA V. BACA, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

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

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. WILLIAM N. SEARCY, 9559

IN THE ARMY

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 major general, Medical Corps

BRIG. GEN. KEVIN C. KILEY, 4471
BRIG. GEN. DARREL R. PORR, 8386

IN THE NAVY

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. GORDON S. HOLDER, 2235

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS 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. RALPH S. CLEM, 2429
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. DANAHY, 2107
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH G. LYNCH, 4963
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY M. MUSFELDT, 8617
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT B. SIEGFRIED, 5248

To be brigadier general

COL. GERALD A. BLACK, 3573
COL. RICHARD B. FORD, 5811
COL. JACK C. IHLE, 1006
COL. KEITH W. MEURLIN, 1682
COL. BETTY L. MULLIS, 0954
COL. SCOTT R. NICHOLS, 8603
COL. DAVID A. ROBINSON, 7497
COL. RICHARD D. ROTH, 8023
COL. RANDOLPH C. RYDER, JR., 0160
COL. JOSEPH L. SHAEFER, 8844
COL. CHARLES E. STERNER, JR., 3274
COL. THOMAS D. TAVERNEY, 6191
COL. JAMES T. TURLINGTON, 4611

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. CURTIS M. BEDKE, 9014

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID E. CLARY, 9098
COL. MICHAEL A. COLLINGS, 3659
COL. SCOTT S. CUSTER, 2467
COL. DANIEL J. DARNELL, 0600
COL. DUANE W. DEAL, 0812
COL. VERN M. FINDLEY, II, 2123
COL. DOUGLAS M. FRASER, 7505
COL. DAN R. GOODRICH, 2370
COL. GILBERT R. HAWK, 6206
COL. RAYMOND E. JOHNS, JR., 3483
COL. TIMOTHY C. JONES, 7733
COL. PERRY L. LAMY, 4559
COL. EDWARD L. MAHAN, JR., 6388
COL. ROOSEVELT MERCER, JR., 3054
COL. GARY L. NORTH, 9194
COL. JOHN G. PAVLOVICH, 9032
COL. ALLEN G. PECK, 1135
COL. MICHAEL W. PETERSON, 5177
COL. TERESA M. PETERSON, 1094
COL. GREGORY H. POWER, 4129
COL. ANTHONY F. PRZYBYSLAWSKI, 7898
COL. RONALD T. RAND, 8658
COL. STEVEN J. REDMANN, 1838
COL. LOREN M. RENO, 7129
COL. JEFFREY R. RIEMER, 4731
COL. JACK L. RIVES, 0540
COL. MARC E. ROGERS, 4472
COL. ARTHUR J. ROONEY, JR., 6482
COL. STEPHEN T. SARGEANT, 1024
COL. DARRYL A. SCOTT, 3767
COL. JAMES M. SHAMESS, 8898
COL. WILLIAM L. SHELTON, 0678
COL. JOHN T. SHERIDAN, 8566
COL. TOREASER A. STEELE, 6197
COL. JAMES W. SWANSON, 6954
COL. GEORGE P. TAYLOR, JR., 9111
COL. GREGORY L. TREBON, 3693
COL. LOYD S. UTTERBACK, 9704
COL. FREDERICK D. VANVALKENBURG, JR., 4600
COL. DALE C. WATERS, 4174
COL. SIMON P. WORDEN, 2998

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOSEPH G. BAILLARGEON, JR., AND ENDING DAVID L. PHILLIPS, JR. WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 16, 1999.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS A PERMANENT PROFESSOR, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 9333(B):

To be colonel

MARK K. WELLS, 2227

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WILLIAM P. ABRAHAM, AND ENDING KENNETH C.Y. YU WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 1, 2000.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING LARAINÉ L. ACOSTA, AND ENDING ROGER A. WUJEK WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 2, 2000.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING SYNYA K. BALANON, AND ENDING EDWARD K. YI WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 2, 2000.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CHARLES G. BELENY, AND ENDING KRISTEN A. FULTSGANEY WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 7, 2000.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RICHARD T. BRITTINGHAM, AND ENDING WILLIAM D. STEWART, JR. WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 16, 1999.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING STEPHEN C. ALSOBROOK, AND ENDING HENRY E. ZERANSKI, JR. WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 16, 1999.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS A PERMANENT PROFESSOR OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 4333 (B):

To be colonel

ANDRE H. SAYLES, 7549

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING THOMAS E. AYRES, AND ENDING JOEL E. WILSON WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 2, 2000.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WAYNE E. CAUGHMAN, AND ENDING CALVIN B. WIMBISH WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 7, 2000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JEFFREY S. MACINTIRE, 5078

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOHN J. FITCH, AND ENDING TIMOTHY L. WATKINS WHICH NOMINATIONS

WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 9, 2000.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JOSEPH B. DAVIS, JR., 6675

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MICHAEL C. ALBO, AND ENDING RICHARD W. YODER WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 2, 2000.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CHRISTOPHER F. AJINGA, AND ENDING JOAN P. ZIMMERMAN WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 9, 2000.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOE H. ADKINS, JR., AND ENDING CHRISTOPHER M. ZUCHRISTIAN WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 9, 2000.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING TERRY C. PIERCE, AND ENDING FRANK G. RINER WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 16, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING BRAD HARRIS DOUGLAS, AND ENDING MARC A. STERN WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 16, 1999.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DEAN J. GIORDANO, AND ENDING WILLIAM K. NESMITH WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 7, 2000.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DAVID R. ALLISON, AND ENDING STEVE R. WILKINSON WHICH NOMINATIONS

WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 7, 2000.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RAQUEL C. BONO, AND ENDING MIL A. YI WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RABON E. COOKE, 6017

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

AMY J. POTTS, 7220

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE MADNESS MUST END

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, amazingly, today yet another tragic shooting claimed another promising life.

Not far from my district, near Flint in Mount Morris Township, a six-year-old girl was shot and killed by a classmate. A first grader had a gun and shot a classmate.

These tragedies go on every day. Thirteen children a day are killed by gun violence. Over 5,000 children are killed every year because of guns falling into the wrong hands.

This madness must end.

But, because the Republican leadership insists on pandering to the extreme right wing who thinks that one reasonable gun safety law is one too many, the insanity goes on.

The gun safety conference has not met since August of 1999. Today, I am writing for the fifth time to House Judiciary Committee Chairman HENRY HYDE to urge the Republican Leadership to stop stalling and call a conference meeting.

It is starting to hit close to home for every Member of this House, Mr. Speaker. How many more senseless killings will it take before the Republican Leadership acts? How many more promising young lives do we have to lose?

Quit stalling. Close the gun show loophole. Require child safety locks. Ban the importation of high capacity ammunition clips.

HONORING MS. ROSE MARIE BELL OF MORRIS, IL

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Ms. Rose Marie Bell of Morris, IL, for the nearly seventeen years of service she has put forth as the Grundy County Circuit Clerk.

In 1983, Robert T. Williamson retired from his duties as Grundy County Circuit Clerk. Ms. Rose Marie Bell, a lifetime resident of the County Seat of Grundy County, was wisely appointed to the position. The Circuit Clerk's seat is open every four years, which means Ms. Bell was elected on four separate occasions before retiring in December of 1999. Three of the four elections were unopposed. This shows her leadership both professionally and in the community have been cherished by the good people of Grundy County.

In 1988, Ms. Bell had the unenviable task of computerizing and automating the Circuit Clerk's office. She led her office through this trying and difficult time. When the spirits were low in the office she would comfort her work-

ers by saying, "And this too shall pass." Ms. Bell told the programmer she wanted a system where a deputy clerk could type in the court proceedings from within the courtroom and they would automatically transfer to the Clerk's office. The programmer said it could not be done, but Ms. Rose Marie Bell insisted on the installation. That particular system was used at that time by many Clerks' offices throughout the state and the code to access the record sheet was "Rose01". A down state judge, upon meeting Ms. Bell, said he was, "pleased to finally meet 'Rose01'."

Not only has Ms. Bell served the public in an official capacity, she was also the founding force of "Breaking Away" which is a victims of domestic violence organization. The organization provides shelter, counseling, and assistance to women and their children who need to detach themselves from an abusive home life. She still is actively involved serving as President of the organization.

Along with being a mother to her four sons Timothy, Daniel, Jeffrey, and Gregory, she was also known as "Mother Bell" to her staff in times of crisis both personally and professionally. She truly is a pillar of the community, holding a County office for 17 years, helping found "Break Away", being a mother of four and a friend to many.

Mr. Speaker, I find it fitting and appropriate to recognize and congratulate the years of service Ms. Rose Marie Bell has given to the Morris community and the people of Grundy County.

HONORING THE LATE DOUGLAS E. DUNSDON

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pause and remember the life of a man who meant a great deal to the Western Slope. Sadly, on February 27, 2000, Colorado said goodbye to Douglas Dunsdon. He was 81 years old.

Douglas spent nearly his entire life in the Glenwood Springs area. When the United States entered World War II, Douglas joined the United States Air Force and was stationed in Edin, England with the 8th Air Force, 100th Bomb Group. Douglas flew 25 missions. He earned a Distinguished Flying Cross, two Presidential Unit Citations, three Battle Stars, four Air Medals, a European Theater of Operations Medal and a group medal from the French and Polish governments. In addition, Douglas was a flight instructor for six months in Flight Control Communications in Bobbington, England.

After the war, Douglas returned to Glenwood Springs. He influenced the community in many ways. He ran the bowling alley, now known as Dumont Building. He and his father and brother built the Alpine Apartments, now

the Alpine Professional Building and he also worked at the Shoshone Power Plant until his retirement in 1976.

Douglas was an active member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, B.P.O.E. and was appointed National Aide-De-Camp in November of 1966 and was Commander of the VFW for three terms.

Douglas was also a wonderful husband and a loving father. I had the privilege of knowing Douglas and grew up with his children. "Mr. Dunsdon" was a very kind man and I have many fond memories of him and his family.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer this tribute to a great man who will be sorely missed by all those who knew him. He was truly a great American who among other things, fought for the freedom that we enjoy today.

HONORING THE UPSTATE URBAN LEAGUE OF GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. JIM DeMINT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. DeMINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my friends in this chamber that freedom in America is created not by government, but by individuals who take responsibility upon themselves and share in the responsibilities of community. When citizens take this responsibility, local people keep dollars, decisions and freedom in their hands. It is my honor several times each year to present the Congressional Spirit of Freedom Award to members of the 4th District of South Carolina. This non-partisan award goes to individuals, organizations, schools, and businesses that go above and beyond the call of duty to advance the spirit and ideals of freedom and volunteerism in service to the communities of South Carolina.

It is my pleasure today to honor one such group, the Upstate Urban League in Greenville, SC that has embodied these ideals. The Urban League's Pre-College Enrollment/Talent Search program has taken the initiative in making sure every Upstate child achieves his or her full potential. They have done this by providing SAT workshops, college visitation tours, and financial aid workshops for disadvantaged students, all without relying on government funding. In 1998 alone, they helped one hundred and thirty-three students raise their SAT scores by as much as two hundred and eighty points. I commend them for their work that helps students reach their dreams of going to college and succeeding in the next century. The Upstate Urban League proves when we come together and give a helping hand, we can overcome any challenge and secure the future for our children.

I offer my sincere thanks and best wishes for their continued success in bringing freedom home to the citizens of the Upstate and South Carolina. I am proud to present the Upstate Urban League, Greenville, SC with the Congressional Spirit of Freedom Award.

• 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.

EAGLE SCOUT HONORED

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding young individual from greater Chicagoland who has completed a major goal in his scouting career. Kevin Michael Fleming, a young man from Evergreen Park, Illinois has attained the rank of Eagle Scout.

Kevin has been actively involved in scouting since 1986 when he joined Tiger Cubs in the Beverly-Morgan Park neighborhood of Chicago. After seven years of progressing through the Tiger Cubs, Cub Scouts and Webelos, Kevin joined Boy Scout Troop #430 in June of 1993. While advancing through the Boy Scouts, Kevin demonstrated leadership abilities as a Junior Assistant Scoutmaster, Senior Patrol Leader and Quartermaster. In addition, he participated in the Owasippe Scout Camp for five summers, where he earned numerous accolades and completed the COPE program.

Not surprisingly, Kevin Fleming has taken part in many diverse activities as a Boy Scout and a student. Some of his many pastimes have included participation in an annual Thanksgiving Day pancake breakfast fundraiser, as well as various campouts, cycling trips and canoe outings.

It is important to note that less than two percent of all young men in America attain the rank of Eagle Scout. This high honor can only be earned by those scouts demonstrating extraordinary leadership abilities. In light of the commendable leadership and courageous activities performed by this fine young man, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Kevin Michael Fleming for attaining the highest honor in Scouting—the Rank of Eagle. Let us wish him the very best in all of his future endeavors.

HONORING MS. PAULA WOLFF

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Ms. Paula Wolff who is resigning from her position as President of Governors State University (GSU) on March 1, 2000.

Ms. Wolff has a B.A. magna cum laude from Smith College and an M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in political science. Before becoming the President of Governors State University, Ms. Wolff was a tenured professor in the College of Business and Public Service between 1972 and 1976. Since becoming President, she has continued to teach public policy at GSU at least once a year.

Between 1977 and 1991, Ms. Wolff served as Director of Policy and Planning for Governor James R. Thompson. She directed development and implementation of policy for all areas of state government, serving with her staff as liaison to 57 state agencies and chairing six subcabinets composed of their di-

rectors, representing 67,000 state employees with over a \$25 billion budget.

Paula Wolff became GSU's President in 1992. Governors State University is the only upper-division university in Illinois. The University, which serves over 9,000 students, has grown by over 22 percent within the past 6 years. Ms. Wolff has maintained a balanced portfolio of programs in the arts and professional areas. Eleven market-oriented programs have been added to the curriculum during Ms. Wolff's tenure.

Paula is married to Wayne W. Whalen, a lawyer, and has five children. She participates in numerous boards and civic activities including the Illinois Courts Commission, the Ariel Capital Management Board, Metropolitan Planning Council, Harris Insight Funds, the Joyce Foundation, the Johnson Foundation and is Chair of the University of Chicago Hospitals Board and a Trustee of the University of Chicago.

It has been my pleasure to work with Ms. Paula Wolff these past 6 years. She has and will continue to be a helpful colleague who is cited for her effectiveness in communicating with employers and legislators. Paula is so dedicated that she has donated her annual pay increases to the student scholarship fund.

I urge this body to identify and recognize others in their congressional districts whose dedication and actions have so greatly benefited America's students, universities and the surrounding communities.

MARLENE MANOWN GOES THE DISTANCE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize a woman who is dedicated to doing whatever it takes to promote the well-being and high self-esteem of young women across the nation. Marlene Manown, a Glenwood Springs, Colorado resident, will join other women who will ride from one coast to the other on their bicycles.

Marlene is part of a group called Girls on the Move, organized by Outward Bound, that uses this trip to help girls all around the nation. During stops along the way, Marlene and the other women will host programs that target raising self-esteem and finding positive role models for women ages 9–18.

Marlene is definitely qualified for this challenge. She has worked as a counselor at Glenwood Springs High School which means she knows all about what young women face on a day-to-day basis. She also has experience in cycling long distances on tours that, often times, last up to two weeks. This trip will last longer than two weeks, and Marlene will cycle at least 60 miles a day.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer this tribute of gratitude to Marlene Manown. She has given selflessly to help young women across the nation.

HONORING HIDDEN TREASURE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

HON. JIM DeMINT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. DeMINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my friends in this chamber that freedom in America is created not by government, but by individuals who take responsibility upon themselves and share in the responsibilities of community. When citizens take this responsibility, local people keep dollars, decisions and freedom in their hands. It is my honor several times each year to present the Congressional Spirit of Freedom Award to members of the 4th District of South Carolina. This non-partisan award goes to individuals, organizations, schools, and businesses that go above and beyond the call of duty to advance the spirit and ideals of freedom and volunteerism in service to the communities of South Carolina.

It is my pleasure today to honor one such group, the Hidden Treasure Christian School in Taylors, SC that has embodied these ideals. This school has cared for hundreds of special needs children from all across the nation. They are recognized as a model school in ministering to the physical, emotional, educational, and spiritual growth of special needs children. They have experienced such a demand for enrollment, they are expanding into a new educational facility to reach out to more children in the community. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for the tremendous gift they have given to our community's children, the gift of renewed opportunity for success.

It is an honor to serve constituents of such high character and dedication to the service of others. I offer my sincere thanks and best wishes for their continued success in bringing freedom and prosperity home to all the citizens of the Upstate and South Carolina. I am honored to award the Hidden Treasure Christian School with the Congressional Spirit of Freedom Award.

A TRIBUTE TO THE 1999 "SENIOR CITIZENS OF THE YEAR"

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the winners of my 1999 "Senior Citizens of the Year" competition. Every year, I select twenty seniors that show exceptional vitality and service to the people of the 3rd District of Illinois. Local civic groups and government leaders nominate many outstanding seniors. Then I have the very difficult task of selecting the best of the pool. This year's winners are: Mary Alexa, Virginia Bannon, Delores Cizek, Robert DeNovo, Cynthia Evenhouse, Frances Green, Alice Horton, Lillian Joly, George Kostakis, Irene Nichols, Harriet Niemiec, Helen Barber Olson, Dr. Shirley Verdugo-Perez, Raymond Rushton, Kurt Schalk, Lorraine Seymour, Evelyn Talerico, Eleanor Trzeciak, Alexander Walter and Theresa Wozniak. It now gives me great pride to describe their accomplishments.

Mary Alexa of Berwyn was nominated by the Jolly Friendly Seniors. Mary has been the President of the Jolly Friendly Seniors club for twelve years and is also an officer in the Gold Medallion and Mid-City Bank clubs. She played an instrumental role in merging The Jolly Club with The Friendly Club to create the Jolly Friendly Seniors. Mary also worked for the Sears department stores for fourteen years. The Jolly Friendly Seniors stated in their nomination: "Mary is generous, gracious—well liked by all."

Virginia Bannon of Crestwood was nominated by the Village of Crestwood. Virginia is an active volunteer at the Village's Christmas, Easter, and Halloween activities for children. She also does volunteer work at the Crestwood library and with needy families in Crestwood. Virginia is a member of several organizations including the Crestwood Senior Club, Incarnation Seniors and the Incarnation Women's Club. According to her application: "Virginia displays an unselfish willingness to help others. She sets personal goals aside when called upon to volunteer her time."

Dolores Cizek of Burr Ridge was nominated by Lyons Township Supervisor Patrick Rogers. Dolores has been a village Trustee for Burr Ridge since 1991 and has been an election judge for the last 9 years. She has written commentary columns for several area papers including the Doings and the Downers Grove Reporter. Dolores served on the local school board, District #107, in the 1970s and on the Burr Ridge Planning Commission in the 1980s. According to Supervisor Rogers: "She represents the right stuff in community volunteerism."

Robert C. DeNovo, Sr. of Palos Park was nominated by Deputy Chief Stan Szpytek of the Palos Fire Protection District. Robert is a founding member of the Palos Fire Protection District and is now in his 46th year of active service with the organization. He is an active member of the Palos Fire Fighters Association, the National Fire Protection Association, and the Illinois Association of Fire Protection Districts. Robert received special recognition by the Illinois House and Senate for his many achievements and years of service. Deputy Chief Szpytek stated in Robert's application: "At over 75 years of age, Bob still is an integral part of our organization and works at the department on a daily basis."

Cynthia Evenhouse of Palos Heights was nominated by Palos Heights Mayor Dean Koldenhoven. Cynthia is a member of the Christ Community Hospital Women's Auxiliary, and has volunteered over 5,000 hours at the hospital. For seven years, she has tutored handicapped people through the Friendship Club at the Palos Heights Christian Reformed Church. Cynthia also belongs to her church's choir and the Coffeebreak Bible study group. Mayor Koldenhoven stated in her application: "She always gives generously of her time and talent; she's dependable, loyal and is always there to help others."

Mrs. Frances Green of Bridgeview was nominated by Fran Marie Green and the Women's Active Party of Bridgeview. Frances was a founder of the first PTA charter at a Bridgeview school in 1954. She was also one of three women to start the first Brownie and Girl Scout troops in Bridgeview. Frances volunteers at Little Company Hospital and is Chairwoman of Active Angels, a group that visits the sick and lonely of Bridgeview. She is

a 20-year member of the Active Women of Bridgeview and a village resident for 45 years. Fran Marie Green, President of the Women's Active Party of Bridgeview, said: "She has truly served a multitude of people, and in my opinion, she is the Queen of Bridgeview."

Alice Horton of Midlothian was nominated by Thomas J. Murawski, Mayor of Midlothian. Alice is a founder and 22-year director of Coffeehouse, an organization that hosts social gatherings for handicapped adults in the Chicagoland area. In addition, she is active as a nursing home visitor and driver for the disabled to doctor appointments. Alice is a volunteer at Oak Forest Hospital, a member of the St. Vincent DePaul Society, and a member of the Altar & Rosary Society. She is a 54-year resident of Midlothian. In her application, Mayor Murawski said: "Alice continues to live her life in the service of others; she does this quietly and without fanfare."

Lillian Joly of Chicago was nominated by the St. Symphorosa Super Club. Lillian volunteers with the Metropolitan Family Services by visiting handicapped children and shut-ins, including driving shut-ins to doctors appointments, among other locations. She is an active member of several organizations including the Hale Park Club, the Messiah Senior Club, the St. Symphorosa Super Club, and the St. Vincent DePaul Society. Lillian also has received the "Ozanam Award," which is given to St. Vincent DePaul members who demonstrate great service to the poor. St. Symphorosa Super Club President George Kouba stated in her application: "She is a silent and willing giver—a role model for anyone who believes in helping and loving his fellow man."

George Kostakis of Cicero was nominated by Cicero Town President Betty Loren-Maltese. George was the co-founder of Cicero's Neighborhood Watch Program in 1984 and has remained a coordinator of the program. His watch includes 141 blocks throughout Cicero. George is a member of the Morton Anti-Violence Task Force and also writes a column for the Cicero Town News, the town's official newsletter. President Maltese stated in George's nomination: "Very few residents have a lasting impact upon their communities; Mr. Kostakis' work with the Neighborhood Watch has made him an impact resident."

Irene Nichols of Burbank was nominated by Stickney Township Supervisor Louis Viverito. Irene has played an important role in the development and success of the Stickney Township Council on Aging since 1978. She is the current President of the Stickney Township Council on Aging, a position she has held since 1998. Irene is also a member of the Circle Senior Club and the Burbank Silvertones Senior Club. Sen. Viverito stated in her application: "Her concern for fellow Senior Citizens is prevalent in any activity she is involved in."

