United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 1999 No. 50

House of Representatives

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MICA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 13, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN L. MICA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

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

WATER VISION 2000

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, since I was elected to Congress I have been focusing on the issue of livable communities and how we create better partnerships between the Federal Government and our citizens.

The livability movement is gaining dramatic momentum nationally as we watch officials from the Vice President, Mr. GORE, to local city and county commissioners champion goals for easing traffic congestion, promoting urban redevelopment and creating more open and green spaces. We have seen fundamental changes in how the Federal Government is approaching transportation once we acknowledged that trying to pave our way out of congestion simply did not work, and just as the ISTEA legislation and the recently-enacted TEA–21 are promoting innovative approaches to transportation problems, I suggest that it is time for us to take a new approach to how we manage water resources. It would begin with a vision and a framework for improving the way the Federal Government approaches water resource problems and management based on the same flexibility that we have seen in transportation.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, we have treated our watersheds and rivers as machines, costing taxpayers billions of dollars as our communities continue to face increased risks from flood, decreasing numbers of fish and growing health risks caused by polluted rivers and streams. Forty percent of our Nation's waterways fail to meet drinking, recreation or fish habitat needs, and that number sadly is growing. Some urban streams and creeks and rivers are so degraded, people consider them dead and beyond recovery.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I joined with the America's Rivers program to announce America's most endangered rivers of 1999, a list of 10 such threatened waterways and what we can do about it. Well, Congress can help right now, and I suggest that we approach water issues in this session with what I would term Water Vision 2000.

It would, first of all, suggest that the Federal Government deal fundamentally with watersheds. We must think more broadly and comprehensively about the missions and how they can work with local communities throughout the entire watershed cycle.

Second, we must focus on increased Federal flexibility. We need more coordination and responsiveness from Federal agencies so local communities can be creative in how they meet their water challenges. In this way we can indeed make sure that we are spending each dollar two or three times over in terms of total benefit, and citizen involvement must be part of the solution and not simply an afterthought of the decision-making process.

We have been using such an approach in Oregon. Last November we brought together over 300 people to deal with a summit on the needs of the Johnson Creek watershed, 54 square miles, to consider 45 separate plans that exist to deal with land use and regulatory issues in this area. It was a beginning for our efforts to deal more comprehensively and creatively together from the Federal level down to the local area.

I have suggested in this Congress three additional legislative proposals. I have already discussed on this floor approaches to the Federal flood control program. I hope ultimately we will have municipal watershed management on Federal lands; and I hope that people will join with me this week in dealing with reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program. High-risk properties for flood insurance right now make up only 2 percent of all the national flood properties, but they claim 40 percent of all Federal flood insurance pay-outs. Over the last 18 years, repetitive losses from these properties have cost the taxpayers over $2.5 billion.

My legislation would deny national Federal flood insurance coverage to people who file two or more claims that total more than the value of their property. It would suggest that people who refuse to use Federal money to take the precaution of flood-proofing their homes or relocating out of harm's way would no longer be entitled to continuous Federal payment. Now is the time that we in this Congress ought to dedicate our efforts at every turn to make sure that the numerous local and

Printed on recycled paper.

Federal water agencies are working comprehensively in the watershed, Mr. Speaker.

The next great advance in livability, if my colleagues will pardon the expression, is to be found on the waterfront, and I call on my colleagues to join me in this Congress in a comprehensive approach to a new vision of water resources.

SPECIFICS OF THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would take a few minutes to kind of report on what the last couple weeks were like when I was back home spending time with my constituents during the district work period, conducting 15 town meetings, and I wanted to report today on really the response to the Republican agenda of good schools and low taxes and a secure retirement for all Americans.

I have the privilege of representing a very, very diverse district, the south side of Chicago in the south suburbs of Cook and Will Counties as well as a lot of rural and bedroom communities, and one always listens for the common concerns when they represent a diverse district of cities, suburbs and country.

During the last two weeks I got a pretty good response. People were very supportive of the Republican agenda of strengthening our local schools, of lowering the tax burden for the middle class, of making for a secure retirement for all Americans by strengthening Medicare and Social Security.

I would like to take a few minutes just to talk about some of those specifics of our Republican agenda, and of course let me begin with the Republican efforts to strengthen Social Security and to strengthen Medicare for the next three generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am often asked a common question over the last several years that I have had the privilege of being in the Congress, and that question is: When are you politicians in Washington going to stop raiding the Social Security Trust Fund? I was pleased to tell my constituents that this is the year we are going to do that. This is the year we are going to wall off the Social Security Trust fund and say, ''Hands off,'' and my constituents frankly were pretty shocked when they learned that the Clinton-Gore budget actually raids the Social Security trust fund by $351 billion.