Harriet Niemiec of Oak Lawn was nominated by the St. Louis de Montfort Seniors. Harriet serves as Oak Lawn's Senior Citizens Commissioner. In addition, Harriet is an active volunteer with the PLOWS organization and Christ Hospital. She is also a member of several organizations including the St. Louis de Montfort Senior Citizens Club, the St. Fabian's Senior Citizens Club, the Oak Lawn Senior Citizens Club and the Christ Hospital Volunteers Auxiliary. According to Helen Sula, President of St. Louis de Montfort Seniors: "She is a model citizen and we all would do well to imitate her."

Helen Barber Olson of LaGrange was nominated by the Robert E. Coulter, Jr. Unit No. 1941 American Legion Auxiliary. Helen is a charter member of the LaGrange Historical Society and Robert E. Coulter, Jr. Unit No. 1941. She assisted in the organization of the LaGrange area Chapter 4277 of the AARP, and was instrumental in establishing the LaGrange Community Hospital. She has been a resident of LaGrange for over 50 years. This past year, the LaGrange Chapter of the Business and Professional Women's Club voted her "Woman of the Year." The Robert Coulter Unit noted in her application: "She is still active in many organizations and never fails to contribute her time and money, even when not asked."

Dr. Shirley Verdugo-Perez of Riverside was nominated by Ms. Mila Verdugo. Shirley holds a bachelor's, two masters and a doctorate degree. She also has seven teaching certificates and can speak five different languages. She has been in the education field for the past 32 years, teaching kindergarten through graduate school students. Shirley has volunteered for numerous organizations including Hispanics in Vocational Education, the Merit Conservatory of Music, and the Polish National Alliance Lodge 825. Ms. Mila Verdugo stated in Shirley's nomination: "She sees the glass as half-full no matter what challenges come her way. She has devoted her life to educating her children, motivating her students, and volunteering her time to various community organizations."

Raymond Rushton of Berwyn was nominated by Berwyn Mayor Thomas G. Shaughnessy. Raymond is a Block Captain in the City of Berwyn's Neighborhood Watch Program, where he checks on seniors in extreme temperatures and spreads information about the Watch Program. He is the founder of the Grace Bible Church Senior Citizen Club and is a volunteer for the Berwyn-Cicero Council on Aging. He was a journeyman union electrician, and worked on the dismantling of the Manhattan Project. In his application, Mayor Shaughnessy stated: "He is a shining example to other captains in the Neighborhood Watch Program in his enthusiasm and commitment to our city and his neighbors."

Kurt Schalk of Chicago was nominated by the Clearing Civic League. Kurt is a trustee for the Clearing Civic League and is in his 5th year as President of the St. Rene Seniors Social Club. In addition, he is a post commander and member of the William McKinley American Legion Post #231. He has been active in Hines Hospital's blood donor program since 1955, and has received recognition from the United Blood Donors. Kurt volunteers with the St. Vincent DePaul Society and is an important booster for the St. Rene School Band. In his application, Rich Zilka, President of the Clearing League stated: "Kurt has realized the full range of life—successful employment, happy marriage, military duty, and civic volunteer work in his 45 years of active community affairs."

Lorraine Seymour of Palos Hills was nominated by Theresa Jania, Senior Service Director of Palos Hills. Lorraine has served as a member of the Palos Hills Senior Advisory Board for 15 years. She has received the "Women of the Year" award from Sacred Heart Church and was given a volunteer award from the PLOWS organization. Lorraine

is also active with several organizations including the New Horizon Senior Club, the Second Timers Club, the Sacred Heart Fun Club, and the Sacred Heart Parish Council. Theresa Jania nominated Lorraine because of her "attitude and professionalism, her smiling face and willingness to help every senior who comes within her reach."

Evelyn Talerico of Palos Park was nominated by James and Victoria Talerico. Evelyn is the founder of the oldest restaurant in Bridgeview, Mama Luigi's, which is now in its 52nd year of operation. Currently, she provides daily care and company to her invalid sister-in-law. Evelyn has also served as First Senior Regent of the Bridgeview Women of the Moose and as a First Graduate Regent. In addition, she was the first baby born in Bedford Park. James and Victoria Talerico stated in her application: "She is a fine example for all women today."

Eleanor Trzeciak of Chicago Ridge was nominated by the Chicago Ridge Friendship Senior Club. Eleanor actively volunteers to assist the elderly and sick members of the Chicago Ridge Friendship Senior Club, and has been the group's tour guide for seven years. She has been a member of the club for thirteen years, and is also a member of the St. Louis de Montfort Seniors Club. According to her application, the Chicago Ridge Friendship Club had a vote to nominate a candidate for the Senior Citizen of the Year award. Eleanor was the group's unanimous selection.

Alexander Walter of Indian Head Park was nominated by the Blind & Visually Impaired Support Group of Greater LaGrange. Al serves as the leader of the Blind & Visually Impaired Support Group, where he arranges programs and discussions for the group. Al has volunteered at Hines Veterans Hospital and at the Illinois Veterans Home—Manteno for a number of years, and has given over 2,100 volunteer hours at Hines. He is active in several groups including the Blinded Veterans Association, Hines Blind Rehab Center Alumni, and Amvets: G.I. Joe Post 24. Julia Emery of the Blind & Visually Impaired Support Group stated in Al's application: "His work on behalf of hospitalized veterans and of the most vulnerable has been constant since his discharge from the Navy."

Theresa Wozniak of Chicago was nominated by the St. Camillus Golden Agers Club. Theresa is President of the St. Camillus Golden Agers, an active member of the St. Camillus Holy Name Society, and legislative liaison for the VFW Rhine Post #2729 Women's Auxiliary. She is a volunteer for the Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs and has received several awards including the "Cook County Sheriff's Medal of Honor" award, the "Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs Volunteer of the Month" award, and recognition from the Chicago City Council for outstanding volunteer service. According to Lucille Budzinski, Secretary of the St. Camillus Golden Agers: "Her cheerful attitude in accepting many volunteer duties encourages other seniors to follow her lead."

I agree with all of the statements submitted by those who nominated the 20 winners. It is community activism and volunteerism that makes Chicagoland a truly great place to live. In the 19th Century, Robert Browning, a British poet proclaimed: "What's a man's age? He must hurry more, that's all; Cram in a day, what his youth took a year to hold." Mr.

Speaker, I believe those are important words, and I commend the senior citizens for their great spirit and hard work.

HONORING BLOOM TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Bloom Township High School which is celebrating its 100th Anniversary in the year 2000. Bloom Township High School lies within Illinois School District 206 and my 11th Congressional District.

Bloom Township High School began in 1900 in four rooms rented from Washing School in Chicago Heights, Illinois. Bloom had an initial enrollment of 81 students and three teachers. By 1901, "new" Bloom was built at the southwest corner of Lincoln and Dixie Highways. In 1931, under the leadership of Board of Education President, Harvey Adair, construction began on the Bloom Township High School at 10th Street and Dixie Highway.

In 1934, Principal Rosewell C. Puckett watched his students carry their books and desks down Chicago Road to the new school. The school was a major architectural achievement highlighted by "the Tower", and later enhanced by the fresco murals and limestone statues. The frescoes were painted by Edgar Britton. Edgar Britton used Bloom students as models for the frescoes and show students in the foreground studying the life work that is being carried out in the background by adults. In 1982, Bloom was named as a National Historic Site. Bloom is the first public high school to be so designated.

Bloom has experienced rapid growth over the years that required major additions to the school, including the Industrial Arts building, McCann Gym, the cafeteria, the music and art wing, the Nelson Field House, the Workman Auditorium and the Steckel Library. By 1954, a separate freshman-sophomore division was built at Cottage Groove and Sauk Trail, which ultimately became its own four-year high school in 1976, named Bloom Trail High School.

The history of Bloom Township High School District 206 has been one of growth and change, with a continuing commitment to quality education and a dedication to meet the needs of a varied student population.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the many teachers, and administrators who have helped to make Bloom Township a success. I wish Bloom a successful year of celebration.

I urge this body to identify and recognize other schools in their congressional districts whose dedication and actions have so greatly benefitted America's students and the surrounding communities.

REMEMBERING HAROLD BAUDUIT,
A TELLER OF TALES AND CAP-
TAIN OF HIS TALE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to share memories of a man that knew no limits when it came to what he wanted out of life. Sadly, Harold Bauduit passed away on January 25, 2000. He was 69 years old.

Harold accomplished many things during his life; he was no stranger to hard work and extra effort. He did so well on military tests that he was told to join the United States Naval Academy. Harold was only the fifth African-American to graduate from the United States Naval Academy. But after graduation, Harold decided he liked the air more than water and he joined the Air Force. During the Vietnam War, Harold was part of the air command based in Thailand flying B-66 aircraft to monitor enemy radar.

When his career in the military ended, Harold turned to education. He earned master's degrees in economics and business, and a law degree. He taught black studies classes at Fort Range Community College and the University of Colorado. He felt very strongly about education and felt that everyone deserved the opportunity to learn.

Harold loved to debate and was always on top of current events. He read the Wall Street Journal every day and kept his TV turned to CNN constantly. He never wanted to be behind on anything.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, I offer this tribute in Harold Bauduit's honor. He truly was an exceptional man who lived life fearlessly.

SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION CON- DEMNING RACIAL AND RELI- GIOUS INTOLERANCE

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, racial and religious intolerance have no place in twenty-first Century America. Hate for a fellow human being because of religion or skin color has no place among us. Institutions that teach our next generation of leaders prejudice are breeding grounds for bigots. And political leaders who fail to speak out against such hurtful and divisive mantras have failed their duties and the people they represent.

We cannot afford to remain silent in the face of anti-religious, anti-Catholic, and anti-minorities preaching from leaders of Bob Jones University. That is why I rise today to commend the gentleman from New York for his forthright Resolution. I am a proud cosponsor of his resolution that rejects discrimination and intolerance based on religion, race, and ethnicity. This resolution would put Congress on record as opposing policies preached and practiced only at Bob Jones University in South Carolina. Policies that are repulsive and unimaginable by a majority of Americans today. Some of these policies include the barring of free association of interracial couples on campus.

Just as repulsive is the anti-Catholic venom emanating from the halls of this university.

This is not what is supposed to be taught in the classrooms. We cannot stand idly by while bigots are free to spout their shortsighted and hurtful words. We must speak out against intolerance and injustice. Congress must act now and pass this Resolution.

HONORING THE TORRANCE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S CELEBRATION OF BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce's celebration of Black History Month. On February 25th, the Torrance Chamber will hold its annual Black History Celebration.

It is during this important month that we celebrate black history and the achievements and legacy of all African Americans. I am grateful that the people of my district have this event which will help them understand the contributions of Black Americans to our entire nation.

As the leading business organization in the South Bay, the Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce is an aggressive, independent advocate of business interests exercising its influence with government, business and the community to ensure economic growth and vitality. I commend the Torrance Chamber for the creation of its Cultural Involvement Task Force. This important outreach program seeks to assist Chamber members of diverse ethnic backgrounds to assimilate into positions of involvement and effectively take advantage of the business opportunities available throughout the community.

To highlight the month-long celebration of African American heritage, Brigadier General Clara L. Adams-Ender will give the keynote address at the Chamber's Black History Celebration 2000. She has had a distinguished career, rising from a staff nurse in the army nurse corps to become brigadier general responsible for the army's 20,000 nurses.

I commend the Torrance Chamber's commitment to multiculturalism. The Torrance Chamber is a community leader in celebrating the importance of our country's African American heritage.

HONORING NEW JERUSALEM BAPTIST CHURCH OF GREER, SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. JIM DeMINT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. DeMINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my friends in this chamber that freedom in America is created not by government, but by individuals who take responsibility upon themselves and share in the responsibilities of community. When citizens take this responsibility, local people keep dollars, decisions and freedom in their hands. It is my honor several times each year to present the Congressional

Spirit of Freedom Award to members of the 4th District of South Carolina. This non-partisan award goes to individuals, organizations, schools, and businesses that go above and beyond the call of duty to advance the spirit and ideals of freedom and volunteerism in service to the communities of South Carolina.

It is my pleasure today to honor one such group, the New Jerusalem Baptist Church in Greer, SC that has embodied these ideals. The Church is headed by Reverend Steve Watson. Under his guidance, the church sponsors summer youth programs, a soup kitchen, homeless shelter, and after-school programs that provide tutoring and mentoring to area children. New Jerusalem Baptist Church is a shining city on a hill, choosing to work through their love and talents rather than forcing government to support them. The entire congregation has answered the call to help those in need, showing the tremendous impact a group of people can have in changing the lives of thousands.

It is an honor to serve constituents of such high character and dedication to the service of others. I offer my sincere thanks and best wishes for their continued success in bringing freedom home to the citizens of the Upstate and South Carolina. I am honored to present the New Jerusalem Baptist Church, Greer, SC with the Congressional Spirit of Freedom Award.

HONORING CARA RAINWATER

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. DeLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate and honor a young Texas student from my district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. Cara Rainwater of Missouri City has just been named one of my state's top honorees in The 2000 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Ms. Rainwater, a senior at Lawrence Elkins High School and an active community volunteer, is being recognized for serving as a peer counselor for burn victims at Camp Phoenix, a summer camp sponsored by the Burn Children Recovery Foundation.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young citizen has made. People of all ages need to think more about how we, as individual citizens, can work together at the local level to ensure the health and vitality of our towns and neighborhoods. Young volunteers like Ms. Rainwater are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by the Prudential Insurance Company of America in partnership with the National Association of Secondary Schools Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly

valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. In only five years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, with nearly 75,000 youngsters participating since its inception.

Ms. Rainwater should be extremely proud to have been singled out from such a large group of dedicated volunteers. Mr. Speaker, I heartily applaud Ms. Rainwater for her initiative in seeking to make her community a better place to live, and for the positive impact she has had on the lives of others. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. Her actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

HONORING TOM PROUD

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise today and tell you a story about a man who has gone to great lengths to help another. In the face of a storm, Tom Proud is definitely someone to have around.

Tom, a Pueblo County Sheriff's Deputy, was on his way to Denver when he saw a car slide on ice and land in the ditch. He claims that he did nothing more than the average citizen when he pulled over to offer assistance. Tom saw that a woman was stranded with children and went out of his way to make sure that they were safe and back on their way.

Miles from any town, Tom drove to a tire station to have the flat tire repaired and then drove back to the car to put in on the car. Tom was so dedicated to making certain Mrs. Martinez, the woman who was stranded, and the children were safe that he put his own plans on hold.

Mrs. Martinez was so overwhelmed with gratitude that a simple thank you was not enough. She wrote a letter to a Pueblo County Commissioner telling the story of selfless valor displayed by the off-duty peace officer. She told the Commissioner that without Tom's help, they would not have been able to be in Denver before one of their family members went into surgery. Mrs. Martinez counts all of Pueblo lucky to have Tom among its citizens.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I offer tribute to Tom Proud. He has gone above and beyond the call of duty and deserves our thanks and praise.

REPEAL THE FEDERAL DIESEL TAX

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to help protect all Americans from the artificially-inflated rise in fuel costs by temporarily suspending

the 24.4 cent per gallon federal tax on diesel fuel.

This step is necessary because the price of diesel has almost doubled in the past six months. This steep rise is bringing ruin to America's truckers, carriers, shippers, farmers, and adversely affecting all consumers. While the U.S. Congress cannot force OPEC to increase production, we must initiate a federal investigation into possible manipulation and price gauging by OPEC members and other oil producers. Clearly there is no shortage of oil. What we see today is intentional manipulation of production to ensure the highest prices for oil producers.

In addition to launching a federal investigation, Congress should pass my legislation which is designed to provide immediate, albeit temporary, relief for the American consumer and so many small businesses which depend on diesel fuel. The average independent trucker and small farmer cannot continue to operate their businesses with the cost of diesel at almost \$2 per gallon! Let's help them out by repealing the federal tax on diesel at the same time that we work the diplomatic and legal channels to bring pressure on oil producers. Please cosponsor this bill.

RECOGNIZING DR. HILARY
KOPROWSKI

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize the outstanding achievements of Dr. Hilary Koprowski—a man who has changed America, and the world, for the better.

Dr. Koprowski is one of the most distinguished and respected biomedical researchers in American history. On February 27, 2000 we marked the 50th anniversary of the first application of his oral polio vaccine—one of Dr. Koprowski's most notable achievements. Truly one of the outstanding scientists of our time, Dr. Koprowski, along with co-workers, engineered a new rabies vaccine that is more effective and less painful than the traditional Pasteur technique. In addition, Dr. Koprowski has pioneered the development of monoclonal antibodies for the detection and treatment of cancer. Dr. Koprowski is known for being a creative scientist. His other contributions include a blood test for early detection of cancer, and a serum for effective therapy against cancer of the bowel. He found a connection between viral infection and diseases of the nervous system. Dr. Koprowski's other research focused on the toxic effect of free radicals on lesions caused by viral disease.

Today, Dr. Koprowski is the author of more than 850 scientific papers and a member of many learned societies. He has received honorary degrees from numerous universities and is the recipient of more than eighteen major honors, including the Order of the Lion, awarded by the King of Belgium, the Legion of Honor of France and the Nicolaus Copernicus Medal of the Polish Academy of Sciences, the Philadelphia Award, the Scott Award, and the Legion of Honor.

Born in Warsaw, Poland, Dr. Hilary Koprowski was faced with a choice between a

career in music or in science. He received a degree in piano from the Warsaw Conservatory as well as the Santa Cecilia Academy of Music in Rome. In 1939, Dr. Koprowski obtained his M.D. degree and adopted scientific research as his life's work. Music remains a significant part of Dr. Koprowski's life. His compositions are published and are currently being played by various orchestras. Dr. Koprowski often compared science to music when he said, "A well-done experiment gives the same sense of satisfaction that a composer feels after composing a sonata."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hilary Koprowski is a hero. He has been a world leader in scientific research for over 50 years. His expertise and leadership have contributed greatly to the field of science, and he has helped save countless lives. I know the House will join me in paying tribute to this outstanding scientist on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his polio vaccine discovery.

IN HONOR OF DR. LIFSHITZ

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding physician, Dr. Aliza Lifshitz.

Many know her as Doctor Aliza, a doctor who has spent the past two decades working in the Latino communities in Los Angeles and across the country, to improve the health of Latino citizens.

Dr. Lifshitz grew up in Mexico, the daughter of a Russian immigrant father and New York-born mother. Dr. Lifshitz attended the prestigious Universidad Autonoma de Mexico. She also studied at Tulane University and at UC San Diego.

During her medical career, Dr. Lifshitz has become known as a primary source of health information to the Latino community. She reports on *Primer Impacto*, the highest-rated Spanish language news magazine television series on the air. She is also the health columnist for *La Opinion*, the largest Spanish-language daily newspaper in America.

Dr. Lifshitz' most recent accomplishment is a book, "Mama Sana, Bebe Sano—Healthy Mother, Healthy Baby," a pregnancy guide written in Spanish and English. The bilingual book is the first published that addresses pregnancy and infant care simultaneously in the same book.

Dr. Lifshitz' stellar career is a testament to dedication. She has concentrated her efforts in administering care to the under-served segment of the population—the indigent, teens in crisis, the elderly and the many who have fallen between the cracks of our society. She has also become a role model for millions of young women striving to better themselves and the world they live in. Throughout her career, Dr. Lifshitz has shared her considerable talent and gift of healing with everyone. Her role is not only as a physician, but as a "friend."

Colleagues, please join with me today as we honor Dr. Lifshitz, a caring physician who is committed to her profession and to the well-being of those in her care.

HONORING DAN KLOSTER,
SNOWMASS VILLAGE ROTARY
CLUB BUSINESS/PROFESSIONAL
PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the Rotary Club of Snowmass Village Business/Professional Person of the Year. Dan Kloster is a businessman who knows how important it is to give back to the community.

The Person of the Year award is given each year to the person who best exemplifies the principles of the club. Candidates for the award are nominated by either Rotarians or by a member of the community. This is the first time the award has been presented to an active member of the club. Dan is a charter member of the Snowmass Club and has served as the club's president in the past.

Rotary clubs across the world have dedicated their mission to serving their local community as well as those areas of the world that are in need of humanitarian efforts. The club from Snowmass has been committed to serving the international community. Dan has served on the International Committee which focuses on projects like going to Africa to immunize young people against polio.

In addition to deeds, Rotary members like Dan try to implement the philosophy of the four-way test. This test is to be applied to everything in the life of a member. The test is comprised of four questions: Is it the truth? Is it fair to all concerned? Will it build good will and better friendships? Will it benefit all concerned? Dan tries to be an example when it comes to the four-way test not only in the business world, but in his personal life.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I offer this tribute in honor to Dan Kloster. His efforts to make his community, country and world a better place deserve our thanks and praise.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. LITA HORNICK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. Gilman. Mr. Speaker, I regret to call to the attention of our colleagues the recent death of Dr. Lita Hornick, a truly remarkable woman, and a former resident of my constituency in Rockland County, New York.

Dr. Hornick was a prominent figure from the 1960's to the present day. Her efforts in the worlds of art and literature are legendary, encouraging the advancement of the avant-garde and "beat" poets, who struggled for recognition, but survived with the dedication of Dr. Hornick. She spoke her mind, and she never hesitated in furthering the ideals in which she so fondly believed. Additionally, she founded the avant-garde publication *Kulcher Magazine*, published over forty-two art-illustrated manuscripts of poetry and writing, and she became known as the "Kulcher Queen," the title of her 1977 autobiography.

During her life, Dr. Hornick collected several fine pieces of 60's art and selflessly gave

many of her major works to the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), including self-portraits painted by the famous Andy Warhol and Alex Katz. She also sponsored several poetry readings at MoMA, which gathered poets and artists alike in support of their crusade in advancing education of modern art and poetry.

Dr. Hornick was extremely involved with the St. Mark's Poetry Project and Columbia University, where she recently donated her archive of papers and writings.

Dr. Hornick received her B.A. from Barnard and her M.A. and Ph.D. from Columbia. An evening poetry reading memorial will be held at MoMA later this year in her honor.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD a biographical article written by Dr. Hornick's family entitled "Lita."

Dr. Lita Hornick will be sadly missed, and I extend my thoughts, my condolences, and prayers to the Hornick Family.