I think it is important to note that when we compare Republican efforts to wall off the Social Security Trust Fund, which means 100 percent of Social Security according to this chart for Social Security versus the Clinton-Gore proposal for 62 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund going to Social Security and the other 38 percent being spent on other things, that is what this means. The President wants to spend 38 percent of Social Security on new government programs. Republicans, of course, want to wall off the Social Security Trust Fund, essentially putting trust back in the trust fund with 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security, and that is a big victory.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to note that the Republican budget sets aside almost $400 billion more than the Clinton-Gore budget for Medicare and Social Security.

Now our second priority in our agenda, of course, is lower taxes for the middle class, and I am one who believes that when the tax burden for the average family in Illinois is about 40 percent of their income going to local, State and Federal Government for taxes, that that tax burden is too high and we need to lower the tax burden, particularly for the middle class. And when we talk about the tax burden, I find that constituents, whether it is at the union hall or the VFW or the local Chamber of Commerce, they tell me that the Tax Code is too complicated, requires too much paperwork, and the majority of people have to hire someone else to fill out the tax forms. And I also point out that the tax burden is really unfair.

As we work this year to lower the tax burden, I believe that our top priority should be to simplify the Tax Code, to address the unfairness in the Tax Code, and of course we need to begin by eliminating the marriage tax penalty. Is it right, is it fair that 21 million married working couples on average pay $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married, $1,400 more than an identical couple living together outside a marriage? That is wrong, that our Tax Code punishes marriage.

The Marriage Tax Elimination Act has 230 cosponsors. Let us get it done this year. Let us simplify the Tax Code and eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Of course the Republican agenda, a secure retirement and lower taxes also includes strengthening our local schools, and we want to strengthen our local schools by empowering our local school boards and our local teachers and our local parents to run their schools and giving them the flexibility, of course, to meet the needs of local communities, and that is an important shift because previously for 30 to 40 years all the power was moving to Washington. And I talk with local school administrators and school board members. They tell me maybe in Illinois 6 percent of our public schools' budget comes from Washington, but so does two-thirds of the paperwork and almost 100 percent of the mandates, micromanaging how our schools are run.

We want to let local schools run themselves and meet the needs of their local communities, and that is why we want to pass the Ed Flex legislation. My hope, it will be on the President's desk fairly soon.

The other concern that local school board members also share with me is they say, as my colleagues know, ''You've increased funding at the Federal level by 10 percent, even while you've been balancing the budget, increasing funding for education, but if you look at how those dollars have been spent, only 70 cents of every dollar actually reaches the classroom. Thirty cents is lost in the Washington bureaucracy.''

Our goal is to ensure that more dollars get to the classroom, with a goal of 95 cents on the dollar reaching the classroom, and if we compare that to the current cost of delivering those funds to our local schools, that is a 25 percent funding increase above and beyond what they are currently receiving. We are providing $22 billion in Federal funding for our local schools. It is just wrong that 30 cents on the dollar currently is lost in Washington.

Let us help our local schools. Let us lower the tax burden for the middle class. Let us secure retirement by strengthening Medicare and Social Security.

PUERTO RICANS—FIRST CLASS CITIZENS IN TIMES OF WAR, BUT SECOND CLASS CITIZENS IN TIMES OF PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, as we return to our offices from our 2-week Easter recess, many important issues claim our immediate attention, not the least of which is the crisis in Kosovo. The matter is further complicated by our concerns about the three American soldiers being held prisoners by the Serbian government. Our prayers are with them and with their families at this critical period.

Throughout our Nation's history it has been demonstrated that our commitment to democratic values and securing peace and stability throughout the world has in many instances required the mobilization of our armed forces for the common good. During this century, in our dedication to peace and harmony amongst all people, we have opposed the forces of genocide and the inhumanity and cruelty of those who aim to ethnically cleanse a population, and this time it is not any different. The NATO allies stand firmly behind the aim to secure peace in the Yugoslavia region.

And now in this endeavor, just like we have in every other armed conflict throughout the century, the American citizens that reside in Puerto Rico stand shoulder-to-shoulder with their fellow American citizens from every

other State, ready and willing to contribute in any way possible to the establishment of justice and freedom. Because we are proud to enjoy the freedoms that our Nation stands for, we have been willing to accept the responsibilities and sacrifices that are demanded. The discharge of this important trust is what patriotism is all about.

Inherent in this quest for freedom is the belief in equality. Only as equals can we join in the common quest.

□ 0945

Our Nation's first elected leader, President George Washington, said it best when he wrote that ''the spirit of freedom beats too high in us to submit to slavery.''