LITA

Sometimes you meet people who just don't add up, alluring characters who somehow are not what they ought to be. At first sight Lita Hornick is a charming and urbane Park Avenue doyenne who has devoted her life to her family and her collection of contemporary art. This in itself is interesting enough, but immediately you recognize something quite different behind the smile, quite naughty behind the look. For Lita is also the Kulchur Queen, champion of the irreverent "beats" and of avant-garde poets and artists ever since. Behind that demure face are locked the secrets of a life led at the vortex of this counter-culture, that she releases in sharp, tantalizing tidbits, well aware of both their value and her ability to shock.

"The paradoxes in my life have been quite deliberate," she admits with endearing honesty, "since they arose from a conscious effort to escape the stereotype, my background and my culture." This path took Lita out of her taffeta-lined social groove into the kaleidoscopic world of avant-garde literature where she has reigned for three decades as publisher, editor, writer, critic and patron. Like her friend Andy Warhol, she was an observer of that frenetic era between the late 50's and the early 70's. She was the admirer of such notable "beats" as Allen Ginsberg, Gregory Corso, William Burroughs and Jack Kerouac—a group once characterized by the media as "the most vicious characters in America". And throughout it all she gave a steady, supportive voice to the avant-garde movement through her Kulchur Magazine, Press and today's Foundation.

Yet Lita, although intimately involved in this other world, was never a part of it, preserving instead a steadfast individualism. "I am not a leftist politically and I have never joined the anarchist pacifists," she states emphatically, alluding to the flower generation. Nor was she a member of her inherited social group; "my work" she says with understatement, "was alien to my class." For Lita refuses to be pigeon-holed, preserving her independence through a defiance that is generously directed everywhere at once—though never malicious and always with an unfathomable sense of humor. She smiles, "I just like people who spit in the face of authority, any authority!"

It was this rebelliousness that impelled Lita first to do her Ph.D. thesis on Dylan Thomas—"because he was persona non grata at the time"—and later to search out those revolutionaries who were instigating change, typically not from the top but from the grass roots of society: the avant-garde poets, musicians and artists.

The poetry has been perhaps the greatest claimant on Lita's considerable talent and energies, appealing to her as she says, paraphrasing Swift, "because it raises the human race out of this pernicious gutter." Whatever the reason, Lita has altruistically devoted herself and her dollars to Kulchur—promoting poetry to a small, though significant core of supporters around the world. Why? Because she thought the work important and, although not commercially viable, it deserved recognition. Lita boasts proudly of her part in breaking down the pornography laws and attacking the civil rights issue, but considers her greatest accomplishment to be the forty-two poetry books published by Kulchur Press, "each of which," she says, "is like a child to me."

As for music, Lita is equally enthusiastic, calling it "the purest form to which all art aspires." And yet she isn't referring to the classic composers as one might expect. In this, as with everything else, Lita is contrary and ever-adventurous. She specifically means those contemporary musicians that rocked the social foundations and her parties during the Sixties. Instead of the usual Park Avenue dinner at eight, Lita recalls with obvious glee those wild evenings spent with her flock of avant-garde friends, loud with the sounds of Nico and the Velvet Underground, Philip Glass, Meredith Monk and a punk rock band called the Stimulators.

Further evidence of Lita's derringdo is her patronage of contemporary art. In the early days this was another activity frowned upon by her family and society friends, "until it started appreciating," she says with a twinkle in her eye. But for Lita, who sees a connection between all the arts, it was a natural extension of her love for avant-garde poetry to collect its equivalent in visual art.

Today her collection reads like a list of celebrated names, totalling over five hundred pieces. It ranges from a multiple portrait of herself by Warhol, a sofa modelled by Man Ray after the lips of his famous, though unfaithful, mistress, Kiki, twenty-two Jo Brainard drawings in her bedroom alone, to a fifty-six foot high Alexander Lieberman sculpture. Not to mention the sculpture garden at her country house and the works donated to the MOMA, the Whitney and the University of Pennsylvania. "In the Sixties I collected hard-edged abstraction; in the Seventies, pattern and decoration pieces," she explains, "then in the Eighties, I started going all over the lot, getting very pluralistic, from landscapes to neo pop-art."

But again typically atypical there is that other side to the Kulchur Queen. Throughout her outrageousness and despite her zest for the shocking, Lita also played the sedate role of mother, grandmother and wife. Morton J. Hornick, her late husband, was far removed from his wife's adopted world being the successful CEO of a draperie and curtain manufacturing company that had been in his family since 1917. Morton slowly became absorbed in Lita's avant-garde concerns, until he was working actively as a fundraiser for the poetry readings and an art collector. Although Lita recalls fondly, "I don't think he ever read anything I ever published."

Lita gives out these golden glimpses of her past like jig-saw pieces whose only consistency seems to be their inconsistency. Then suddenly, you stumble across a consistent thread that helps make sense of the final picture: for her whole life Lita, the maverick, has been having fun, outrageous fun! She has been laughing at herself, at her class, at the system—at everything. "It takes strength of character to amuse yourself," she explains, briefly shining a light deep into the serious depths of her character, "most people are taught not to amuse themselves—that's the whole purpose of civilization."

CRIME OF HATE AGAINST THE 9TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, the district office of the people of Illinois' 9th Congressional District was vandalized with an anti-Semitic obscenity. While I am pleased to say that we, as a community, are prepared to stand tall in the path of any and all acts of hate and words of bigotry, today's action is a sad reminder that there are those among us that fear diversity and refuse to view it as the sign of strength and tradition that it is.

Acts of hate directed against Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Muslims or any other group or person in this country are unacceptable and will not be tolerated. I am proud to represent one of the most ethnically diverse districts in America. The diversity and tolerance in our district is symbolic of what our nation should be. We will not be silent whenever hatred shows its ugly face.

I wish to commend the brave officers of the Niles Police Department, Chief Sheehan, and FBI officials for their prompt response and effort on behalf of the people of the 9th Congressional District. This crime of hate is a cowardly act that will not go unpunished. There are those who view the 9th Congressional District, because of its diversity, as a prime location to spread their hateful venom. I am confident that the rich tradition and values of the people of the 9th Congressional District will always prevail.

TRIBUTE TO SOCIAL VOCATIONAL SERVICES, INC. AND PEOPLE FIRST OF THE SOUTH BAY

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special organization in my district, Social Vocational Services, Inc. (SVS). Established in 1978, SVS' mission is to design and deliver vocational and residential services to persons with disabilities that will result in their full participation in all aspects of community life.

On Monday, February 28th, SVS will host the 7th anniversary celebration of "People First of the South Bay" and honor special guest Michael Long. SVS facilities People First of the South Bay, a self-advocacy group by and for persons with disabilities. PFSB improves the lives of people with disabilities by fostering a sense of belonging, self esteem and confidence, friendship and recreation, community involvement, civic responsibilities, and leadership opportunities and training.

I commend Michael Long on this achievement. Michael has had a distinguished career. An individual with a developmental disability, Michael serves as Consumer Advocate, Department of Developmental Service, Sacramento and he is also a published author.

The men and women of SVS have touched the lives of many. SVS serves 2,500 persons

with disabilities and employs over 800 staff and administrators. SVS is a pioneer organization within the development disabled community. They strive to enhance opportunities for growth and independence.

I commend the staff and volunteers of Social Vocational Services for their efforts in improving the quality of life for individuals with developmental disabilities. You have made a difference in the lives of many, and I wish you continued success. The South Bay is grateful for your services.

TRIBUTE TO DALE MORRIS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding American, Mr. Dale Morris. Mr. Morris has devoted his career to helping individuals in public service. As the Manager of Special Services and Government Affairs for American Airlines, Mr. Morris is responsible for handling elected officials and other government VIPs, including diplomats and Members of Congress, as they make their way throughout the world. As a registered lobbyist, he also is responsible for advocating on behalf of American Airlines' varied interests with respect to the myriad regulations that challenge airlines and help keep American citizens safe.

Mr. Morris is departing the Washington area for Dallas, Texas, where he will serve as Company Spokesperson at American Airlines' Corporate Communications office. He will be missed by those of us who have counted on his commitment to top notch customer service, and especially for his ability to find simple solutions to complicated challenges. Mr. Morris's promotion is a phenomenal reflection of his own achievements as well as American Airlines' commitment to equal opportunity. As an African American, Mr. Morris has overcome tremendous obstacles throughout his career. He began in the industry eighteen years ago as a passenger sales representative for United Airlines. His professional honors and accomplishments are numerous, and include being awarded the NATO commendation medal from Field Marshall Sir Richard Vincent, GBE, KCB, DSO and Chairman of the Military Committee; organizing the "Ax the Fuel Tax" airline rally in Washington, D.C.; assisting with Wright Amendment legislation; serving as an "On Air" spokesperson for American Airlines during the pilots' proposed strike; and personally interacting with Senator John McCain on the "Passenger Bill of Rights."

Regarding Dale Morris' professional triumphs, it might be said that they are merely genetic. His father, William Morris, was awarded the Bronze Star for operations during the Invasion of Normandy during World War II with the all Black 6th Cavalry Infantry unit. His great uncle Leroy Calhoun also served with the Black Stevedores/Pioneer Infantry unit in France during World War II, and another uncle played baseball for the all Black Fresno Giants of the Negro Leagues. As the proud father of Dale, Jr., Keith Ernest, and Erin Mitchell, and the reverent husband of Janet Leigh Riley Morris, Dale has managed to soar professionally while keeping his primary focus on his

family, which in his view, is the only reason worth living. He has given his family a great deal of which to be proud. As his friend, and the beneficiary of his sincere devotion to professional integrity, I am equally proud. It is on behalf of the countless other Members of Congress who have appreciated his fine service, that I congratulate Dale on his remarkable promotion, and on this, the 29th day of February, 2000, not only his last day in the Washington office of American Airlines but his birthday, I wish him every personal and professional success.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER DOLS

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate and honor a young Texas student from my district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in his community. Christopher Dols of Houston has just been named one of my state's top honorees in The 2000 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Dols, a ninth-grader at Strake Jesuit College Preparatory School, is being recognized for developing a Pre-Teen Health Information Line for the Harris County Hospital District. This information line provides free bilingual health information on 24 topics of special interest to young adults.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young citizen has made. People of all ages need to think more about how we, as individual citizens, can work together at the local level to ensure the health and vitality of our towns and neighborhoods. Young volunteers like Mr. Dols are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by the Prudential Insurance Company of America in partnership with the National Association of Secondary Schools Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. In only five years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, with nearly 75,000 youngsters participating since its inception.

Mr. Dols should be extremely proud to have been singled out from such a large group of dedicated volunteers. Mr. Speaker, I heartily applaud Mr. Dols for his initiative in seeking to make his community a better place to live, and for the positive impact he has had on the lives of others. He has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. His actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities,

and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

COLORADO NATIONAL GUARD NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER OF THE YEAR, SANDY HANSON

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the Colorado National Guard Noncommissioned Officer of the Year, Sandy Hanson. Sandy was nominated for the award by the officers on the local and state level boards consisting of high-ranking officers. Sandy has been on the Army Reserves and now the Colorado National Guard for thirteen years. She presently holds the rank of E-5, Sergeant, and is a member of the Montrose-based Unit C of the 109th Area Support Medical Battalion of the Charlie Company.

Every year soldiers are chosen to go before the "boards" to be tested verbally on every subject related to the military from history to marksmanship. Sandy's precision and excellent knowledge have won her the distinction of being the best noncommissioned officer in the entire State of Colorado.

Sandy was the only one that was surprised when she received the award. Everyone around her knows that she is very focused and disciplined when it comes to organizing her busy lifestyle. In addition to being in the Colorado National Guard, which takes her away from her family one weekend a month and two full weeks every summer, she has two children, a full-time job and she still finds time to study for the boards on the national level.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I offer this tribute to Sandy Hanson and congratulate her on a job well done. She has served her country well.

EAGLE SCOUTS HONORED

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it always gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of Chicagoland constituents. Today, I rise to honor sixteen outstanding young individuals from the 3rd Congressional District of Illinois, all who have completed a major goal in their scouting career.

The following young men of the 3rd Congressional District of Illinois have earned the high rank of Eagle Scout in the winter and spring seasons: James A. Donovan, Eric Alfredson, James M. Siniawski, Bryan Jonathan Balin, Steve Beyer, Raju Shah, Matt Mottel, David J. Giblin, Michael T. Fitzgibbon, John D. Kenney, Matthew K. Vari, Andrew Thomas Giger, John F. Ponce de Leon, Anthony R. Kubes, Benjamin Patrick Hyink, and Alexander T. Yount.

These young men have demonstrated their commitment to their communities, and have perpetuated the principles of scouting. It is important to note that less than two percent of all

young men in America attain the rank of Eagle Scout. This high honor can only be earned by those scouts demonstrating extraordinary leadership abilities.

In light of the commendable leadership and courageous activities performed by these fine young men, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the above scouts for attaining the highest honor in Scouting—the Rank of Eagle. Mr. Speaker, let us wish them the very best in all of their future endeavors.

HONORING REVEREND SACQUETY

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the Reverend Canon Charles W. Sacquety on his retirement from the ministry of the Episcopal Church.

Reverend Charles was born in Detroit, Michigan. He attended the University of Michigan where he received a Bachelors of Arts degree and a Masters of Arts degree in Music. After teaching music in the Ann Arbor Public Schools, he served in the United States Army for two years where he was stationed in the Canal Zone, Panama.

Upon returning from his tour of duty, Reverend Charles attended the Church Divinity School of the Pacific in Berkeley, California. Upon completing his theology courses, Reverend Charles was ordained as a deacon and priest in the Diocese of Michigan. He served two congregations before being called to St. Mark's Parish in Glendale, California. Reverend Charles then moved to Germany where he served as Rector of the Parish Church of Christ the King in Frankfurt. After six and a half years, Reverend Charles was again called to California where he became the Rector of St. Wilfrid's in July of 1978.

Reverend Charles brought so many gifts to St. Wilfrid's. He is best-known for his ebullient sense of humor and his ability to reach out to the members of the parish by listening to their needs. He has developed and implemented the plans for construction of the beautiful new church and community hall which now bears his name, Sacquety Hall. Reverend Charles was a friend to the members of the church. His sermons on Sundays touched the lives of all who attended with his inspirational wisdom and his eloquent words.

After leaving St. Wilfrid's, Reverend Charles served as an Archdeacon for the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles. Reverend Charles will receive an Honorary Doctorate degree of Divinity from Church Divinity School of the Pacific, in Berkeley, California this year.

Colleagues, please join me today as we recognize the Rev. Canon Charles W. Sacquety on his many years of ministry and the many contributions that he has made to the community and the Episcopal Church and to the parishioners who came to know him as a man of understanding and inspiration.

HONORING MR. MARK MORELLI

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man whose life-saving work demands our attention and respect. Mr. Mark Morelli, a dedicated member of the Folcroft, Pennsylvania Fire Company has recently been honored for his heroic work during a tragic time. I come before my colleagues to recognize the heroic efforts to Mr. Morelli and congratulate him for being awarded the Valor Award by the Delaware County Firemen's Association.

Mr. Morelli is being honored for his selfless efforts during last September's Hurricane Floyd that caused destruction up and down the east coast. Mr. Morelli was chosen for the Valor Award for saving the lives of three citizens trapped by the flooding waters. He called upon his skills gained during his assignment with the United States Navy by maneuvering a rescue boat against the overwhelming currents to ensure the safety of the stranded people. His courageous duties went beyond the call of duty. All Americans should applaud him for his efforts.

Too often the heroic efforts of our nation's volunteer firefighters go unnoticed by the public. Mr. Morelli's actions exemplify the spirit and dedication of the men and women in the fire service. At a time when many lament the absence of heroes in today's society, I can attest that we can find role models right in our own backyards.

As a fellow firefighter, I applaud Mr. Morelli's unselfish bravery. I want to extend my gratitude to him for putting his life on the line in order to secure the safety of local residents.

HONORING GRAND JUNCTION CITIZEN OF THE YEAR, JAMIE HAMILTON

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the 1999 Grand Junction Citizen of the Year, my friend, Jamie Hamilton.

A man that knows no end when it comes to serving his community, Jamie was awarded the Citizen of the Year award by the Grand Junction Chamber of Commerce. He has donated his time and talents to a list of over twenty-five community and state organizations. This past year alone Jamie served on the Grand Junction Park and Recreation Board, Community Hospital Board, Sober Grad Committee, Lions Club, Grand Junction Chamber of Commerce, JUCO and the Board of Trustees for the State Colleges of Colorado.

Jamie and his wife, Debbie, share a dedication to the community that does not stop with boards and committees. After volunteering all of his time to these organizations, Jamie still finds time to coach little league baseball and baseball clinics for area youths.

He leads by example, never asking an employee to do something that he would not do

himself. This outstanding leadership and dedication is a leading factor in the success of Home Loan Insurance where Jamie is the CEO and President.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer this tribute to a great community leader and a good personal friend, Jamie Hamilton, in honor of receiving the 1999 Grand Junction Citizen of the Year Award. The Grand Junction community owes him a debt of gratitude for his leadership and selfless service.

CONDEMNING RACIAL AND ANTI-CATHOLIC BIGOTRY

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the concurrent resolution, introduced by my colleagues JOHN CONYERS, Jr. and JOSEPH CROWLEY, that condemns the discriminatory practices prevalent at Bob Jones University and all individuals who espouse similar beliefs. As members of a diverse society who desire mutual respect for and by all, we should never let bigotry go unchecked. Bob Jones University has been perpetuating its anti-Catholic and racially bigoted practices and beliefs for decades. It is about time that the institution be condemned.

Bob Jones University claims it is neither racist nor anti-Catholic. However, the University's policies and preachings create an environment where it is permissible to view those of different religions and races as inferior. Once that environment is established, all other forms of discrimination can ensue. In my own state of California, we have witnessed all too often what such an environment can lead to: police brutality, such as that endured by Rodney King; the passage of harsh anti-immigrant measures, such as proposition 187; and the grinding, persistent prejudice that blocks too many hardworking families and individuals from realizing their full potential.

Many people throughout California and across the nation have been working hard to counteract the damage done by thoughts and acts of hatred and intolerance. At a time when we as a nation should be focusing our efforts on healing our wounds, it is troubling that an academic institution would be dedicated to unraveling the fabric of our multicultural society. Our nation will only be weakened if we fail to speak out against policies that seek to divide, segregate and denigrate people on the basis of race or religion.

HONORING JUDGE GERALD SNODGRASS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a longtime community leader, Judge Gerald Snodgrass. On March 2nd, community leaders will join family and friends to celebrate the career of Judge Snodgrass as he marks his retirement after 20 years of service in the

field of law, and to the citizens of Burton, Michigan.

In 1969 Gerald Snodgrass began his distinguished legal career, receiving his Juris Doctorate Degree from Texas Southern University. Two years later, he received a degree in Criminal Prosecution from the University of Houston. He eventually made his way to Michigan, where in 1978 he received a Master's Degree in Criminal Justice and Sociology and also post-graduate degrees from the University of Detroit, Western Michigan University, and a degree in Industrial Management from Cleary College in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Armed with this impressive educational experience, Gerald decided to pursue both law and education. He began a career as an educator, working as an Adjunct Professor at Charles Stewart Mott College, Western Michigan University, and the University of Detroit. He also began his legal career in 1971 as a Senior Assistant Prosecuting Attorney in Genesee County. He was then chosen to serve as a Judge in Genesee County's 67th District Court. During this time he also served as an Alternate Circuit Judge for the 7th Judicial Circuit, a position he held for 18 years. After 20 years of service as a judge, he continued his legal career as a Trial Attorney specializing in criminal law and personal injury cases.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Snodgrass has always tried to ensure that justice was provided to all Americans. That is why every person who appeared before him was treated with the utmost dignity and respect. But I believe what always made Gerald such a special judge and person was the time he spent in the community, visiting the churches, meeting with people of all economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. He is responsible for making our community a much better place. It is for this reason that I ask my colleagues in the 106th Congress to join me in congratulating Judge Snodgrass on his retirement.

CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE TO
FAYE BOYD, ANNA JO HAYNES,
COUNCILWOMAN EDNA MOSLEY,
STATE SENATOR GLORIA TANNER
AND HAZEL WHITSETT

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. DeGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the splendid efforts and notable accomplishments of five outstanding women in the African American Community within the 1st Congressional District of Colorado. It is fitting and proper that we recognize these leaders for their exceptional record of civic leadership and invaluable service to our community. It is to commend these outstanding citizens that I rise to honor Faye Boyd, posthumously, Anna Jo Haynes, Councilwoman Edna Mosley, State Senator Gloria Tanner, and Hazel Whitsett.

Faye Boyd touched the lives of many people and made a tremendous impact on our community and those who knew her and worked with her. Faye fulfilled both the spiritual and humanitarian needs of our community through her church, the Shorter Community African Methodist Episcopal Church. She was president of the Women's Missionary So-

ciety and shared an international ministry in Central Africa with her husband, Reverend Jesse Langston Boyd. She worked in communications and media and was the author and producer of Christian Music and drama productions.

Faye Boyd devoted herself to protecting the interests and rights of working people as the Deputy Director of the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment and she was instrumental in creating both the Physicians Accreditation and Independent Medical Examiners Programs. She was also well known for working conscientiously and effectively in addressing the needs of various groups and constituencies as the Director of Constituency Outreach for Governor Roy Romer. It comes as no surprise to our community that Faye Boyd was recently honored as one of the "Women of Distinction—2000" by Macedonia Baptist Church for her devotion and extraordinary service to our community.

Anna Jo Haynes has devoted a lifetime to improving the condition of children and families in Denver. She currently serves as the Executive Director of the Mile High Child Care Association and under her direction, the agency now operates thirteen child development centers that truly serve families in Denver's inner-city neighborhoods.

Ms. Haynes began her distinguished career in early childhood during the mid-1960's where she served in a variety of capacities with Head Start. As an educator, she developed a college credit course for training family child care home providers with the Community College of Denver and subsequently developed and provided training for two hundred family child care homes which served as satellites to the Mile High Child Care centers. She directed the development of the nationally recognized television series, "Spoonful of Lovin'."

Anna Jo Haynes has an impressive history of civic leadership. She was the founding Chairperson for the Colorado Children's Campaign and is a past President of the Women's Foundation of Colorado. Ms. Haynes was appointed to the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues by then Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder and served as a consultant to the White House Conference on Children and Youth. She is the Co-Chair of the City/School Joint Council for Early Childhood Care and Education and chairs the Mayor's Child Care Advisory Committee. Her devotion and service to our community has earned her several accolades and major awards including the YMCA's Martin Luther King Human Dignity Award and the Children's Health and Welfare Award given by the Colorado Chapter of the American Association of Pediatrics.