President Washington's message to the Senate and the House of Representatives of January 8, 1790, underscored this guiding belief in equality. He said, and I quote, ''The welfare of our country is the object to which our cares and efforts are to be directed. And I shall derive great satisfaction from a cooperation with you, in the pleasing though arduous task of ensuring to our fellow citizens the blessings which they have a right to expect from a free, efficient and equal government.''

What is difficult to understand is how, despite our Nation's adoption of equality as one of the guiding principles of our democracy, we, the American citizens who reside in the territory of Puerto Rico, are not only denied the right to participate as equals in the democratic process but also denied participation in the safety net programs that all other Americans enjoy in the 50 States. Despite our common vision throughout the century, despite the 197,000 Americans from Puerto Rico who have heard the call to defend democracy, and despite the thousands who willingly paid the price of patriotism and sacrificed their own lives, 4 million American citizens are denied the benefits that all others in the Nation take for granted.

Senator MOYNIHAN told us a decade ago that when people fight for a country, they get a claim on that country. His words ring as true today as they were then. We have been equals during times of war and death, and we aspire to be equals in time of peace, prosperity and in life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage my colleagues to remember at this critical time that separate and unequal policies that promote unfairness and discrimination have no place in our Nation. By virtue of living in a territory, American citizens are denied equality that is inherent in the American system of government. This denial betrays our democracy and the men and women who valiantly defend it.

What is more, let us remember that even though our troops face danger equally, they are not all equal citizens because not all of them enjoy the same participation in the health and education programs that benefit all other Americans.

Puerto Ricans are first-class citizens in times of war, but second-class citizens in times of peace. That is un-American.

THE SOLVENCY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). 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. Mr. Speaker, I come before the Chamber this morning to talk about an important item for this country, and that is the solvency of Social Security.

I have been in Congress 6 years. When I first came to Congress in the 103rd Congress, and subsequently in the 104th Congress, 105th Congress, I have introduced legislation that would keep Social Security solvent.

This year, I am chairman of a bipartisan Budget Committee Task Force on Social Security. The problem of solvency justifies a few minutes of review and comment.

Most workers today look forward to some kind of Social Security when we retire based on the fact that most of us now pay 12.4 percent out of every dollar we earn as a Social Security tax. Most workers anticipate that there is going to be some return on that kind of contribution to the Social Security system.

However, we were told back in 1993 by the Congressional Budget Office, and by the President's Office of Management and Budget, that Social Security would be going broke.

Now, in the last several months, we have been hearing from both sides of the aisle, the Democrats and the Republicans, that paying down the public debt with some of the Social Security surplus would somehow save Social Security. Not so. Not so, Mr. Speaker.

It is good and it is historic that for the first time in recent history we will not be using the Social Security surplus for other government spending programs. So when some have bragged about having a balanced budget in the past, they have been misleading. It has been somewhat of a hoodwinking of the American public, because we have depended all these years on the surplus coming in from Social Security to mask the deficit.

The good news is that this year, for the first time in many, many years, we will not be spending that Social Security trust fund surplus. Now we have got to have the intestinal fortitude, we have got to have the willingness, to face the tough problem of saving Social Security and Medicare. That means a restructuring of the program.

Generally, Mr. Speaker, the problem is based on demographics. There are more and more retirees in relation to the number of workers paying in those taxes. Let me just give you a quick example of why depending on current worker taxes to pay current retiree benefits is a problem.

In 1950, there were 17 people working, paying in their Social Security taxes that was immediately sent out to beneficiaries. 17 to 1. This year there are three workers paying in their Social Security tax for every one retiree, and the estimate is that by 2030 there will be only two workers trying to come up with enough to support their families and one retiree. So there has to be some structural changes in the way the Social Security system works.

It is a tough decision, and that is why politicians have not dealt with it. There are only two ways to save Social Security. That is, either reduce benefits or increase the amount of revenue coming in. One way to increase revenue is private investment. However, that by itself will not fix Social Security.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have the gumption, the fortitude, the willingness to step up to the plate to make the hard decisions in order to save Social Security. Let us hope that the American people are willing to learn about the complicated ways Social Security is financed and to encourage their representatives in Congress to move ahead. Let us be clear that even though using the Social Security surplus to pay down the public debt is better public policy than using the money to finance more government spending, it does not save Social Security.

LET US KEEP MEDICARE A SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC PROGRAM

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we received good news 2 weeks ago when the Medicare and Social Security trustees reported that both programs will be solvent significantly longer than projected. For Medicare, the trustees reported that the Medicare trust fund will remain solvent through at least 2015.

Those in Congress, the think tanks and the Washington pundits who want to privatize Medicare are wringing their hands over the trustees' latest report. They believe these new projections will lead Congress to do nothing towards reforming Social Security and Medicare.