Councilwoman Edna Mosley has amassed a distinguished record of leadership in our community and with the City of Aurora. She currently serves as an At-Large Member of the Aurora City Council and in that capacity has provided the needed guidance and public policy direction pertaining to city management, finance and budget, transportation, planning and development, and environmental affairs. She has been on the forefront of redevelopment for former military installations in the 1st Congressional District of Colorado and serves as the Vice Chair of the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority and has served as an Executive Committee Member of the Lowry Economic Recovery Project.

Councilwoman Mosley has also been an effective advocate for equal opportunity in Colo-

rado and served as the Director of Community Relations for the Colorado Civil Rights Commission, as well as the Director of Community Development and a Board Member for the Urban League of Metro Denver. Her broad range of activities and interests has been a great service to the community as well. She was a founder and board member of the Women's Bank, and has served as the Chairperson of Denver Sister Cities International, the Denver Civic Theater, the Morning Star Senior Day Care Center and Adams County Economic Development, Inc. She has served as a member of the Governor's Trade Mission to the People's Republic of China and the Colorado Supreme Court Nominating Commission.

Her commitment and service has earned her several awards including the Aurora Chamber of Commerce "Woman of the Year Award", the Colorado Broadcaster's Association "Excellence in Broadcasting Award" for Best Sustaining Public Affairs Program, the Martin Luther King, Jr., Holiday Commission Humanitarian Award.

State Senator Gloria Tanner has an eminent history of civil leadership. I had the great privilege of serving with her in the Colorado State Legislature. Senator Tanner has been a trailblazer and is the first African American woman to serve in the Colorado Senate. Currently, she is one of six legislators to serve on the powerful Joint Budget Committee, which formulates the budget for the State of Colorado. Senator Tanner has been a voice for progress in Colorado and has sponsored and passed significant legislation pertaining to civil rights for women and minorities, marital discrimination in the workplace, parental responsibility, worker's compensation cost savings and parental rights for adoptive parents.

In 1998, Senator Tanner was elected President of the National Organization of Black Elected Legislators/Women. She is the founder and past Chairperson of the Colorado Black Women for Political Action and the Chairperson of the Colorado Caucus of Black Elected Officials. She has served on numerous commissions and boards including the Commission on Women, the Governor's Job Training Council, the Economic Development Commission and the Juvenile Justice Committee.

Her devotion and service to the community has earned her numerous awards for her civic and social contributions including the Metro Denver Chamber of Commerce "Leadership Denver" Award and the Colorado Association of Community Centered Boards "2000 Legislator of the Year" Award.

Hazel Whitsett has been on the front lines of progress for over thirty years. She is one of the co-founders and is currently the Executive Director of the Northeast Women's Center. This Center works with women and families to increase opportunity and build self-sufficiency through education, training and employment.

Hazel Whitsett has been a long time activist and has an extensive record of designing and conducting educational programs in the community. Her membership on several boards and commissions including Colorado Kids Ignore Drugs, The Black Church Initiative, The Colorado Black Women for Political Action, The Black Women's Network and the National Council of Negro Women exhibits her strong commitment to community, families and youth. Her devotion and service to our community has earned her several local and national

awards including the National Common Cause Public Service Award, the National Council of Negro Women "Women in Excellence" Award, the Colorado Black Women for Political Action "Tribute to Black Women" Award, and the American Association of University Women "Trailblazers" Award.

Please join me in commending Faye Boyd, Anna Jo Haynes, Councilwoman Edna Mosley, State Senator Gloria Tanner and Hazel Whitsett for their courage, dedication and invaluable service to our community. It is the strong leadership they exhibit on a daily basis that continually enhances our lives and builds a better future for all Americans. Their lives serve as examples to which we should all aspire.

HONORING ELSIE COFIELD FOR
OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE
COMMUNITY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join with the West Haven Black Coalition as they honor my dear friend, Elsie Cofield, with the Distinguished Citizens Award. Elsie, as founder of AIDS Interfaith Network, has demonstrated a unique commitment and dedication to the comfort and care of those members of our community living with AIDS and facing the many challenges of this terrible disease.

An educator for 31 years, Elsie founded AIDS Interfaith Network, an organization dedicated to providing care to New Haven residents afflicted with HIV and AIDS, after her retirement in 1987. Elsie, recognizing the need, focused her attentions on the inner-city. AIDS Interfaith Network provides a full circle of assistance with social service agencies, support groups, individual counseling, transportation, food and clothing—offering both physical and spiritual comfort. Elsie's enthusiasm and passion has improved the quality of life for many residents of New Haven. Beginning with a few volunteers, Elsie built a solid foundation and for eleven years has assisted hundreds of families as they face both life and death simultaneously.

What began as a small, volunteer-staffed program in a small church basement has flourished into a national working model for church-based AIDS programs. Under Elsie's strong leadership and endless faith, AIDS Interfaith Network has grown to hold nine full-time and six part-time employees. "Putting a face to people with AIDS" has been her enduring philosophy and it is this personal approach that has made this program so successful. It is rare to find an individual that demonstrates the personal touch the way Elsie has—every man, woman and child she sees is special to her. She has traveled to hospitals at midnight to hold a hand, attended the funerals of clients she has served, and written commemorative poems memorializing those she has known best.

A myriad of awards and citations adorn her walls—testimony to her undaunted spirit and inspirational dedication. Devoting their attention to predominantly minority families and neighborhoods, AIDS Interfaith Network has

caught the attention of local, state, and national organizations. Honors from the Yale Divinity School, State of Connecticut, the National Organization for Women, and an invitation to join President Clinton at his announcement for programs aimed at stemming the spread of AIDS in minority communities all speak to her success. Elsie's commitment to her work is well-known throughout the community and was further affirmed as former New Haven Mayor John Daniels declared October 11, 1990 Elsie Cofield Day.

It is with sincere thanks and appreciation that I stand today and honor Elsie Cofield for her outstanding and invaluable service to our community. She has made a difference in so many lives and has truly distinguished herself as a community member and citizen.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PATRICIA
HILLIGOSS

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to pay tribute to the Honorable Patricia Hilligoss, a community leader, who after years of fighting for Petaluma, California, recently lost her battle with Lou Gehrig's disease.

It's hard to think of Petaluma without thinking "Madam Mayor," as Patty was called.

During my eight years as Petaluma City Councilwoman working with Madam Mayor, I came to respect her hard work on behalf of our city. Even when we didn't see eye to eye, I knew that Patty was doing what she thought was right and what she considered best for the city.

Two of her legacies to our city include affordable housing for seniors and an award-winning general plan. These will continue to make a difference for Petaluma well into the future.

For 12 years, Madam Mayor pounded the gavel at City Council meetings and made numerous trips to Sacramento and Washington to advocate on behalf of our city.

Outside Council Chambers, Madam Mayor continued her advocacy for the residents of Petaluma. She was active with the Petaluma Valley Hospital Foundation, Boys and Girls Club, Committee on the Shelterless, and the Petaluma Visitors Bureau.

Whenever there was an event in Petaluma, you knew Madam Mayor was part of it. From parades to ribbon cuttings to Eagle Scout ceremonies, Patty Hilligoss was a part of Petaluma's life.

She may be gone, but her work for the residents of Petaluma will survive for many years to come.

You will be missed, Madam Mayor.

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GUNNISON COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the 60th Anniversary of the Gunnison County Public Library.

The library assembles, preserves and administers collections of books and related educational and recreational materials to promote the communication of ideas and enrichment of personal lives. It serves as a center of reliable information, supports the Gunnison community and encourages education and recreation through the use of literature, music, media and other forms of art.

The library began as an idea in 1939. The American Association of University Women, AAUW, placed 2,000 volumes of books in the basement of Webster Hall. The community contributed books, magazines, money and manpower to support the organization. Now the Gunnison County Public Library consists of two buildings, reading programs and many other opportunities for community involvement.

When space began to run out for the existing library, efforts to fund raise took priority. Between grants and contributions from the Community, the new library opened in 1974. In 1982, a donation was made to the library to add a music room and a story telling room. The library was formally dedicated and named after Ann Zugelder, the library's main supporter.

Throughout the past sixty years, the Ann Zugelder Public Library has undergone many changes. AAUW continues its support of the library, as it has from the beginning.

The library has also expanded to include a branch in Crested Butte. This branch of the Gunnison County Public Library was originally housed on the second floor of the Crested Butte Elementary School. The library is now located in the Old Rock Schoolhouse, a building that was renovated after many years of vacancy. Public and private funds were raised to make the renovations possible. In 1993, former Colorado Governor Roy Romer dedicated the Old Rock Community Library.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer this tribute in honor of the 60th Anniversary of the Gunnison County Public Library. It has served its community well.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO JOHN
"JACK" RAHDER

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest sympathy that I pay a special tribute to my constituent John "Jack" Rahder, of Whittier, who passed away in an automobile accident on February 10. With his passing, Whittier lost an exemplary citizen—a great husband, father, grandfather and community volunteer.

Jack will be remembered for the tremendous support he gave his wife throughout her career and in her current position as the City of Whittier's Planning Commissioner. Helen was by his side in that tragic car accident and luckily she survived, though with many injuries. We pray for her speedy recovery.

Publicly, Jack will be widely remembered for his tremendous efforts as a volunteer—an endeavor to which he dedicated himself full-time after his retirement in 1990. Through his involvement with community programs at St. Mary's Catholic Church, Jack delivered tons of surplus food and supplies each week from a

regional food bank in Los Angeles to low income families in Whittier.

It was fitting that Jack gave so much of his time and energy to a community that was deeply interwoven with his own life. He was born in Whittier on October 17, 1939. His mother, Doris Burton Rahder, was a longtime Whittier resident and 1927 graduate of Whittier High School. As a child, Jack moved to the Central Valley with his family and graduated from Bakersfield High School and the Northrop Institute of Technology. He then worked as an aerospace designer for Boeing and Northrop, and later became a pilot for United Airlines.

Even though he lived in Bakersfield, Jack strengthened his ties with his hometown when he married Helen McKenna, also of Whittier, in 1978. Five years later, they returned to Whittier with their six children.

Jack is survived by his brother Keith, his children David, Robbie, Teri, Chris, T.K. and Katie and ten grandchildren. His family and friends will miss him greatly and to them I extend by sincerest heartfelt sympathy and pray that they will receive God's comforting graces in abundance.

CONGRESSMAN KILDEE HONORS
SISTER KATHERINE SEIDENWAND

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to an outstanding educator, Sister Katherine Seidenwand. Last year, Sister Katherine, or "Sister Kate" as she is known to friends and family, celebrated her 80th birthday on February 1st, 1999. This year, Sister Kate will attain another milestone, as on March 5, she will celebrate 60 years of service to God, the Catholic Church, and her community.

As a member of The Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Sister Kate has devoted her entire time toward the field of education. Not only did she function as a teacher and administrator, but by the nature of her position, she was a counselor, spiritual advisor, and friend to many.

Sister Kate's educational ministry began in 1941 at St. Cecilia's Parish, and from there she went on to spread her influence throughout the Southeastern Michigan area, including St. Patrick in Wyandotte, Holy Name in Birmingham, St. Mary of Wayne, St. Mary of Redford, and St. John of Monroe. In 1959, Sister Kate became the founding principal of St. Regis School, and held that position until 1970. After leaving St. Regis, Sister Kate returned to work with the IHM order, as their Community Education Supervisor, but soon found herself returning to an administrative role, as in 1972, she began a 23-year tenure as Co-principal of St. Mary of Redford.

In 1995, Sister Kate changed roles, stepping down as Co-Principal, and becoming an Administrative Volunteer, thereby allowing others to grow and improve based on her personal experiences and insight.

Mr. Speaker, Sister Katherine Seidenwand has inspired many in the field of education. More importantly, she has instilled in them the importance of faith and the joy of God's love.

As a former seminarian, studying with her late brother Father Eugene Seidenwand, and as a teacher it is indeed an honor and a privilege for me to pay tribute to Sister Kate. I know that I am a better person for having known her, and our community is certainly a better place because of her presence. She has served our Lord and our community with the greatest devotion and is deserving of our praise.

HONORING THE REMARKABLE
CAREER OF LIZ BENNETT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable career of one of the best teachers in the state of Tennessee—Liz Bennett. Mrs. Bennett will retire in April from the Rutherford County School System after 30 years as an educator.

Mrs. Bennett not only taught students, she also taught young teachers how to help their students learn more effectively. After 17 years in the classroom teaching second graders, she took on another role as the coordinator of elementary education. In this capacity, she advised young teachers on the best techniques for helping children to learn.

A whole generation of educators and students have benefited through their association with a person so caring, devoted and energetic to her profession. Her uncanny ability to transfer her knowledge to others has made the Rutherford County School System one of the best anywhere. Mrs. Bennett is, without a doubt, absolutely one of the best teachers I have ever known.

Mrs. Bennett will leave a big void inside Rutherford County's classrooms when she retires in April, but we all can be satisfied in knowing that she has left an indelible mark on the teaching profession. I congratulate Liz Bennett on her admirable and distinguished career and wish her well in her much-deserved retirement.

HONORING A MEMBER OF THE AD
100, ILLYA HENDRIX

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize one of Architectural Digest's top one hundred interior designers and architects for the year of 2000. The AD 100 is an international guide profiling outstanding and talented designers and architects from around the world. Architectural Digest publishes this list once every five years. The gifted designer being honored is Mr. Illya Hendrix.

Mr. Hendrix and his partner, Tom Allardyce, founded their design firm in Los Angeles in 1980. For the past twenty years, they have specialized in residential estates. Their innovative designs for architectural structures, their customized interior surfaces, and their choice of exquisite antique furnishings have earned

them numerous awards and published features of their projects both in national and international magazines. Their most recent endeavor has been the creation of their own line of furniture and accessories. Their firm employs a full-time support staff to provide quality craftsmanship for each project.

The firm's international clientele is varied and includes notable names from the entertainment and business industries. They take pride in their ability to incorporate into the design the preferences and individual style of each of their clients. This enables the client to make an easy transition when their home is completed. Mr. Hendrix and Mr. Allardyce travel frequently to Europe with their clients in search of the unusual and fine furnishings and objects to create and complement the classic and timeless style that is their trademark.

It is with this outstanding achievement, Mr. Speaker, that I offer this tribute in honor of Illya and his contribution to the international community of architecture and interior design.

SALUTE TO D.C. UNITED,
"AMERICA'S SOCCER TEAM"

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud D.C. United as "America's Soccer Team," which won its third Major League Soccer (MLS) championship while Congress was in recess. It is a well-deserved title, not only because the team is located in the nation's capital, but especially because D.C. United has won three of the four MLS championships offered by the league. Rarely, if ever, has an American team so dominated its sport or displayed greater skill and sportsmanship. Both were in full view last November, when United snared its latest championship in a two-to-nothing victory over Los Angeles.

We, who live in the District of Columbia, are proud that D.C. United took our hometown name. Our hometown soccer team has become the District's version of a triple crown champion that does not know how to lose. D.C. United's victories over the past several years have paralleled the continuing revitalization of the team's hometown. After what our city went through in the 1990s, the team's championship means much more to D.C. than it would to Baltimore or New York, or Atlanta or Los Angeles. D.C. United has taught this town that we, too, can be winners. Now, when Americans and people from around the world visit the nation's capital, they come not only to see our monuments. They want also to see our monumental team.

Our team reflects the nations of the world in a sport that is played by virtually every country in the world. Across the nation and throughout the soccer world, D.C. United fans applaud the team's determination to fight and to win. Today, we salute D.C. United for a job well done and send best wishes to "America's Soccer Team."

HONORING JUDY LACHVAYDER,
RECIPIENT OF A 1999 TEACHER
ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Judy Lachvayder, a science teacher at Parma Senior High School in Parma, Ohio, and recipient of a 1999 Ohio Teacher Achievement Award. Ms. Lachvayder is one of ten Ohio teachers to be honored by the Ashland Oil Company for her exceptional accomplishments in teaching.

Judy Lachvayder is an enthusiastic and inspiring teacher. She has three personal teaching principles—know your subject, keep alive, and be inspired. Lachvayder does all these things, and does them well. First, she possesses great knowledge in the subject of science. She is a former Christa McAuliffe grant recipient; a two-time participant in the Human Genome Project; a recipient of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship to study neurobiology at Princeton University; an Access Excellence Fellow; and a recent participant in the "Forging a Link" conference of the National Science Foundation. She follows her second principle, "Keep Alive", by staying current with her subject matter and through personal self-discovery and growth. And finally, she stays inspired by challenging her students to get excited about science and to think critically.

Lachvayder says, "Just as new pathways were opened for us by various explorers, teachers help to open new pathways of exploration for their students."

Lachvayder encourages her students to become independent learners with the ability to think both critically and creatively. Her caring and devoted style of teaching is an inspiration.

My fellow colleagues, please join with me in honoring Judy Lachvayder on her receipt of the 1999 Ohio Teacher Achievement Award.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Guam village of Mangilao on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of Mayorship for the municipality. I would also like to pay tribute to four men who, through the past five decades, have devoted and dedicated a substantial portion of their lives towards service to the island of Guam and the village of Mangilao. The Honorable Jesus Cruz Pereira, the Honorable Jesus dela Rosa Santos, the Honorable Nicolas Duenas Francisco, and the Honorable Nonito C. Blas are men who have made great contributions to the progress, growth and development of the village of Mangilao.

Mangilao's first mayor, the Honorable Jesus C. Pereira was born in Hagatna, Guam on November 13, 1920—the son of Manuel Delgado and Josepha Leon Guerrero Cruz Pereira. He was educated at the Guam Institute and the Edmund S. Root Agricultural School and

worked as a civil service employee for the United States Navy. In 1944, he enlisted in the Navy and served through 1950.

Having been instrumental in the development of Mangilao into a separate municipality which was formerly part of the village of Barrigada, Mayor Pereira holds the distinction of having been elected as the first mayor to serve the village of Mangilao. His service commencing in 1950, the mayor went on to serve a total of 16 years in this post. During his tenure, he directed Mangilao's growth from a community of 700 to a full fledged village of 3,000 residents. In addition, Mayor Pereira played a vital role in the establishment of facilities for the University of Guam, the Guam Community College and the Department of Public Health and Social Services within his village. Holding seniority over the men who have served as Mangilao village mayors, Mayor Pereira, to this day, continues to offer assistance and advice to the residents and leadership of the village of Mangilao.

In 1968, the Honorable Jesus dela Rosa Santos became the second man to be elected mayor of Mangilao. He took office at a crucial time in the village's development. Mayor Santos immediately became his constituency's link to the Government of Guam enabling Mangilao to gain government services and basic infrastructure such as power, water and roads which were unavailable at the time. In addition, he was known for going above and beyond the prescribed duties of his office—dedicating his time and personal funds to needy constituents. As mayor, he was instrumental in enhancing public awareness to Federal Welfare Assistance and other programs designed to benefit eligible constituents.

Born in Hagatna on November 16, 1923, Mayor Santos grew up in the village of Mongmong. He graduated from George Washington High School shortly after the end of the Second World War and commenced government service with the Records and Account Office. He was later employed by the Department of Land Management for sixteen years prior to his election as Mayor.

After the end of his tenure as mayor in 1972, Mayor Santos worked in the private sector, initially for Ricky's Auto Company and later, in 1973, for Citibank. Although he retired in 1984, he has been active in the area of agriculture and is known for imparting his knowledge of the traditional ways of farming and raising livestock. He remains a valued member of the community and has always been willing to contribute towards the benefit of the village of Mangilao.

The Honorable Nicolas Duenas Francisco was born in the village of Mangilao on September 12, 1945—the son of Joaquin Cabrera Francisco and Angustia Tenorio Duenas. Popularly known as "Nick," Mayor Francisco attended Price Elementary and San Vicente Middle School and graduated in 1964 from Tumon High School now known as John F. Kennedy High School. Prior to enlisting in the United States Army in 1966, he worked as an apprentice at an air engineering company, as a community worker for the Department of Public Health and Social Services, and as a youth counselor in the Juvenile Justice Division of the Superior Court of Guam. Nick served during the Vietnam War. In recognition of his valor and distinguished service, he was awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

In 1972, he successfully ran for Mayor of Mangilao. He went on to win re-elections for three consecutive terms. As mayor, he was able to secure over 2 million dollar's worth of capital improvement projects for his village. His many accomplishments include the construction of a baseball field, the establishment of the Mangilao Senior Citizens' Center, the completion of over fifty paved roadways, and the naming of over 200 streets within the village of Mangilao.

He served as mayor until 1987 when he was appointed Deputy Director of Civil Defense/Guam Emergency Services Office by then Governor Joseph F. Ada. In addition to his continued involvement with the Guam Babe Ruth Baseball League and the Kiwanis Club, he continues to provide service to the community to this day as a Legislative Aide to the Honorable Mark Forbes, member of the Liheslaturan Guahan.

The current mayor of Mangilao, the Honorable Nonito C. Blas was born in Hagatna. Known to many as "Nito," Mayor Blas attended Asan and Agana Elementary School before graduating from George Washington High School in 1957. He went on to enlist in the United States Navy. He served for 24 years and retired in 1980 at the rank of chief yeoman.

Upon his retirement from the Navy, Nito returned to Guam and worked as an alternative sentencing officer for the Superior Court of Guam. In 1988, he was appointed by then Governor Ada to serve in the vacated Mangilao mayor seat. In 1989, Nito was elected to the position which he has held for the past eleven years.

Upon taking office, Mayor Blas continued his predecessor's commitment to capital improvement projects. His efforts have resulted in the repair and installation of guardrails along village roads, installation of street signs, flood control projects, sewer improvement projects, hazard elimination projects and the construction of community and recreational facilities.

A member of several local civil organizations, Mayor Blas has been a very active member of the community. He has made substantial contributions towards the enhancement of youth activities and senior citizens programs in the village of Mangilao. As with his predecessors, Mayor Blas should be commended for his outstanding job in fostering the growth and successfully handling the rapid population expansion and ethnic diversity of Guam's cultural and population centers.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the mayorship of the village of Mangilao, I congratulate the residents of this marvelous community and commend the remarkable mayors who, for the past fifty years, have labored, led and contributed to the growth and development of the village of Mangilao.

HONORING A MEMBER OF THE AD
100, TOM ALLARDYCE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize one of Architectural Digest's top one hundred interior designers and architects for the year of 2000. The

AD 100 is an international guide profiling outstanding and talented designers and architects from around the world. Architectural Digest publishes this list one every five years. The gifted designer being honored is Mr. Tom Allardyce.

Mr. Allardyce and his partner, Illya Hendrix, founded their design firm in Los Angeles in 1980. For the past twenty years, they have specialized in residential estates. Their innovative designs for architectural structures, their customized interior surfaces, and their choice of exquisite antique furnishings have earned them numerous awards and published features of their projects both in national and international magazines. Their most recent endeavor has been the creation of their own live of furniture and accessories. Their firm employs a full-time support staff to provide quality craftsmanship for each project.

The firm's international clientele is varied and includes notable names from the entertainment and business industries. They take pride in their ability to incorporate into the design the preferences and individual style of each of their clients. This enables the client to make an easy transition when their home is completed. Mr. Hendrix and Mr. Allardyce travel frequently to Europe with their clients in search of the unusual and fine furnishings and objects to create and complement the classic and timeless style that is their trademark.

It is with this outstanding achievement, Mr. Speaker, that I offer this tribute in honor of Tom and his contribution to the international community of architecture and interior design.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL
DIALOGUE IN KAZAKHSTAN

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last December President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan was in Washington, D.C. for the annual meeting of the U.S.-Kazakhstan Joint Commission. The purpose of these meetings, which are alternately held in the United States and Kazakhstan, is to promote economic and political cooperation between our two countries. Among other things, the U.S. side regularly presses the government of Kazakhstan to improve its human rights record and undertake economic and political reform.

I understand that U.S. officials pressed the Kazakhstani side especially hard this year, because of the sham parliamentary elections held last October, heightened corruption, and an acceleration of abusive action taken against opponents of President Nazarbayev's increasingly repressive government. In an apparent move to blunt U.S. pressure during the upcoming Joint Commission meeting, President Nazarbayev issued a statement on November 4, 1999 indicating his willingness to cooperate with the opposition in Kazakhstan. He also stated he would welcome the return of former Prime Minister Akhezan Kazhegeldin, the exiled leader of the main opposition party.

On November 19, Mr. Kazhegeldin responded to President Nazarbayev by calling for a "national dialogue" to examine ways to advance democracy, economic development and national reconciliation in Kazakhstan.

Similar national dialogues have met with success in Poland, South Africa and Nicaragua. Mr. Kazhegeldin pointed out that convening a national dialogue would be an ideal way to initiate cooperation between the opposition and the government.

However, President Nazarbayev has reacted with stony silence to Mr. Kazhegeldin's proposal. Moreover, Mr. Nazarbayev has reneged on a pledge he made in November to ship oil through the proposed Baku-Ceyhan pipeline, and continues to refuse to settle investment disputes with foreign companies that have lost millions of dollars because the government failed to honor its commitments. Mr. Nazarbayev also arranged to have a "kangaroo court" convict an opposition leader for having the temerity to criticize Nazarbayev's government. Finally, and this is very troubling, an investigation and trial have failed to find anyone to blame for the delivery last year of 40 MIG fighter aircraft from Kazakhstan to North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the Administration needs to stop turning the other cheek every time Mr. Nazarbayev commits an outrage. The cause of freedom and democracy will continue to backslide in Kazakhstan unless the Administration voices its strong support for a national dialogue similar to the one proposed by former Prime Minister Kazhegeldin. At the very least, the government of Kazakhstan should make one hour a week of state-controlled television available for use by the opposition. The U.S., for its part, should assist the democratic opposition by providing printing presses to replace those that have been confiscated by the government. It is time to stand up for democracy in Kazakhstan and to stop coddling dictators like Nazarbayev.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit an article into the RECORD from the Washington Times that speaks volumes about the situation in Kazakhstan today.

[From the Washington Times, Dec. 20; 1999]
DINING WITH DICTATORS—WHITE HOUSE FETES
KAZAKH PRESIDENT

(By Thomas B. Evans, Jr.)

For some inexplicable reason the president of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, has been invited to visit Washington this month by the Clinton-Gore administration.

Mr. Nazarbayev is the same dictator who over the past eight years has created a monopoly of riches for himself, his family and carefully selected friends. He has also lured many investors to his country and then pillaged their assets for himself, his family and a few cronies. Knowledgeable sources say that he is the eighth richest man in the world. This, in a country where the per capita income is well below the poverty level.

Mr. Nazarbayev is the same person who promised Vice President Gore a year ago that he would permit a fair and free presidential election in January 1999 and then rigged the disqualification of his main opponent, thereby eliminating any chance of defeat and ensuring the perpetuation of his corrupt regime. Mr. Nazarbayev is also the same person who has had \$85 million in ill-gotten gains frozen by the judiciary in Switzerland. Mr. Nazarbayev is the same individual who ordered the destruction of printing presses used to print newspapers questioning his policies.

And Mr. Nazarbayev's record on human rights is anything but outstanding. There is, quite simply, no freedom of the press, no independent judiciary and no freedom of assembly that could threaten Mr. Nazarbayev's one-man one-family rule in Kazakhstan.

In spite of all the above, Kazakhstan still receives millions of dollars in foreign assistance from U.S. taxpayers and hundreds of millions more indirectly through the Export-Import Bank and international financial institutions in which the United States is a major contributor. Is it not just about time that we let dictators like Mr. Nazarbayev know that we are not going to accept this type of behavior? Is it not past time for us to be taken as fools who don't care about how a country's ruler treats his people and foreign investors? Is Kazakhstan's oil so important to us that we would sacrifice basic principles by inviting dictators to dine with our president and vice president? Don't we ever learn lessons from past mistakes? Doesn't anyone in the administration remember how in Indonesia President Suharto's greed, nepotism and general misrule led to his downfall and plunged the country into near chaos? Tolerance of corrupt rule does not contribute to stability. In fact, quite the opposite is true. Have we also learned nothing by cozying up to Victor Chernomyrdin in Russia? Certainly, none of these examples are ancient history.

Surely, this administration does not want to assist in the perpetuation of a regime in Kazakhstan that is the antithesis of all that we stand for as Americans. Both the president and vice president should make it unmistakably clear that the status quo in Kazakhstan is unacceptable.

On Nov. 17, former Prime Minister Akhezan Kazhegeldin, who was prevented from running against Mr. Nazarbayev last January and now heads the leading opposition party (although living in exile in Western Europe), proposed that a national dialogue be launched with a view toward reforming the political and economic system in Kazakhstan and holding free and fair presidential and parliamentary elections. Similar national dialogues were successful in Poland and South Africa, and convening one for Kazakhstan could set the pattern for reform throughout the former Soviet republics of Central Asia. Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gore should emphasize to Mr. Nazarbayev that close cooperation between our two countries depends on his agreement to participate in a national dialogue. They should also insist that in order for a national dialogue to be credible, it must be held outside Kazakhstan and should be organized and monitored with the assistance of respected organizations such as the Council of Europe or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gore should make support for political and economic reform the centerpiece of their discussions with Mr. Nazarbayev. That is the very least this administration should do at this point, and that is not an unreasonable expectation on the part of the United States.

A PROCLAMATION COMMENDING
CHRISTOPHER J. BARRETT ON
HIS PROMOTION TO THE RANK
OF MAJOR IN THE UNITED
STATES ARMY

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following to my colleagues:

Whereas, Christopher J. Barrett was recently promoted to the rank of Major in the United States Army; and,

Whereas, Christopher J. Barrett has served as a Military Police Officer in the United

States army for eleven years and has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to the preservation of the United States of America; and,

Whereas, in 1991 Christopher J. Barrett served his country in Operation Desert Storm during the Gulf War and the citizens of the United States owe Major Barrett a great deal of gratitude for his undying loyalty and dedication to our country; and,

Whereas, the Members of Congress, with a real sense of gratitude and pride, join me in commending Major Christopher J. Barrett on his recent promotion in Major in the United States Army.

HONORING ROBERT M. EPPLEY

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert M. Eppley for his many years of service to Cumberland County, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Eppley is currently Chairman of the Board of Supervisors for Middlesex Township, Pennsylvania. He was first elected supervisor of Middlesex Township in 1963. Prior to that, he spent three years as supervisor in East Pennsboro Township. His service in both townships qualifies Mr. Eppley as one of the most senior municipal officials in Cumberland County.

Mr. Eppley has served through eight Presidential administrations and has never missed an opportunity to vote since being qualified to do so. While a Cumberland County committeeman, he served on the County Committee's Finance and Executive Committees and guided Middlesex Township from a farming community of 1,900 people to its present status as a transportation center for the eastern United States. As a committee member and a lifelong public servant, he has dedicated his life to serving our country by bettering our government and political process.

Mr. Eppley has been a Sergeant-at-Arms of the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors, a Deacon of St. Matthew's United Church of Christ, and a Deputy District Commander and County Commander for the American Legion. He is a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, the Mechanicsburg Men's Club, and a charter member of the Enola's Sportsman Club. Mr. Eppley is also a veteran of World War II, having served as a corporal in the Army.

If every precinct had a committeeman that is as involved and dedicated as Bob Eppley, rest assured more Americans would be involved in the electoral and political process. Mr. Speaker, I salute Robert M. Eppley for his lifetime of public service to Cumberland County and his many years of dedication to the betterment of our community.

THE CHANGING FACE OF
AMERICA'S FINANCIAL SUCCESS

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, women are changing the face of America's financial success.

Today, there are nearly 8.5 million women-owned businesses in the United States, and they are increasing in number, range, diversity, and earning power. As their companies expand, women business owners employ 18.5 million individuals and produces \$3.1 trillion in sales.

Since 1994, the Republican-led Congress has diligently worked on behalf of women business owners. We have instituted a variety of reforms from achieving a balanced budget and modernizing financial services, to easing the burden of unnecessary regulation and taxation. In this new century, we must do everything we can to keep the economy growing and enable women to keep more of their hard-earned dollars.

I would like to take the opportunity to submit an insightful interview, conducted by the Center for International Private Enterprise in their magazine *Economic Reform Today*, highlighting the positive contributions of women-owned businesses to the U.S. economy.

BUSINESSWOMEN IN THE MAINSTREAM

ERT: In recent years, the US and a few other industrial nations have seen very impressive growth in the number of women-owned firms. What do you think is the reason for this rapid increase, and what impact is it having on the US economy?

Mr. DONOHUE: It's very true that the number of women-owned firms has increased phenomenally. In 1997, the US Small Business Administration (SBA) found that women owned 8.5 million small businesses in this country—that's one in every three small businesses! Together, they employ more than 23.8 million people and generate up to \$3.1 trillion in sales.

There are many reasons why there has been such a rapid expansion in the number of women in business. First of all, women in general are increasingly better educated than they were a few decades ago. According to the US Department of Commerce, in 1970 only 8% of women completed college, compared with 14% of men. By 1990, that number had risen to 17.6% (compared with 23% of men). Women's educational attainment increased by 4.8% while men's rose by only 2.8%.

In addition to being better prepared, women are also delaying marriage and child-bearing in order to enter the workplace—a trend that started in the 1970's. The percent of never-married females ages 20 to 29 rose, in average, by 11.4% between 1980 and 1990. This helped power an increase in productivity from which we are benefiting today.

The impact of these twin social trends has been to increase the influence of women in business—particularly small business. For many women, owning a business and setting their own schedules has been a way for them to reconcile their personal and career goals. Between 1987 and 1996, the number of women-owned businesses grew 78%—and, according to the National Foundation of Women Business Owners, women are starting businesses at twice the rate of men. As a result of this incredible productivity and activity, women-owned firms now employ more people than do the Fortune 500 companies!

ERT: The US Chamber has seen a significant increase in women-owned businesses as a segment of its membership in recent years. Has this changed the organization in any way?

Mr. DONOHUE: In recent years, the US Chamber has approached this positive situation in two ways. First, we have worked hard to provide resources for businesswomen. For example, throughout 1999 the Chamber is co-sponsoring three national satellite con-

ferences designed to help women entrepreneurs develop winning small business strategies.

These conferences are intended to present women business owners with an excellent opportunity to grow and learn from fellow entrepreneurs and to share their knowledge and experience with colleagues. These conference programs also include a question-and-answer session with the studio audience and call-in participants. Co-sponsors of the series include Edward Jones, the US Small Business Administration, the Small Business Development Center Program, IBM, the American Business Women's Association, and Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE).

We have already held two conferences. The first was held May 17, 1999 and offered "Practical Tips for Today and Tomorrow." It featured Jay Conrad Levinson, author of *Guerilla Marketing: Secrets for Making Big Profits from Your Small Business* and Flori Roberts, an ethnic cosmetic pioneer who now runs motivational seminars. The second satellite conference was held August 30 and focused on how to expand a business. The third in the series—on financing for stability and growth—is set for November 2.

Networking opportunities and new resources have always been a key reason that women have joined the Chamber. But let's face it—whether you're a male business owner or a female business owner, you're still going to have the same interests and concerns when it comes right down to it.

You're still going to worry about high taxes, health care mandates and onerous workplace and environmental regulations that cost business well over \$700 billion every year. We understand this, and we fight for all of our members' interests before the US Congress, regulatory agencies, in the courts—and in the court of public opinion. And in our view, that's the main reason why women-owned businesses—and indeed, all of our business members—join together with us.

ERT: How can women business leaders help to shape public policy, and what is the role of public policy in promoting the involvement of women in business?

Mr. DONOHUE: Most women business leaders are so busy running their businesses that they have little time for public policy. But the most important public policy effort that women business leaders can make is to recognize that their interests lie in protecting and improving our system of free enterprise. Taxes, health care mandates and regulations impact every business, and it's important for women—and their male counterparts—to recognize this.

My advice to businesswomen in this country is to get involved. Join your local and state chambers of commerce. Become a member of the US Chamber of Commerce! Find examples of other women who have successfully fought for business and emulate them—for example, the Treasurer of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is Carol Ball, the Publisher and CEO of Ball Publishing Company of Greenville, Ohio. She is a tough, ardent advocate for a pro-business agenda, and we are lucky to have her on board.

When it comes to promoting women in business, I believe that the US government ought to do two things. First, through agencies like the Small Business Administration, it should provide information and act as a clearinghouse for different resources that would be beneficial to women.

Second, I believe that the federal government should create a better climate for enterprise creation. From serious regulatory reform to better bankruptcy laws, pro-business policies will help all business owners,

but they will aid women in particular, who, as I previously noted, start businesses at twice the rate of men.

ERT: Women's business associations appear to be growing around the world. How can they make a difference? Do they address special needs of business-women that traditional business associations do not?

Mr. DONOHUE: Women's business associations are an invaluable resource for women at all stages of their careers. The networking possibilities alone make them worthwhile. In addition, some associations offer member benefits such as loans and discounts on business products. These benefits, other resources and networking are major draws for women entrepreneurs.

For example, the American Business Women's Association (ABWA) offers options for every phase of a career. Whether a woman is looking for a promotion, career move, her own business or a way to stay active in retirement, ABWA offers a specific membership program tailored to get her on her way.

But remembers, women's business associations and organizations like the Chamber can work together! The Chamber offers conferences and leadership forums to help prepare women for the world of business. And, as I've mentioned before, we also fight for pro-business policies that benefit both men and women.

ERT: In many nations, women-owned businesses are confined to cottage industries and the informal sector. Do you see this changing over time?

Mr. DONOHUE: Yes, I do. As more women in those societies enter the workforce, as they become better educated and as societies become more open, you will see greater numbers of women assume top corporate leadership posts around the world.

ERT: Many women business owners—even the smallest scale entrepreneurs—seek access to global markets and access to potential partners for their goods or services. Are there key ways in which their business associations should be assisting them?

Mr. DONOHUE: I'm very glad you asked that. The scale of international trade today is such that even the smallest of companies, be it an importer or a manufacturer, is operating on a global scale. The US Chamber has long been committed to policies that make it even easier for companies of all sizes to trade. Right now, we have a major international trade education project under way, in which we hope to communicate the benefits of increased trade to the public. By looking beyond our borders, women business owners have an excellent opening to grow their businesses, especially with the advent of information technology, the Internet and e-commerce. At the Chamber, we aim to create an environment so that these companies prosper, and that they take advantage of the opportunities available to them.

ERT: Speaking of technology, how do you foresee the Internet and other information technology boosting the ability of small-scale entrepreneurs—like many women-owned firms—to access international markets?

Mr. DONOHUE: The Internet is one of the most profound inventions of this century. It enables the smallest of small companies to compete with the biggest ones—if they can figure out how to do it.

The Internet confers many advantages on small businesses. For example, small companies can use it to monitor orders and other customer services—and cut costs dramatically. Network connectivity makes it possible for you to hook up your local area network (LAN) directly to the Internet. And a wide-area network (WAN) connection offers multiple simultaneous connections through a dedicated data line, at tremendous savings

over individual modems and standard telephone lines. This makes your existing internal email address work as Internet email addresses, and allows you to set up your own Web server (with your own domain name) to provide volumes of information to existing and potential new customers and to take orders on-line.

The Internet also offers small businesses a much wider consumer base. There are 92 million Internet users in North America. The number of women Internet users jumped by 80% in only nine months, passing the 10 million mark. And 55 million people have shopped on the Web for products ranging from books, computers, clothing, CDs, and videos, to cars, car parts and even houses. Those consumers spent \$12 billion this year, up from \$7 billion last year.

Moreover, the biggest business is . . . business! Companies have spent even more than consumers—about \$43 billion on Internet purchases according to Forrester Research. This year, that figure will likely jump to nearly \$110 billion. It's no wonder, as the University of Texas reported, that the Internet economy generated \$301 billion of revenues in 1998 and created 1.2 million jobs.

In short, to connect with people and businesses in other countries, the Internet can't be beat. And there's nowhere to go but up as more and more nations get wired and go on-line. E-commerce will be the story of the next century.

LEHIGH VALLEY HERO

HON. PATRICK J. TOOMEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to one of my constituents, Mr. J. Anderson Daub. Mr. Daub, who owns and operates five car dealerships in my district, recently won the prestigious Time Magazine Quality Dealer Award for outstanding performance. This award is the culmination of a lifetime of hard work for Mr. Daub, who began his career washing cars in his father's dealership at the age of twelve. Through hard work and diligence, he learned how to operate his dealerships successfully, with a commitment to quality and service that won him this impressive award.

In addition to his excellence in business, Mr. Daub also gives much of his time back to the community. He is a board member of the Lehigh Valley Easter Seal Society, the State Theatre for the Arts, and the United Way of the Lehigh Valley. In addition, Mr. Daub is president of the Brown-Daub Foundation, which provides educational and social services to thousands of citizens in my district. I applaud Mr. Daub for his professional achievements and his involvement in his community.

IN MEMORY OF MARY M.
BRANNEGAN OF PAWCATUCK,
CONNECTICUT

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a very heavy heart to offer a few words in memory of Mary Mullaney Brannegan of

Pawcatuck, Connecticut. Mary was my friend and an outstanding public servant in the southeastern Connecticut for decades. She will be missed by countless members of the community whose lives she touched during her long and meaningful life.

Mary was born in Pawcatuck in 1908 and lived in the same house her entire life. Early in her career, she was a teacher in the business department of Stonington High School until her retirement in the 1950s. Over many years, she served as a clerk in the office of probate judge and for a brief period as judge of probate. She was well-known by everyone in Town Hall. Later in life, she was an active volunteer with the Pawcatuck Neighborhood Center, which provides a range of essential services to residents in the community. She was affectionately known as the "daffodil lady" because she sold bouquets of daffodils each year to raise funds for the Center.

Mary was also the pillar of the Democratic party in Stonington for many decades. In this capacity, she helped every Democratic leader—including this member—to understand that our party represents the interest of working Americans who have made this country great. To her final days, she had an acute political sense and understood the pulse of the community better than anyone.

Mr. Speaker, Mary has been widely remembered as a friend, a mentor and a leader. She reached out to every member of the community and had an extended family which is too numerous to count. Everyone who knew her will remember her fondly. I extend my deepest sympathy to her son and daughter. We can take comfort in the fact that Mary Brannegan's memory will endure in Pawcatuck through her many good deeds, years of service and friendships.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of honor that I rise to celebrate Black History Month and its 2000 theme—Heritage and Horizons, the African-American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st century. As I consider this year's theme, I reflect on this great nation's African-American heritage, and anticipate a multitude of future accomplishments in the new millennium.

As we reflect on the great African-American contributions made to our nation's history, I would like to draw your attention to some individuals who were the first in representing the African-American community in Indiana's First Congressional District: William Burke, the first African-American police officer in Gary; Lonnie Bolden, the first African-American firefighter in Gary; Bernard Carter, the first African-American Prosecutor in Lake County; and Rudy Clay, the first African-American State Senator.

These individuals, the trailblazers for our future leaders, had the courage and initiative to set high aspirations, achieve their goals, and become role models for our youth. We must recognize this great African-American heritage, honor our African-American pioneers and celebrate their accomplishments. However, we must stop there. We are at the dawn of a new century.

A true role model for today's youth is Karen Freeman-Wilson of Indiana's First Congressional District. Karen, a native of Gary, recalls showing her seventh grade report card to her father. Her grades included 5 "A's" and one "B". After indicating his pleasure, her father told her if she brought up the "B" and continued to work hard, she could achieve any goal she could conceive. She became the 1978 valedictorian for Gary Roosevelt High School, the first in her family to attend college, and in 1985, a graduate of Harvard Law School. She then returned to her home in Lake County to confront new challenges as a deputy prosecutor and later a public defender. From 1989 to 1992, she headed the Indiana Civil Rights Commission, guiding legislation which made Indiana the first state in the nation to pass fair housing laws aligned with the federal government's. She also brought Indiana law into alignment with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Karen was appointed a Gary Circuit Court judge in 1994, the first African-American to serve in that position. As a judge, she developed programs to combat drug addiction, gang involvement and teen smoking. In addition, she has worked with Gary pediatrician Dr. Steve Simpson to establish a home for babies born addicted to crack cocaine.

On February 21, 2000, Karen Freeman-Wilson confronted her latest challenge when she was appointed to be the youngest Indiana State Attorney General. As Attorney General, Karen vows to continue her efforts to protect children, the elderly, and victims of rape and domestic violence, while providing quality legal representation of all the people of Indiana.

Karen clearly states that she owes her personal and professional success to many influential leaders and activists who paved the way before her. Now, Karen Freeman-Wilson is paving the way for young African-American children to confront and conquer new challenges.

I would also like to draw your attention to two distinguished African-American youths who have emerged victorious after facing many difficulties and will lead us into the 21st century. Dominic Adams, a junior at Lew Wallace High School in Gary, is currently serving as a Congressional page. Dominic is a member of the male role model program at his high school, head of the school newspaper, and a member of the Christ Baptist Church youth choir.

Another distinguished young person is Andrea Ledbetter, a senior at Emerson High School in Gary. She recently won a national Target scholarship. Andrea is involved in many activities including the Gary Youth NAACP Chapter, U.S. People to People Student Ambassador Program, Big Brothers/Big Sisters Program, Academic Super Bowl team, and Governor O'Bannon's Indiana Point of Youth Program. As a part of a citywide Stop-the-Violence rally in Gary, Andrea was instrumental in recruiting cheerleaders from each of the area high schools to provide routines aimed at increasing the peace. In addition, Andrea is an outstanding academic student, ranked number one in her class with a grade point average of 4.10 on a four-point scale. Andrea and Dominic are fine representatives of their high schools in Gary, of Indiana's First Congressional District, and of Future African-American leaders.

As we celebrate Black History Month, let us all continue our work together. Let us cele-

brate our country's African-American heritage and commemorate it. Let us address the challenges of the 21st century, encouraging and helping our young African-Americans to achieve success.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN WATERS'
"ENDLESS CHAIN"

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has produced many notable individuals and accomplishments. From Andrew Jackson to Michael Jordan and from the first American born child to first in flight. North Carolina has a lot to brag about. There is one North Carolinian in particular who I wish to remember today, Mr. Benjamin Franklin Waters.

Mr. Benjamin Waters was from the small town of Dover, which is located in historic Craven County, North Carolina. In 1907 Mr. Waters received a patent for a revolutionary new invention, which he called "the endless chain." The principle behind his invention is used today as the tracks of our amphibious military tanks and in machinery such as farm equipment.

Mr. Waters invented the "endless chain" as a useful improvement for boats. The original patent specifications give Mr. Waters credit for "propelling mechanism . . . comprise(d) of an) endless chain of propeller blades which travel about and below the boat and which are so constructed that water will be prevented from getting behind the blades and thereby retarding the progress of the boat."

As is often the case, it was only by accident that Mr. Waters realized the potential use for his invention on land. He and his brother, Frank Waters, who had helped him build his invention, were out testing their model one Sunday afternoon using a clock spring as a power source. They placed the boat into the water and sent it to the other side, only to have the boat quickly run up the bank and onto land. This amazing discovery led Mr. Waters to begin work on obtaining a new patent for use of his invention on land.

Unfortunately, plans for the new patent were not completed before Mr. Waters was tragically killed at the age of 35. He was deaf and did not hear the oncoming train that would take his life as he attempted to cross the railroad tracks. His family claims that Mr. Waters' workshop was broken into and all of his drawings and sketches stolen soon after his death. Thus he never received credit for invention's capability and utility on land. In 1924 the right to his patent on water also expired.

However, today, the "endless chain" lives on in daily use by our military, our farmers, and our industries. I wish to officially recognize Mr. Benjamin Franklin Waters and thank him for his ingenuity in providing us the principles of the "endless chain."

INDIA TRIES TO FALSELY IMPLICATE SIKHS IN MURDER OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY BY USING ALIAS "SINGH"

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the Tribune newspaper of India reported on February 9 that the Indian government has identified the killer of Christian missionary Graham Staines as Dara Singh, but his real name is Rabinder Kumar Paul. The use of "Singh" is a smear against the Sikhs designed to create the impression that Sikhs were somehow responsible for the Staines murder and put the Christians against the Sikhs, promoting India's divide-and-rule strategy against minorities.

The facts do not support this. Staines, an Australian missionary, and his two young sons were burned to death in their jeep. They were surrounded by a mob of militant Hindus affiliated with the RSS, which is the parent organization of the ruling BJP. These fundamentalist Hindus chanted "Victory to Hanuman," a Hindu god, while the Staines family's jeep burned. Yet India wants to create the impression that one person was responsible for this brutal murder and that he is a Sikh.

Mr. Speaker, I am offended by this open manipulation of both Christians and Sikhs. Apparently, India is concerned about the support that leaders of the freedom movements of South Asia have showed for each other. So they have resorted to this divisive strategy to preserve their empire.

The time has come for America, the beacon of freedom, to take strong measures to stop India from pursuing this campaign to turn one minority against another. First, we must cut off our aid to India. We must recognize its violations of religious liberty and impose appropriate sanctions. Then we must declare our support for free and fair plebiscites, under international supervision, on the question of independence for Punjab, Khalistan, for Kashmir, and for Nagaland.

Pitting one group against the other to maintain a corrupt, brutal tyranny is not a democratic or a moral way to behave.

HONORING KING HUSSEIN AND
QUEEN NOOR OF THE
HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor his Majesty the late King Hussein and her Majesty Queen Noor of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and to bring to the attention of my colleagues a special event that will take place on April 6, 2000. On this evening, the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation will sponsor "A Royal Evening for Peace" in Santa Barbara, California.

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation works to create a more peaceful and secure future for humanity through its projects and activities, and annually honors an outstanding individual

in the cause of peace. This year the Foundation will honor the late King Hussein with its prestigious Peace Leadership Award for his courageous efforts in forging an atmosphere of trust and peace in his country of Jordan and throughout the Middle East.

Her Majesty Queen Noor worked with her husband in these pursuits and has carried on this work creating peace in Jordan and around the world. She has worked tirelessly to eradicate landmines, improve the lives of women and children, and promote economic sustainability.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the immeasurable contributions that King Hussein and Queen Noor have made to their country and to the world have changed the course of history. Their dedication to peace and humankind will continue in perpetuity. I thank her Majesty Queen Noor on behalf of the 22nd Congressional District of California and I am honored by her visit.

IMF REFORM ACT OF 2000

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to fundamentally change the way the International Monetary Fund (IMF) operates. The bill is an outcome of a 2-year JEC research program that has included eight Joint Economic Committee (JEC) studies and reports and 5 hearings on the IMF and its operations. The bill, entitled the "IMF Reform Act of 2000," expands on my IMF Transparency and Efficiency Act of 1998, a version of which became law in that year.

The legislation I am introducing today builds on previous efforts to provide more transparency and efficiency in IMF operations. The IMF is far too secretive and its use of pervasive interest rate subsidies is economically indefensible. IMF finances must become transparent, and its policy of extremely low interest rates, currently under 5 percent, for countries such as Russia and Indonesia must be ended. Such uncreditworthy countries should not be able to borrow at interest rates below the cost of funds of IMF donors such as the United States.

My bill would mandate IMF financial transparency and IMF lending at market interest rates, and would also reduce the maturity of loans to less than one year. IMF lending would be restricted to crisis lending only. Furthermore, IMF lending safeguards are needed to end the IMF traditional "see no evil, hear no evil" approach to potential corruption. The IMF's continued lending to countries that have falsified loan documents or other information is very hard to justify to taxpayers. Strict accounting controls and safeguards should be instituted to prevent misuse, and if insufficient further lending should be halted.

This bill would also improve transparency by requiring a reorganization of the public financial statements of the Fund. As a former IMF research director recently observed, "the Fund's jerry-built structure of financial provisions has meant that almost nobody outside and, indeed, few inside, the Fund understand how the organization works, because relatively simple economic relations are buried under in-

creasingly opaque layers of language. This is the very point I have made for over two years in pressing for greater transparency in IMF finances, and it is good to see agreement on this point.

Over the last two years our research at the JEC has uncovered a number of fascinating facts about how the IMF is financed, IMF subsidies, and IMF lending practices. I look forward to a substantive and vigorous debate on IMF reform based on this research and facts. There will be other points of view and other legislative ideas, but I am convinced that this bill includes the right basic ingredients of IMF reform. As usual, I plan to use every opportunity to advance these ideas into law, as with the IMF reforms enacted into law in 1998 and 1999.

268TH BIRTHDAY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month we marked the 268th anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Nation, General George Washington.

It is regrettable that the establishment of "President's Day" as a national holiday has put onto the back burner the remarkable achievements of this incredible, irreplaceable American. I understand that one of our automobile companies commemorated "President's Day" by having an actor disguised as General Washington blow out 269 candles on a faux birthday cake. Considering that this auto company couldn't be bothered to get the number of the year correct, we can imagine to our consternation the other injustices perpetrated against the man who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Last week, I was honored to be asked to deliver brief remarks at the celebration of Washington's Birthday at the Masonic Historic Site in Tappan, NY, in Rockland County in my Congressional District.

I would like to share with my colleagues my remarks delivered at that time, and insert them into the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY REP. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, 20TH DISTRICT—NY, FEBRUARY 20, 2000

Right Worshipful Ambrose R. Kurtzke; Right Worshipful Grand Chaplain John H.R. Jackley Jr.; Brother Masons; Friends:

We are gathered today, as we have gathered every February, to commemorate the birth of the greatest American of all time, and our Brother Mason, General George Washington.

Two hundred years ago this month, Masonic Lodges throughout the United States gathered to pay tribute to President Washington's 268th birthday. Those commemorations in the year 1800 were bittersweet, for Brother Washington had passed away two months earlier, having died of what was apparently a strep throat on December 14, 1799.

Soon after his death, Richard Henry Lee, a Congressman from Virginia, declared on the floor of Congress that Washington was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

No truer words were ever spoke.

George Washington's record as our nation's Commander in Chief during our War for Inde-

pendence was incredible. With a small, ragged force, he skillfully brought the greatest military power on the face of the earth at that time to its knees. He did this despite the fact that his Army was ill equipped, ill financed, and that he was constantly the target of intrigues to replace him.

At the end of the Revolutionary War, Washington set an example for all time by refusing to allow his Army to set him up as dictator of the United States—a temptation that no military ruler in other nations has been able to resist.

He turned down the crown of the United States at his New Windsor encampment, just a few miles north of here, in Orange County, NY.

In peacetime, George Washington lent his great prestige to the cause of establishing a strong central government. Many historians contend that our Constitution would never have been ratified had not our state governments been confident that George Washington would be our first president.

And, Brother Masons, I regret to note that in the face of some revisionist historians out to make a name for themselves by denigrating Washington's good name, it has become our responsibility to make certain that George Washington remains "first in the hearts of our countrymen."

It is our task and responsibility to make certain the truth about this saintly man will not be forgotten.

Have a happy Washington's birthday. Thank you and God Bless!

A SALUTE TO HAROLD TAYLOR

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend of mine, Harold Taylor. He is an advocate for all ages who provides leadership and inspiration to many in my 13th Congressional District of California. Both Harold and his wife, Marie, dedicate a great deal of time and effort helping people and organizations in their community.

Harold's involvement spans a wide variety of activities. He has held leadership positions with the Boy and Girl Scouts, the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), and the California Retired Teachers Association (CRTA). In addition, Harold has spent over twelve years advocating health insurance issues for seniors on the state level.

In his work for the California Retired Teachers, Harold demonstrated true leadership in educating and lobbying Members of Congress for a correction in the Medicare Part A Hospital buy-in provision, which will help thousands of retired teachers obtain affordable health insurance. His lobbying and persuasive presentations were the key to several hundred million dollars worth of improvements in the program for teachers nationwide, and especially those in California.

Educating and interacting with children has always been a priority for Harold. He spent thirty-four years teaching physical education and special education classes to elementary school children. Additionally, Harold has coached basketball and little league, taught Sunday school, acted as a youth group counselor, and has worked with the San Lorenzo Community Organizing Committee.

One of Harold's most recent successes has been his involvement in planning a fundraiser

for the Family Emergency Shelter Coalition (FESCO). Two years ago, the Volunteer Center announced it would not be holding the annual Human Race Walkathon, FESCO's largest fundraiser. Being his usual take-charge self, Harold announced that FESCO could do the walkathon on its own, and so was born the Shelter Shuffle. Harold's great leadership and organizational skills made the Shelter Shuffle FESCO's most successful walkathon ever.

All of Harold's contributions and successes have not gone unrecognized over the years. His fame started many years ago when he was inducted into the Athletic Hall of Fame in Chico for basketball and track. His dedication to improving and expanding the Boy Scouts in the Tres Ranchos area awarded him the Silver Beaver Award, one of Scouting's highest honors. Finally, last year, Harold was nominated for an award at Hayward's Volunteer Dinner in recognition for his service.

Harold's love and interest in helping and interacting with others continues to be the force behind his dedication and his actions. I ask my colleagues to join with me today in recognizing and honoring Harold Taylor as a true leader whose example inspires others to work towards a greater good in their communities.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends and submits for the RECORD this February 15, 2000, editorial from the Omaha World Herald regarding attempts by the Clinton Administration to require businesses to provide paid family and medical leave for employees.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Feb. 15, 2000]

NO ONE THERE TO PAY

Government-mandated family leave policies cause a particular difficulty for people who want government to do a great deal more to make life comfortable: No readily tappable reservoir of money exists to conveniently cover the costs.

Currently people must go without pay if they exercise their rights under the 1993 federal law entitling them to 12 weeks away from work each year for family reasons. The time off can be used to care for a sick family member or bond with a newly adopted or newborn child.

The original promoters of family leave in the 1980s said "No, never" when they were accused of planning to slip in a paid-leave requirement later. Now, predictably, "No, never," has turned into "Unfair—some people can't afford to take time off without pay."

However, a majority of Congress has never bought into the idea that government should force employers to keep the paychecks coming for extended family leave. Moreover, the thought of taxing the general public has also been a non-starter—it raises such questions as why a family that sacrificed to have a stay-at-home caregiver should pay higher taxes to subsidize the paid leave of a two-earner family.

Thus when President Clinton came around to paid family leave on the list of social programs he wants to leave as a legacy, he used

an indirect approach. He said he would ask Congress for \$20 million in grant money to encourage state governments to find a way to pay people who took time off. He had previously suggested raiding accounts currently used to compensate the jobless and temporarily disabled workers—accounts that in many states are flush because of economic growth and low unemployment in recent years. But other creative ideas are encouraged, he said.

It's always easy to be generous with someone else's money, but in our opinion Congress shouldn't even start down that road. Unemployment and disability funds aren't a windfall and shouldn't be treated as one. Much of the money in the fund resulted from a special tax collected only from businesses. Industries with a history of more layoffs paid proportionately more.

In theory, the special tax rates are lowered when a healthy balance exists in the jobless accounts. Businesses would have a legitimate complaint if they were forced to continue to pay because the fund was drawn upon for reasons other than those for which it was established. And what happens if a recession sends unemployment soaring and the fund is drawn down to pay for family leave? How healthy would it be to raise business taxes still higher at the very time the vitality of the job-producing sector is under stress?

The president showed a glimmer of understanding when he noted that his widowed mother was able to get job training because his grandparents cared for him while she attended school. No federal mandates were involved. But Clinton quickly dismissed the significance of that saying that his family had been lucky. He contends that a federal mandate is needed because not everyone has that kind of luck.

As past editorials in this space have noted, Clinton's lack of firsthand experience with the private sector undermines his credibility on workplace issues. He said no American worker should have to choose between job and family. But such choices are made all the time. Balancing the various parts of one's life is a normal part of adulthood.

And it's by no means a one-sided choice. Long before family leave was invented as a liberal political cause, fathers and mothers were dealing with such issues with the help of extended families, carefully scheduled vacations, generous workplace friends and kind neighbors.

Sympathetic employers—the kind whose existence is seldom acknowledged by the left—also played a role in helping people manage. Competitiveness was also a factor. In a 1987 survey, 77 percent of 1,000 companies indicated that they already had formal or informal family leave policies. In some cases, employees were compensated while taking time off.

So, long before Congress passed the original family leave law, the private sector was already moving forward. It would be interesting to know if this initiative has accelerated—or slowed—in the years since the government served notice that it was taking over the field.

HOUSING FINANCE REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

HON. RICHARD H. BAKER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, today, Chairman LEACH and I introduce a bill to improve the

regulation of the three housing GSEs: FannieMae, FreddieMac, and the Federal Home Loan Banks.

The bill is designed to implement a GAO recommendation to consolidate GSE regulation into one independent board. Currently, three agencies regulate the three housing GSEs. The Federal Housing Finance Board regulates the Federal Home Loan Banks for safety and soundness and mission compliance. HUD regulates the mission compliance of FannieMae and FreddieMac; the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight regulates them for safety and soundness.

Based on several studies it conducted, GAO found that the creation of a single regulator to oversee both safety and soundness and mission compliance of the housing GSEs would lead to improved oversight. GAO identified these advantages:

A single regulator could be more independent and objective than the separate regulatory bodies and could be more prominent than either OFHEO or FHFB.

The regulators' expertise in evaluating GSE risk management could be shared more easily within one agency.

A single regulator would be better positioned to be cognizant of specific mission requirements, such as special housing goals or new programs, and should be better able to assess their competitive effect of all three housing GSEs and ensure consistency of regulation for the GSEs.

GAO analyzed different regulatory structures that could be used for a single housing GSE regulator. It found that an independent, arm's-length, stand-alone regulatory body headed by a board would best fit its criteria for an effective regulatory agency. GAO cited these advantages:

An independent regulatory body should be positioned to achieve the autonomy and prominence necessary to oversee the large and influential housing GSEs.

Using a board would enable Congress to provide for representation that could help ensure the regulator's independence and provide appropriate balance and expertise in the regulators' deliberations of both safety and soundness and mission-related issues.

A board could be structured to provide equal links to HUD, due to its role in housing policy, and Treasury, due to its roles in finance and financial institution oversight.

I believe that an independent board consisting of five persons, including representatives from HUD and Treasury, is a more effective oversight agency for the three housing GSEs than the current regulatory system. The Federal Home Loan Banks, FannieMae, and FreddieMac have essentially the same mission: to provide access to mortgage credit for families throughout the United States. We should not have inconsistent regulations for them.

In short, the bill seeks to improve supervision and to diminish the systemic risk of FannieMae, FreddieMac, and the Federal Home Loan Banks. The provisions in the bill intend to do the following:

1. Consolidate regulation of the three housing GSEs.
2. Reform the approval process for new GSE initiatives.
3. Limit GSEs' non-mission related investments.
4. Remove each GSE's line of credit with the Treasury.

5. Impose uniform risk-based capital requirements on the GSEs.

6. Require annual credit ratings of each GSE.

7. Puts into statute the current GSE practice of maintaining the conforming loan limit to reflect downward movement in average home prices.

8. Equalize the capital treatment of GSE and private-label mortgage-backed securities.

9. Study the exposure of the deposit insurance funds to GSE failure.

10. Gives authority to the new regulator; the power to appoint a receiver in case of GSE failure.

Times of crises are never the best time to act because the focus is on past problems rather than on future risks. We must not forget the painful lessons from the 1980s. Taxpayers can be put at risk during systemic downturns in economic activity. The recommended actions in my legislation are intended to protect your constituents from paying another tax dollar for events beyond their control, even in the case of GSEs. It is best to act now while our GSEs are healthy.

The housing GSEs are large and growing larger. The total obligations of the three housing GSEs is about half of our \$5.6 trillion federal debt. To assure they remain healthy throughout economic downturns and that taxpayers are never called upon to bail out GSEs, my bill aims to improve their supervision.

I hope that the House of Representatives consider the merits of my legislation as I conduct a series of hearings.

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS

A Bill to consolidate and improve the regulation of the housing-related government-sponsored enterprises and for other purposes
TITLE I—HOUSING FINANCE OVERSIGHT BOARD

SUBTITLE A—IMPROVEMENT OF SUPERVISION

Sec. 101. Establishment of Board

The Housing Finance Oversight Board is established as an independent agency in the executive branch. The Board succeeds to the authority of the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO), the Federal Housing Finance Board (FHFB), and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in regard to the enterprises (Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac).

The Board consists of five full-time members, including the Secretary of HUD, the Secretary of the Treasury, and three U.S. citizens appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a term of six years.

The appointed members must have extensive experience or training in housing finance, financial institution regulation, or capital markets. Not more than three members may be from the same political party.

No Board member may hold any office, position, or employment with any FHLBank, enterprise, or FHLBank member, or hold stock in any FHLBank member or enterprise.

The President designates an appointed director to serve as Chairperson of the Board. The Chairperson carries out the Board's policies, acts as spokesperson for the Board, and represents the Board in its official relations with the federal government. The Chairperson acts as chief executive officer of the Board, responsible for the operations and management of the Board.

Sec. 102. Duties and Authorities of Board

The Board's principal duties are to ensure that the enterprises and the FHLBanks oper-

ate in a financially safe and sound manner, carry out their mission, and remain adequately capitalized. The Board also exercises general supervisory and regulatory authority over the enterprises and the FHLBanks.

Sec. 103. Public disclosure of Information

The enterprises and the FHLBanks are required to publicly disclose at least annually financial, business, and other information that the Board determines is in the public interest because the information would increase the efficiency of the secondary mortgage market or the housing finance system.

Sec. 104. Personnel

The Board may not delegate any function to any employee, administrative unit of any FHLBank, or joint office of the FHLBank System.

Sec. 105. Assessments

The Board may annually assess the enterprises for reasonable costs and expenses, without Congressional appropriations approval. Receipts from Board assessments on the FHLBanks must be deposited in the same Treasury Department Fund as assessments on the enterprises.

Sec. 106. Public Disclosure of Final Orders and Agreements

Public disclosure requirements of orders and agreements concerning the enterprises are extended to the FHLBanks.

Sec. 107. Limitation on Subsequent Employment

The two-year limit on subsequent employment of former Board officers or employees by the enterprises is extended to the FHLBanks.

Sec. 108. Regulations

The Board must issue any regulations and orders necessary to carry out its duties.

Sec. 109. Termination of authority of HUD

The Secretary of HUD's general regulatory authority over the enterprises is removed, including affordable housing goals. HUD retains Fair Housing Act responsibilities.

Sec. 110. Approval of Board for New Activities

The Board has the authority to approve new activities and to review ongoing activities of an enterprise or a FHLBank to ensure legal compliance.

An enterprise or FHLBank may not commence any new activity before obtaining the Board's approval. New activity is defined for the enterprises and the FHLBanks, respectively. The Board may approve a new activity only if it is authorized by law, the Board determines the enterprise or FHLBank can conduct the new activity in a safe and sound manner, and the Board determines the new activity is in the public interest.

An enterprise or FHLBank proposing to implement a new activity must submit to the Board a written request for approval; the Board will publish this request in the Federal Register for at least a 30-day public comment period. Within 90 days of Federal Register publication, the Board will approve or deny the request. If the Board denies a request, the enterprise or FHLBank may seek judicial review of the decision.

Sec. 111. Limitation on Nonmission-related Assets

The Board must limit the nonmission-related assets that the enterprises and the FHLBanks may hold at any time.

Sec. 112. Conforming Loan Limits

Puts into statute the current GSE practice of maintaining the conforming loan limit to reflect downward movement in average home prices.

Sec. 113. Definitions

Inserts the new Board in the Definitions section.

Sec. 114. Supervision of Federal Home Loan Bank System

Makes the FHLBanks subject to the supervision and regulation of the Board.

Sec. 115 Amendments to Title 5, U.S. Code

Strikes Director of OFHEO and Chairperson/Directors of FHFB and inserts the new Board, with regard to executive schedule pay rates.

SUBTITLE B—REDUCTION OF SYSTEMIC RISK

Sec. 131. Annual Review of Enterprises by Rating Organizations

The Board will annually provide for two nationally recognized statistical rating organizations to assess the financial condition of each enterprise, each FHLBank, and the FHLBank System to determine the level of risk that they will be unable to meet financial obligations, taking into consideration the legal status that those obligations are not guaranteed by the United States. These assessment must include assigning a credit rating, using a scale similar to what the organizations use for the obligations of other financial institutions.

Sec. 132. Annual Reports

Requirements for annual reports and enforcement action reports concerning the enterprises are extended to the FHLBanks.

Sec. 133. Risk-based Capital Test for Enterprises

Allows the Board to make changes in the stress period circumstances of the risk based capital test for the enterprises.

Sec. 134. Effective Date for Supervisory Actions

Shortens from one year to six months the effective date for supervisory actions applicable to undercapitalized enterprises, subsequent to the risk based capital test taking effect for the enterprises.

Sec. 135. Appointment of Receivers

If an enterprise is critically undercapitalized or a FHLBank does not comply with its leverage and risk-based capital requirements, the Board may appoint a receiver to liquidate or wind up the affairs of the enterprise or FHLBank.

Sec. 136. Repeal of Treasury Lines of Credit

Repeals the \$2.25 billion line of credit from the Treasury Department for each enterprise and the \$4 billion line of credit from the Treasury Department for the FHLBanks.

Sec. 137. Board Membership on Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council

Makes the Board a member of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FIFIEC).

Sec. 138. Elimination of Super-lien for Federal Home Loan Banks

Eliminates the priority given a FHLBank's security interest in the assets of a member financial institution that fails.

Sec. 139. Federal Home Loan Bank Finance Corporation

Establishes a FHLBank Finance Corporation as a federally-chartered instrumentality to issue and service the debt obligations of the FHLBanks. Management of the Corporation is vested in a board of directors, with each FHLBank having one representative (an officer or director of the FHLBank) on the Board. Consolidated obligations issued by the Corporation shall be the joint and several obligations of all the FHLBanks.

Sec. 140. Capital Treatment of Private Label Mortgage-backed Securities

Expresses the sense of Congress that proposed agency rules addressing the treatment of privately issued mortgage backed securities under risk-based capital requirements are appropriate and the final rules should not be significantly altered.

Sec. 141. Study of Effects of GSE Failure on Depository Institutions

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in consultation with the Federal Reserve Board, will conduct a study of the existing exposure of depository institutions to default or failure of the enterprises and FHLBanks and the effects such failures would have on depository institutions. The study will determine: (1) the extent of equity, debt, and mortgage-backed securities issued by the GSEs that is held by depository institutions; (2) the likely implications for depository institutions arising from such holdings if any GSE fails to meet risk-based capital requirements, is more severely undercapitalized, or defaults on its financial obligations; and (3) the effects on the financial exposure of depository institutions to GSEs from restricting loans to a single borrower.

SUBTITLE C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 161. Conforming and Technical Amendments

Amends statutes to insert the new Board.

Sec. 162. Effective Date

The effective date is 270 days following enactment.

TITLE II—TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS, PERSONNEL, AND PROPERTY

Sec. 201. Abolishment of OFHEO and Federal Housing Finance Board

The OFHEO and the FHFB are abolished, effective 270 days following enactment. Various issues are addressed to facilitate an orderly transfer of functions to the Board.

Sec. 202. Continuation and Coordination of Certain Regulations

All OFHEO, FHFB, and HUD (related to the enterprises) regulations and orders in effect upon abolishment must remain in effect and be enforceable by the Board until determined otherwise.

Sec. 203. Transfer and Rights of Employees of Abolished Agencies

OFHEO and FHFB employees will be transferred to the Board. Such employees are guaranteed a position with the same status, tenure, grade, and pay as previously held. Each employee cannot be involuntarily separated or reduced in grade or compensation for 18 months following the transfer, except for cause or temporary employee status. Membership in employee benefit programs is also retained for 18 months.

Sec. 204. Transfer of Property and Facilities

Upon abolishment, all OFHEO and FHFB property transfers to the Board.

INTRODUCTION OF CIPRIS
CORRECTION BILL**HON. PATSY T. MINK**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that will repeal a burden being placed on our colleges and universities.

In 1996, Congress enacted the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) directing the INS to establish an electronic tracking program to monitor foreign students and scholars in the United States.

The Coordinated Interagency Partnership Regulating International Students, CIPRIS as it is called, was established to enable colleges, universities and exchange programs to

report information electronically to the INS, the Department of State, and the Department of Education.

CIPRIS is funded through a \$95 fee imposed on each student and visitor enrolled in higher education institutions or exchange programs.

Section 641(e) of IIRIRA requires that colleges and universities and exchange programs collect and remit this \$95 fee for each of these foreign students or exchange visitors.

This mandate places an inappropriate, costly, and unenforceable burden on our colleges and universities. Moreover, it establishes a dangerous precedent by requiring higher education institutions to act as collection agents for the federal government.

Significant financial costs will have to be undertaken by our colleges and universities to carry out this mandate. Thus, the collecting, processing, and remitting of CIPRIS fees will force universities to redirect resources away from educational endeavors to defray the additional costs of this mandate or it will result in higher educational costs for all students.

My bill corrects this problem by repealing Section 641(e) of IIRIRA. By repealing this section, foreign students will be responsible for remitting this fee to the government.

The colleges and universities will not serve as a collection agency for the government.

This bill will relieve our higher education institutions of a costly and timely burden and will allow them to spend time on what is most important—educating our youth.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in support of this measure.

CONGRATULATING M. NIGHT
SHYAMALAN FOR HIS ACHIEVEMENTS
IN THE SIXTH SENSE**HON. JOSEPH M. HOFFFEL**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. HOFFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate M. Night Shyamalan on the success of his film, the Sixth Sense. This film was recently nominated for an Academy Award for best picture of the year, and Mr. Shyamalan, a resident of Conshohocken in the 13th congressional district of Pennsylvania, was nominated for best director and best screenplay. I would like to recognize Mr. Shyamalan for his superior work in the field of filmmaking and writing.

Mr. Shyamalan's career did not begin with *The Sixth Sense*. Growing up in Montgomery County, in the suburbs of Philadelphia, his early passion for filmmaking began at the age of eight, when he was given his first super eight camera. By the age of 10, filmmaking had captured his heart. It was then that he started making short films, finishing forty-five by the age of 16. In 1992, following NYU film school, he made his first independent film, *Praying With Anger*, which he wrote, directed, starred in and produced. His next film was *Wide Awake*, which was set in his hometown of Philadelphia and was also successful. His third feature film, *The Sixth Sense*, became a surprise hit in the summer of 1999, ranking second in box office earnings. Recently, he also wrote the screenplay for *Stuart Little*.

The Sixth Sense is an incredible film that is surreal, emotional, entertaining and mystifying.

The movie showcases the great city of Philadelphia, celebrating many of its wonderful facets. In addition to the Academy Award nominations, Mr. Shyamalan has been nominated for the Chicago Film Critics Association Award for Best Screenplay, a Directors Guild of America Award for Outstanding Directorial Achievement in Motion Pictures, a Golden Globe for Best Screenplay, and he won a Golden Satellite Award for Best Screenplay.

Even with his success, Mr. Shyamalan handles himself with grace and humility. He has established a reputation for integrity and commitment to his community. He has creative and innovative approaches to filmmaking that have set him apart as a leader in the entertainment community. He has given us a sense of appreciation of the greater Philadelphia area in a unique and truly special film. We look forward to his next movie, *Unbreakable*, which has also been filmed in Philadelphia, and is due out soon. I know we will be hearing a lot more from M. Night Shyamalan in the future and I wish him much success.

IN RECOGNITION OF YESHIVA
SCHOOLS AND DR. CYRIL WECHT**HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge an event that recently took place in my district. Dr. Cyril H. Wecht, a leading authority on medical and legal issues, was honored at the Yeshiva Schools Annual Dinner on February 20, 2000.

The Yeshiva School has been recognized nationwide as a Blue Ribbon School for its excellence in education. For over 50 years the school has been a contributor to the education of Pittsburgh's young people, a leader in continued achievement for Pittsburgh, and an institution in which all of Allegheny County can be proud.

Dr. Cyril H. Wecht, a resident of Allegheny County since childhood, is a graduate of the University of Pittsburgh and received both his medical and law degrees there, as well. He is Allegheny County's coroner, and president of the medical staff at St. Francis Hospital. He is also a professor at the University of Pittsburgh and an adjunct professor at the Duquesne University School of Law. Dr. Wecht directs the Pittsburgh Institute of Legal Medicine and is a fellow of the College of American Pathologists and the American Society of Clinical Pathologists. Dr. Wecht served as a captain in the United States Air Force. He has written several best-selling books and published over four-hundred papers. He has been a leader in Democratic politics and government in Allegheny County. He is a supporter of Jewish organizations and institutions.

Dr. Wecht has been the recipient of many awards, including: the Meah Club Award from the Hebrew Institute of Pittsburgh; the Humanitarian Award from the Jewish War Veterans, Pennsylvania Department; the Man of the Year Award from the Israel Bonds ZOA; and the Hall of Fame Award for Outstanding Achievements in Professional, Communal and Governmental Activities by B'nai B'rith District Three. Also, he received the Lifetime Achievement Award from B'nai B'rith Areas of Western Pennsylvania, Western New York, West

Virginia, and Ohio and was recently named in Who's Who in Israel.

I congratulate Dr. Wecht and wish both him and the Yeshiva Schools continued success.

ONLY SON KILLED: \$50,000 HOSPITAL BILL AWAITS FAMILY WITH \$30,000 INCOME

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, of all the unspeakable sadness in the world, losing one's child has to be the greatest.

But in America, we often compound the pain with family bankruptcy.

The following article by Dennis Rockstroh from the San Jose Mercury of February 18, 2000 describes how "tragedy hits family doubly hard," in the case of the death of Eleazer Gamez, Jr.

What is wrong with us? Why can't we find in this time of wealth and prosperity a way to provide all our residents with health insurance and to remove at least the financial disaster of medical care. The goal of universal coverage should be the highest priority of this Congress and every Congress until all Americans have health care that is as good as we in Congress have.

I submit the aforementioned article for the RECORD.

[From the Mercury News, Feb. 18, 2000]

TRAGEDY HITS FAMILY DOUBLY HARD—LACK OF INSURANCE ADDS TO FAMILY'S PAIN IN LOSS OF ONLY CHILD

(By Dennis Rockstroh)

Shame on us. Forty-four million Americans, 11 million of them children, have no medical insurance.

Californians list it as a top priority right behind education, but to Carolina and Eleazer Gamez of Union City, the lack of health insurance was simply piled on anguish following the tragic death of their first and only child.

They haven't got the hospital bill yet, but they estimate it will be countless thousands of dollars they do not have.

They paid the funeral expenses with an aunt's credit card.

Twenty-month-old Eleazer Jr. was crushed between two cars about 3 p.m. on Feb. 4.

Eleazer's mom was taking him to her sister's house on 11th Street. He was in the care of an aunt in the back seat. As the aunt was getting out, she put the baby on the ground and then reached back into the car to get her purse.

The Gamez car was partially blocking a driveway and, in an instant, a car in the driveway zoomed out backward, striking the baby and smashing his head into the door.

Eleazer died in a hospital the next day.

"Paramedics took the child to Children's Hospital in Oakland for emergency surgery," another of the boy's aunts, Shirley Baker, told me. "But the trauma to the child was too great."

Salvador Mora, Carolina's brother and the spokesman for the family, said that his sister had just moved off welfare and was applying for health insurance from her husband's work.

Said Baker: "What makes this story so sad is that my cousin and her husband are about 20 years old. They are a newlywed couple trying to start a family. They were not

prepared for this tragedy and had no money to bury their son."

From family experience I can tell you that there is no grief to compare with the loss of a child. It is a lifelong sorrow.

Mora said the boy's dad is in denial and sleeps a lot, hoping he will wake from this terrible nightmare.

The boy's mom speaks mostly in monosyllables, but managed to tell me, "We can use all the help we can get."

"We're emotionally drained right now," said Mora. "We're overwhelmed with everything. My sister and her husband are taking this very, very hard. He's never experienced a loss in his family."

Mora said the family is expecting a bill of about \$50,000, dwarfing the combined annual family income of about \$30,000.

This is not an isolated case.

It's a national scandal.

Despite the best economy in 30 years, 44 percent of California respondents in the Field Poll released this week said they have gone without health insurance or have been financially responsible for someone without insurance in the past two years.

According to researchers, about one-quarter of California adults have no insurance.

The politicians have known of this state and national problem for years but failed to fix it.

Make no mistake, the Gamez family is a national victim of a system that excludes 44 million Americans. That's a lot of suffering.

There oughta be a law. In fact, the Field Poll found that 45 percent of those surveyed, regardless of political affiliation, ranked health care as an important issue, just behind education.

Meanwhile the Carolina and Eleazer Gamezes of the world will fall through the cracks, an American tragedy that can be avoided.

Besides pushing for adequate medical care for all Americans, there is something you can do to help the family.

A trust fund has been set up to pay the hospital and funeral bills.

Donations can be sent to the memorial trust fund: Eleazer Gamez Jr., Account No. 379-326020-4, Washington Mutual, 39995 Paso Padre Parkway, Fremont 92538.

Oh, and don't forget to vote.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. CLAY ON INTRODUCTION OF THE "PUBLIC SCHOOL REPAIR AND RENOVATION ACT OF 2000"

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the "Public School Repair and Renovation Act of 2000," which will allocate \$1.3 billion to renovate 8,300 public schools in areas of financial need. Emergency plumbing, faulty electric, leaking roofs as well as asbestos removal and fire safety hazards will be the primary focus of these funds. President Clinton proposed this in his State of the Union Address. This measure will supplement Representative RANGEL's more comprehensive school modernization plan providing \$24 billion in tax credit bonds over two years for school construction.

Today, over one-third or more than over 28,000 public schools have inadequate heating, ventilation, and air condition systems.

Over 23,000 have inadequate plumbing, and more than 20,000 schools have crumbling roofs. A report to be released soon by the National Education Association documents \$307 billion dollars of unmet funding need for public school infrastructure and education technology. The Department of Education estimates that 2,400 new public schools will be needed by year 2003 to accommodate rising enrollments and to relieve overcrowding. In my State of Missouri, for example, the NEA report documents \$4.5 billion of infrastructure and school technology needs. In Chairman GOODLING's State of Pennsylvania, there are \$10.4 billion of unmet school construction projects. And Illinois, Speaker HASTER's home state, there are over \$11 billion worth of unmet school construction needs. This school renovation act will set aside 10% of funds for direct grants to our nation's poorest school districts. Most of the remaining funds will provide either grants or loans, as determined by the Secretary of Education, to schools that lack the bond capacity or authority to issue bonds. Loans would have a zero interest rate, to be paid back over a 7 year period. Our failure to act on this critical measure will leave tens of thousands of our school children at risk.

I urge the Republican Majority to take action on school construction before we recess this summer.

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this month the 90th anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) was celebrated in our nation's Capitol. At the event I had the honor of hearing the remarks of Norman R. Augustine, who describes below what scouting means to America and the impact it has had on his life. I believe it is appropriate that at the beginning of the new millennium we pause to reflect on the accomplishments of this organization. It is a tribute to the vision of the founders of the BSA that the basic ideals upon which Scouting was founded have endured and are as important at the dawn of the 21st century as they were in the early years of the 20th century. I hope you will enjoy Norman R. Augustine's testimonial as much as I did.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA 90TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION, FEBRUARY 8, 2000, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I have been asked this evening to draw upon my 56 years of membership in scouting to describe "in five minutes or less" what scouting means to America and to me. The task brings to mind the time my friend, David Roderick, then Chairman of U.S. Steel, was given an introduction so brief that it noted simply that he was one of America's most gifted businessmen, and as evidence thereof it was said he had made a million dollars in California oil.

Approaching the podium, it was obvious that David was uncomfortable. He began by saying that it had not been California, it had been Pennsylvania; and it had not been oil, it was coal. Further, it had not been a million dollars it was \$10,000; and it wasn't he, it was his brother. And he hadn't made it, he lost it!

So bravely and perhaps unwisely disregarding the hazards of brevity, I will . . . in the spirit of scouting . . . "do my best."

With respect to the impact of scouting on America, that is, ironically, the easier of the two questions for me to answer. Simply stated, scouting helps build new generations of leaders . . . leaders who understand that character does count. On many occasions I have noted that I learned more about leadership from scouting and sports than from any of the other things I have ever done.

In my youth, the professional and volunteer leaders whom I came to know, and who not incidentally are the people who make scouting possible, provided inspiration and served as mentors. These people profoundly affected my life . . . just as they and their counterparts have done for generation after generation of America's youth.

I suspect that if one were suddenly required to choose from a hundred total strangers a single individual to whom to entrust one's life or our country's future, and were permitted but a single question of them, a good start would be, "have any of you been scouts" or better yet . . . "are any of you eagle scouts?"

Turning to the impact of scouting on my personal life, first and foremost scouting afforded extraordinary opportunities to build lasting and remarkable bonds between my father and myself and my son and myself. My son is an eagle scout, and we continued into adulthood many of the pursuits we first enjoyed together in scouting. The last adventure we undertook before he died this past year found us standing together on the north pole, much as we had stood together on mountain peaks in Colorado during his youth. Many of my fondest memories of Greg were inspired by our experiences in scouting.

That is not to say that those experiences were invariable easy. I have been to both the north pole and the south pole, but by far the coldest I have ever been was on a cub scout picnic! And there was the time when I was the only adult available to take my son's patrol on a long-anticipated hike. There was one minor problem: My leg was in a cast and I was relegated to walking with crutches. I assembled the boys and told them, very forcefully I thought, that I would serve as their adult leader . . . but only on the condition that they never get so far ahead of me on the trail that they could not see me: Whenever I should begin to drop out of sight they were to stop immediately and wait for me to catch up. All expressed enthusiastic agreement with this policy . . . so the hike began.

That was the last time I laid eyes on any of the boys until I came across the campsite they had established for the night!

Scouting of course helps prepare one for the challenges of life. In that regard I recall fondly the time my son and I became lost while backpacking in the Rockies. I immediately began sighting nearby mountain tops with my trusty compass. Greg, being of another generation, smugly whipped out from his pack a hand-held GPS receiver. After a few minutes of button-pushing and several puzzled glances at our map, he announced, "I know exactly where we are, dad. We're on that mountain right over there!"

This sort of thing may be the reason why my loyal wife, mother of an Eagle Scout, wife of an Eagle Scout, has over the years gradually come to consider "roughing it" to mean a slow bell hop!

Those not familiar with scouts and scouting might ask, do you really enjoy sleeping in the rain with a rock poking you in the ribs after a dinner of burned hot dogs and sandy marshmallows? Truthfully, the answer is no.

So then why do we do it?

I found the answer to this question when I was serving as Under Secretary of the Army and was visiting the 82nd Airborne Division. Talking with a grizzled old paratrooper who had parachuted more than 1,000 times, someone remarked that he certainly must like to jump. To our utter surprise, he responded, "I hate it". Asked why, then, in a volunteer Army, did he do it, his answer was simple: "I like to be around the kind of people who do."

There is in fact a certain kinship among all who have ever been involved in scouting. For example, there was the occasion a couple of years ago when I was leaving a Cleveland hotel and was being assisted in loading my baggage into a waiting car by the doorman, a large and powerfully built black man with a fetching smile.

Noting the scout pin in my lapel, he remarked, "I was a scout 22 years ago." He went on to point out with pride, "I am an Eagle Scout," to which I responded, "So am I." He said, with obvious satisfaction, "I can still say the scout law." I assured him I could as well. Oblivious to the group of people standing around us on the curb awaiting their cabs, my new-found friend looked at me with a twinkle in his eye and decided to put me to the test: "Trustworthy", he said! "Loyal", I responded. "Helpful", he replied. From there on we sort of continued together, "Friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean and reverent."

When we finished, the crowd on the curb burst into applause! As we shook hands to depart, I realized that this man was an instant friend simply because he had been a scout 22 years ago—and I one some 56 years ago.

The newspapers are fond of referring to wayward souls who have strayed from the beaten path by noting, "He is no boy scout." One of the finest compliments I can imagine anyone could pay to me is to say, "He is a boy scout".

And I know . . . because I am also a rocket scientist!

STEM CELL RESEARCH

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 2000

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Perry, with the Alliance for Aging Research, contributed an important article on stem cell research and ethics to the February 25, 2000 issue of Science. I submit it for the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it carefully.

PATIENTS' VOICES: THE POWERFUL SOUND IN THE STEM CELL DEBATE

(By Daniel Perry)

Millions of patients may benefit from the applications of stem cell research, although there is disagreement about whether public funds should be used to develop the science. Patients have been key to winning political support. Acting as advocates, they have contended that public investment will speed the research and bring accountability to biomedical technology. A political dispute about the new research, which holds the potential for cures to devastating diseases and to foster healthy aging, shows the need to respect public sensibilities and to court public approval, as well as the importance of involving patients in debates where the methods of biomedical discoveries and ethical beliefs collide.

The achievement of isolating and growing cultures of self-renewing human pluripotent stem cells has set off waves of optimism among both researchers and the lay public (1). The promise is tangible for effective new approaches to incurable diseases and underlying biological processes (2). As shown in table 1, over 100 million Americans suffer from illnesses that might be alleviated by cell transplantation technologies that use pluripotent stem cells. Yet some representatives in Congress and some of the lay public, as well as religious groups such as the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, oppose putting public funds behind the technology. They say that stem cell research belongs under a federal ban that currently prohibits federal funding embryo research (3).

TABLE 1. PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES AFFECTED BY DISEASES THAT MAY BE HELPED BY HUMAN PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL RESEARCH

Condition	Number of persons affected (in millions)
Cardiovascular diseases	58
Autoimmune diseases	30
Diabetes	16
Osteoporosis	10
Cancer	8.2
Alzheimer's disease	4
Parkinson's disease	1.5
Burns (severe)	0.3
Spinal cord injuries	0.25
Birth defects	0.150
Total	128.4

Data are from the Patients Coalition for Urgent Research, Washington, DC. Per year.

PATIENTS FOR RESEARCH

In 1999, a coalition of three dozen national nonprofit patient organizations, the Patient's, Coalition for Urgent Research (CURE), emerged to argue for public funding of human embryonic stem cell research under guidelines of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). This would achieve two goals: (i) participation by the broadest number of scientists under established peer-review mechanisms, thus rewarding the most promising research and speeding progress, and (ii) public accountability and guidelines developed through processes that allow for public comment on an area of science that has raised ethical concerns (4).

Why a patients' coalition? As taxpayers, patients and their family members are entitled to expect their government to make the most of a substantial public investment in biomedical research through the NIH and other agencies. And as the bearers of the ultimate burden when medicine cannot relieve their suffering, patients are the most compelling witnesses to the value of research that quite literally can save their lives.

In general, the patients and their advocates who are active for CURE display tempered optimism when it comes to appraising the chances of anyone's health benefiting soon from applications of stem cell research. Furthermore, broad views on the ethics and appropriateness of the technology have been expressed by those in CURE. For example, they believe in the principles of informed consent and free choice. Stem cell research must not lead to an underground black market in "spare" embryos for research. In addition, women and men, as individuals or as couples, should not be paid to produce embryos for research purposes.

The stories of patients and family members have fostered bipartisanship on Capitol Hill and have effectively complemented other activities such as the stance voiced by leading theologians from four major faiths—Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, Judaism, and Islam—who, noting the calls of their religions for compassion for the sick,

wrote a joint letter to Congress urging federal involvement (5).

THE BROADER STAKES

The promise of human pluripotent stem cell research increases the likelihood that vastly more people will experience healthy and productive aging. Age-related disease costs billions of dollars and burdens millions physically and financially (6). The additional costs in medical and long-term care that are incurred annually in the United States because its Medicare recipients lose their functional independence are calculated at \$26 billion (7).

One can imagine the cost 20 years from now in the United States alone, when the population over age 65 is expected to double and the number of Americans over age 85 is projected to quadruple (7). Unless bioscience engenders and receives broad popular support, in the future, nations like the United States, which have a rapidly increasing aging population, will more than likely struggle with a much greater health care

burden. This is why it is so important to respect public sensibilities and to court public approval fervently, even though it is also public approval fervently, even though it is also likely that the next discoveries will, too, collide with the ethical and religious beliefs of some.

In the stem cell debate, patients have stepped forward to help draw the line between science in service to the community and science for lesser motives. Sadly, some of their most compelling stories will be silenced before long by the progression of their diseases. It surely behooves us to remember their contributions and to engage their successors, who will continue to put a human face on the promise of biomedical research.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. J. A. Thomson et al., *Science* 282, 1145 (1998); M. J. Shambloott, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 95, 13726 (1998).
2. Stem Cell Research and Applications: Monitoring the Frontiers of Biomedical Research (American Association for the Advancement of Science

and Institute for Civil Society, Washington, DC, November 1999).

3. Rep. J. Dickey (R-Ark), "No such thing as spare embryos," Roll Call (3 June 1999), p. 4; R. M. Doerflinger, testimony on behalf of the Committee for Pro-Life Activities of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Education hearing on legal status of embryonic stem cell research (Senate Hearing 105-939), 26 January 1999 (available at frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgibin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=105_senate_hearings&docid=f:54769.wals).

4. Goals adopted by Patients' CURE, Washington, DC, 20 May 1999.

5. "Theologians from four major faiths express support for Federal funding of stem cell research," press release from Patients' CURE, Washington, DC (14 October 1999).

6. A Call for Action: How the 106th Congress Can Achieve Health and Independence for Older Americans Through Research (Alliance for Aging Research, Washington, DC, 1999).

7. Independence for Older Americans: An Investment for Our Nation's Future. A Report by the Alliance for Aging Research (Alliance for Aging Research, Washington, DC, 1999).

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S899–S981

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2113–2125, S. Con. Res. 85–86, S.J. Res. 40–42, and S. Res. 264.

Pages S929–30

Measures Passed:

National Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Act: Senate passed S. 935, to authorize research to promote the conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products, after agreeing to a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S972–75

Crapo (for Murkowski) Amendment No. 2862, in the nature of a substitute.

Pages S974–75

Congratulating Year 2000 Special Committee: Senate agreed to S. Res. 264, congratulating and thanking Chairman Robert F. Bennett and Vice Chairman Christopher J. Dodd for their tremendous leadership, poise, and dedication in leading the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem and commending the members of the Committee for their fine work.

Pages S979–80

Affordable Education Act: Senate continued consideration of S. 1134, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S899–S924

Adopted:

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 16), Collins Amendment No. 2854, to eliminate the 2-percent floor on miscellaneous itemized deductions for qualified professional development expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers and to allow a credit against income tax to elementary and secondary school teachers who provide classroom materials.

Pages S899, S919–22

Pending:

Robb Amendment No. 2861, to eliminate the use of education individual retirement accounts for ele-

mentary and secondary school expenses and to expand the incentives for the construction and renovation of public schools.

Pages S922–24

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

By 44 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 15), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive certain provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of Reid (for Dodd) Amendment No. 2857, to increase funding for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendment thus fell.

Pages S899–S919

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the Robb Amendment No. 2861 (listed above), on Wednesday, March 1, 2000, with a vote to occur on or in relation to the amendment.

Page S975

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Sylvia V. Baca, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

61 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy.

Pages S971–72, S980–81

Messages From the House: **Pages S926–27**

Measures Referred: **Page S927**

Communications: **Pages S927–29**

Petitions: **Page S929**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S930–51**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S951–53**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S955–64**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S964**

Authority for Committees: **Pages S964–65**

Additional Statements: **Pages S965–71**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—6) **Pages S919, S922**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 6:39 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, March 1, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S975–76.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on assistance to producers and the farm economy, after receiving testimony from August Schumacher, Jr., Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, and Keith Collins, Chief Economist, both of the Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS—JUSTICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Justice, after receiving testimony from Janet Reno, Attorney General, Department of Justice.

APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR/HHS/EDUCATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001, receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from Alexis M. Herman, Secretary of Labor; Donna E. Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services; and Richard W. Riley, Secretary of Education.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARCHITECT/GAO/OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001, receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from Alan M. Hantman, Architect of the Capitol; David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office; and Ricky Silberman, Executive Director, Office of Compliance.

APPROPRIATIONS—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for Navy and Defense Agencies military construction programs,

after receiving testimony from Robert B. Pirie, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment), Lt. Gen. Norton A. Schwartz, USAF, Deputy Commander in Chief, United States Special Operations Command, Marshall H. Bailey, Director of Support Services, Defense Logistics Agency, Ray Tolleson, Acting Director, Education Activity, and Diana Tabler, Deputy Executive Director, TRICARE Management Activity, all of the Department of Defense.

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on military strategy and operational requirements of the unified commands, after receiving testimony from Gen. Wesley K. Clark, USA, Commander-in-Chief, United States European Command; and Gen. Anthony C. Zinni, Commander-in-Chief, United States Central Command.

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic concluded hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management, after receiving testimony from Carolyn L. Huntoon, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management.

FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded hearings on the President's proposed budget requests for fiscal year 2001, focusing on the U.S. Forest Service, after receiving testimony from James Lyons, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, and Mike Dombeck, Chief, Forest Service, both of the Department of Agriculture.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation concluded hearings on the President's proposed budget estimate for fiscal year 2001 for the operation of the National Park Service system, after receiving testimony from Denis P. Galvin, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

MEDICARE REFORM

Committee on Finance: Committee resumed hearings on certain Medicare reform proposals, focusing on

beneficiary premiums and the competitive implications of health plan pricing rules, receiving testimony from Madeleine Smith, Specialist in Social Legislation, Congressional Research Service; Mark McClellan, Stanford University, Stanford, California; Jeff Lemieux, Progressive Policy Institute, Len M. Nichols, Urban Institute, and Karen Ignagni, American Association of Health Plans, all of Washington, D.C.; and Keith Mueller, Nebraska Center for Rural Health Research, Omaha.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANK REFORM

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings on multilateral development bank reform proposals, focusing on the future of the International Monetary Fund and International Financial Institutions, after receiving testimony from Lawrence H. Summers, Secretary of the Treasury; and George P. Shultz, Stanford University Hoover Institute, Stanford, California, former Secretary of State/former Secretary of the Treasury.

AOL/TIME WARNER MERGER

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee held hearings to examine the proposed AOL/Time Warner merger, and its effects on competition and consumer choice in broadband Internet services and technologies, receiving testimony from Stephen M. Case, America Online, Inc., Dulles, Virginia; and Gerald M. Levin, Time Warner, Inc., New York, New York.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee completed its review of those programs which fall within the committee's jurisdiction as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 2001, and agreed on recommendations it will make thereon to the Committee on the Budget.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee will meet again tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 68 public bills, H.R. 3699–3766; and 9 resolutions, H.J. Res. 88; H. Con. Res. 256–258, and H. Res. 424–428, were introduced.

Pages H572–74

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 1749, to designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, amended (H. Rept. 106–500);

S. 613, to encourage Indian economic development and to provide for the disclosure of Indian tribal sovereign immunity in contracts involving Indian tribes (H. Rept. 106–501);

H.R. 2484, to provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States (H. Rept. 106–502);

H.R. 3222, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve literacy through family literacy projects, amended (H. Rept. 106–503);

H.R. 3616, to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, amended (H. Rept. 106–504);

H. Res. 425, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (H. Rept. 106–505); and

H. Res. 426, providing for consideration of H.R. 1827, to improve the economy and efficiency of Government operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies (H. Rept. 106–506).

Pages H571–72

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Joseph S. Edmonds of Arlington, Virginia.

Page H517

Recess: The House recessed at 12:58 and reconvened at 2:00 p.m.

Page H517

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Designation of Wilson Creek, North Carolina to Wild and Scenic Rivers System: H.R. 1749, amended, to designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System;

Pages H519–20

Indian Economic Development and Contract Encouragement Act: S. 613, to encourage Indian economic development and to provide for the disclosure

of Indian tribal sovereign immunity in contracts involving Indian tribes (passed by a ye and nay vote of 406 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 26) clearing the measure for the President; and

Pages H520–21, H538

Lease or Transfer of Land Owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community: H.R. 2484, to provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States.

Pages H521–22

Recess: The House recessed at 4:15 p.m. and reconvened at 6:00 p.m.

Page H538

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H513.

Referrals: S. 400 was referred to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and S. Con. Res. 83 was referred to the Committee on International Relations.

Page H553

Quorum Calls—Votes: One ye and nay vote developed during the proceedings of the House today and appears on page H538. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the FDA. Testimony was heard from Jane E. Henney, M.D., Commissioner, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2000 Emergency Supplemental Request for Assistance to Plan Colombia and Related Counter-Narcotics Program. Testimony was heard from Barry McCaffrey, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; and Randy Beers, Assistant Secretary, International Narcotics Control, Department of State.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior held a hearing on the Secretary of the Interior. Testimony was heard from Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on the National Institute of General Medical Sciences the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, the National Institute of Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Diseases, and the National Library of Medicine. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the NIH, Department of Health and Human Services: Gerald D. Fischbach, M.D., Director, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke; Marvin Cassman, M.D., Director, National Institute of General Medical Sciences; Allen M. Spiegel, M.D., Director, National Institute of Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Diseases; and Donald A.B. Linberg, M.D., Director, National Library of Medicine.

VA, HUD AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies held a hearing on the Corporation for National and Community Service. Testimony was heard from Harris Wofford, CEO, Corporation for National and Community Service.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Special Oversight Panel on the Merchant Marine held a hearing on the Fiscal year 2001 Maritime Administration authorization request and related matters. Testimony was heard from John E. Graykowski, Deputy Administrator, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

NAVY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Procurement held a hearing on Navy shipbuilding programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Navy: Vice Adm. Conrad C. Lautenbacher, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Resources, Warfare Requirement and Assessments); Vice Adm. Charles W. Moore, USN, Commander, Third Fleet; and Vice Adm. Dennis W. McGinn, USN, Commander, Third Fleet; and public witnesses.

READINESS NEEDS—BUDGET REQUEST ADEQUACY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Readiness held a hearing on the adequacy of the Fiscal Year 2001 budget request to meet readiness needs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Gen. John M. Keane, USA, Vice Chief of Staff, Department of the Army; Adm. Donald L. Pilling, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy; Gen. Lester L. Lyles, USAF, Vice Chief of Staff, Department of the Air Force; and Gen. Terrence Dake, USMC, Assistant Commandant, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps.

U.S./MEXICO COUNTER-NARCOTICS EFFORTS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources held a hearing on U.S./Mexico Counter-narcotics Efforts. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Justice: William Ledwith, Director, International Operations, DEA; Mary Lee Warren, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division; and John Montoya, U.S. Border Patrol Sector Chief, Loredo; and a public witness.

IRS'S FINANCIAL STATEMENT AUDIT RESULTS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a hearing on the Results of the Internal Revenue Service's Fiscal Year 1999 Financial Statement Audit. Testimony was heard from Gregory D. Kutz, Associate Director, Governmentwide Accounting and Financial Management, Accounting and Information Management Division, GAO; and the following officials of the Department of the Treasury: Lawrence W. Rogers, Acting Chief Financial Officer, IRS; and Steven O. App, Deputy Chief Financial Officer.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on H.R. 3312, Merit Systems Protection Board Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Ben L. Erdreich, Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board; Jeffrey Senger, Deputy Senior Counsel, Office of Dispute Resolution, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

GOVERNMENT WASTE CORRECTIONS ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted by voice vote an open rule providing one hour of general debate on H.R.

1827, Government Waste Corrections Act of 1999, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform. The rule provides that, in lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Government Reform and printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment. The rule waives clause 4 of rule XXI (prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill) against provisions included in the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be open for amendment at any point. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Burton.

CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Committee on Rules: Granted by voice vote a rule providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, March 8, 2000. The rule provides that the Speaker or his designee will consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on any suspension considered under the resolution.

NSF BUDGET AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Basic Research continued hearings on the National Science Foundation Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Authorization request, Part II: Education and Human Resources. Testimony was heard from Judith S. Sunley, Acting Assistant Director, Directorate for Education and Human Resources, NSF; and public witnesses.

SBA'S PROPOSED NEW AUTOMATED LOAN MONITORING PROGRAM

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Government Programs and Oversight held a hearing on the SBA's Proposed New Automated Loan Monitoring Program. Testimony was heard from Fred Hochberg, Deputy Administrator, SBA; Joel C. Willemssen, Director, Civil Agencies Information Systems, Accounting and Information Management Division, GAO; and a public witness.

FAA'S BUDGET REQUEST AND FUNDING NEEDS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on the FAA's Budget request and funding needs. Testimony was heard from Edward T. Schafer, Governor, North Dakota; Paul E. Patton, Governor, Kentucky; Bill Campbell, Mayor, Atlanta, Georgia; the following officials of the State of Oklahoma: Susan Savage, Mayor, Tulsa; Mitch Surrent, Special Counsel, Secretary of Transportation; and Tom O'Neill, Aerospace Industry Deputy, Department of Commerce; and a public witness.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

COAST GUARD AND FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION BUDGET REQUESTS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing on the Coast Guard and Federal Maritime Commission Fiscal Year 2001 budget requests. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation: Adm. James M. Loy, USCG, Commandant; and Master Chief Petty Officer Vincent Patton, III, USCG; and Harold J. Creel, Jr., Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 3313, Long Island South Restoration Act; and H.R. 2957, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Representatives Johnson of Connecticut, Ackerman, Shays, Jefferson, Lazio and Vitter; George E. Pataki, Governor, New York; John C. Rowland, Governor, Connecticut; and public witnesses.

SENIOR CITIZENS' FREEDOM TO WORK ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 5, Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act of 2000.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION REFORM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing on unemployment compensation reform. Testimony was heard from Representatives English and Levin; Jane Dee Hull, Governor, Arizona; Raymond J. Uhalde, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employment Training Administration, Department of Labor; Garey Forster, Secretary, Department of Labor, Louisiana; and public witnesses.

ACCRUAL BASIS TAXPAYERS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing to review last year's repeal of the installment method of accounting for accrual basis taxpayers. Testimony was heard from Joseph M. Mikrut, Tax Legislative Counsel, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

NSA

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on the NSA. Testimony was heard from departmental officials.

Joint Meetings**INTERNET DENIAL OF SERVICE ATTACKS**

Joint Hearing: Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Criminal Justice Oversight concluded joint hearings with the House Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Crime to examine recent Internet denial of service attacks and the federal response, focusing on the challenges facing the Department of Justice in its fight against cybercrime, after receiving testimony from Eric Holder, Deputy Attorney General, Michael Vatis, Director, National Infrastructure Protection Center, Federal Bureau of Investigation, both of the Department of Justice; Howard Schmidt, Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington; Charles Giancarlo, Cisco Systems Incorporated, San Jose, California; Paul Misener, Amazon.com, Seattle, Washington; Dan Rosensweig, ZDNet.com, New York, New York; Katherine T. Fithen, Software Engineering Institute CERT Coordination Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; James X. Dempsey, Center for Democracy and Technology, Washington, D.C.; Samuel A. Guiberson, Houston, Texas; and "Mudge", @stake, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts.

ELECTRONIC COMMERCE

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of S. 761, to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to the call.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2000**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine the agriculture trade agreement with China, 9 a.m., SD-192.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and Chemical Safety Board, 9:30 a.m., SD-138.

Subcommittee on Interior, to hold hearings on the proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, 9:30 a.m., SD-124.

Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Navy and Marine Corps programs, 2 p.m., SD-192.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold closed, followed by open hearings, on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on cyber security and critical infrastructure protection, 2:30 p.m., SR-222.

Committee on the Budget: Committee on the Budget, to hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001 for nuclear non-proliferation, stockpile stewardship, and other energy programs, 2 p.m., SD-608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings on the nomination of John Goglia, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board; and Carol Jones Carmody, of Louisiana, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, 10:30 a.m., SR-253.

Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, to hold hearings to examine certain internet issues for the next generation, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings on the President's proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001, focusing on the Department of the Interior, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water, to hold hearings to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed rules regarding changes in the total maximum daily load and NPDES permit programs pursuant to the Clean Water Act, 1 p.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the war in Chechnya, focusing on Russia's conduct, the humanitarian crisis and United States policy, 10:45 a.m., SD-419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nominations of N. Cinnamon Dornsife, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the Asian Development Bank, with the rank of Ambassador, and Earl Anthony Wayne, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of State Economic and Business Affairs, 2 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to markup S. 2, to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and to consider pending nominations, 9:30 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold oversight hearings on the National Association of Public Administrators' Report on Bureau of Indian Affairs Management Reform, 2:30 p.m., SR-485.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters, 9:30 a.m., SH-219.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine Cuba's oppressive government, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings to examine contractual mandatory binding arbitration, 2 p.m., SD-226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendation of the Disabled American Veterans, 10 a.m., 345, Cannon Building.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, on Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, 10 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, on Secretary of State, 10:30 a.m. and Secretary of Commerce, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, on Fiscal Year 2001 Department of Defense Budget Overview, 9:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, on Bureau of Land Management, 10 a.m., H-308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease, and the Fogarty International Center, 10 a.m., on Human Genome Research Institute, and the National Eye Institute, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, on the Coast Guard, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, on the Council on Environmental Quality, and Cemeterial Expenses of the Army, 10 a.m., H-143 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Readiness, hearing on Real Property Maintenance and Infrastructure funding, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, hearing on defense-wide research and development programs, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, hearing on "Decimal Conversion 2000: Are the Markets Ready," 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Public Access to the National Practitioner Data Bank: What Consumers Should Know About Their Doctors, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families, hearing on Building a Nation: The Role of Character Education in America's Schools, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Financial Management at the Department of Education, 10:30 a.m., 2261 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, hearing on "The Role of Yah Lin 'Charlie' Trie in Illegal Political Fundraising," 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on U.S. Policy Toward OPEC, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to continue consideration of the Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget and to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1443, Traffic Stops Statistics Study Act of 1999; H.R. 2372, Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 1999; and H.R. 1283, Fairness in Asbestos Compensation Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, hearing on H.R. 3160, Common Sense Protections for Endangered Species Act, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: H.R. 5, Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act of 2000, and a resolution providing for consideration of Motions to Suspend the Rules, 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Authorization Request: Department of Energy, 1 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on FAA Research and Development Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Review, 10:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, to continue hearings on the FAA's Budget request and funding needs, 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing on restoration of the Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem, 1 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, to consider pending business, 1 p.m., and, executive, hearing on the FBI, 1:15 p.m., H-405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Joint Meetings: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendation of the Disabled American Veterans, 10 a.m., 345 Cannon Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 1

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 1

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1134, Affordable Education Act, with a vote to occur on or in relation to the Robb Amendment No. 2861.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 5, Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act; and Consideration of H.R. 1883, Iran Nonproliferation Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baker, Richard H., La., E197
 Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E197
 Burton, Dan, Ind., E192
 Capps, Lois, Calif., E195
 Clay, William (Bill), Mo., E200
 Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E179
 Coyne, William J., Pa., E199
 DeGette, Diana, Colo., E188
 DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E189
 DeLay, Tom, Tex., E183, E186
 DeMint, Jim, S.C., E179, E180, E183
 Doolittle, John T., Calif., E195
 Dunn, Jennifer, Wash., E193

Gejdenson, Sam, Conn., E194
 Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E184, E196
 Goodling, William F., Pa., E193
 Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E190
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E183, E186
 Hoeffel, Joseph M., Pa., E199
 Jones, Walter B., N.C., E195
 Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E187, E190
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E191
 Kuykendall, Steven T., Calif., E183
 Kuykendall, Steven T., Calif., E185
 Lipinski, William O., Ill., E180, E180, E186
 McInnis, Scott, Colo., E179, E180, E182, E183, E184,
 E186, E187, E189, E190, E191
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E201

Mink, Patsy T., Hawaii, E199
 Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E187, E189
 Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E192
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E190
 Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E184, E187
 Saxton, Jim, N.J., E196
 Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E182, E185
 Smith, Lamar S., Tex., E208
 Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E196, E200
 Toomey, Patrick J., Pa., E194
 Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E191
 Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E194
 Weldon, Curt, Pa., E184, E187
 Weller, Jerry, Ill., E179, E180, E182
 Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E189



Congressional Record

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512-1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access*, contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512-1262; or by calling Toll Free 1-888-293-6498 or (202) 512-1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$179.00 for six months, \$357.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$141.00 per year, or purchased for \$1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to (202) 512-1800, or fax to (202) 512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.