Once again, Medicare privatizers are wrong. The real threat to Medicare is not its alleged pending bankruptcy. The real threat to Medicare is a legislative proposal just rejected by the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare which would have privatized Medicare and delivered it to the private insurance market.

Under a proposal soon to be introduced called ''premium support,'' Medicare would no longer pay directly for health care services. Instead, it would provide each senior with a voucher

good for part of the premium for private coverage. Medicare beneficiaries could use this voucher to buy into the fee-for-service plan sponsored by the Federal Government or to join a private plan.

To encourage consumer price sensitivity, the voucher would track to the lowest cost private plan; Medicare privatizers tell us that seniors could then shop for the plan that best suits their needs, paying the balance of the premium and extra if they want higher quality care. The proposal would create a new, private system of health coverage but it would abandon Medicare's fundamental principle of egalitarianism.

Today, the Medicare program is income-blind. All seniors have access to the same level of care. The idea that vouchers would empower seniors to choose a health plan that best suits their needs is simply, Mr. Speaker, a myth. The reality is that seniors will be forced to accept whatever plan they can afford.

The goal of the Medicare Commission was to ensure the program's long-term solvency. This proposal will not do that. Supporters of the voucher plan say it would shave 1 percent per year from the Medicare budget over the next few decades. That is still not enough to prevent insolvency, and it is based frankly on overly optimistic projections of private sector performance. Bruce Vladeck, a former administrator of the Medicare program and a commission member, doubted the commission plan would save the government even a dime.

Efforts to privatize Medicare are, of course, nothing new. Medicare beneficiaries have long been able to enroll in private managed care plans. Their experience, however, does not bode well for a full-fledged privatization effort. These managed care plans are already calling for higher government payments. They are dropping out of unprofitable markets and they are cutting back on benefits to America's elderly.

Managed care plans are profit driven and they do not tough it out when those profits are unrealized. We learned this lesson the hard way last year when 96 Medicare HMOs deserted more than 400,000 Medicare beneficiaries, including in Lorain and Trumbull Counties, Ohio, because the HMOs did not meet their profit objectives.

Before the Medicare program was launched in 1965, more than half the Nation's seniors were uninsured. Private insurance was the only option for the elderly, but insurers did not want seniors to join their plans because they knew that seniors would actually use most of their coverage. The private insurance market has changed considerably since then, but it still avoids high risk enrollees and, whenever possible, dodges the bill for high-cost medical services.

The problem is not necessarily malice or greed. It is the expectation that private insurers can serve two masters, the bottom line and the common good. Logically, always looking to the bottom line, our system of private insurance has left 43 million uninsured individuals in the United States. If the private insurance industry cannot figure out how to cover these people, most of whom are middle-income workers and children, how will they treat high-risk, high-cost seniors?

If we privatize Medicare, we are telling America that not all seniors deserve the same level of quality health care. We are betting on a private insurance system that puts its own interests ahead of health care quality and a balanced Federal budget.

The Medicare Commission wisely disbanded without delivering a final product. Premium support proponents must realize that they cannot make Medicare privatization look like an equitable, fair alternative to the public program upon which 36 million seniors in this country depend. Premium support backers also have repeatedly tried to scare America's seniors by predicting that Medicare will go bankrupt.

Congress would not let Medicare go bankrupt any more than it would let the Department of Defense run out of money.

The goal is simple. Let us keep Medicare the successful public program it has always been.

TROOPS TO TEACHERS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Troops to Teachers Program Improvement Act of 1999. This legislation will enable retiring military personnel to find rewarding second careers as teachers in our Nation's public schools.

As we all know, our schools and students are in desperate need of more high-quality teachers. This bill, which I am introducing with the support of my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL), will help provide those teachers. This bill not only reauthorizes Troops to Teachers, but also strengthens and improves the enormously successful program.

Troops to Teachers was created in 1994 to assist military personnel who were affected by military downsizing find second careers in which they could utilize their knowledge, professional skills and expertise in our Nation's schools. The program offers counseling and assistance to help participants identify teacher certification programs and employment opportunities.

Since its authorization in 1994, Troops to Teachers has helped over 3,000 active duty soldiers enter our Nation's classrooms and make significant contributions to the lives of our students.

□ 1000

These military personnel turned teachers have established a solid reputation as educators who bring unique real-world experiences to the classroom. They are dedicated, mature, and experienced individuals who have proven to be effective teachers, as well as excellent role models. They are also helping fill a void felt in many public school districts. Over three-quarters of the Troops to Teachers participants are male, compared with about 25 percent in the overall public school system, and over 30 percent of these teachers belong to a minority racial ethnic group.

In addition, a large portion of these teachers are trained in math, science, and engineering, and about half elect to teach in inner city or rural schools. Overall, the retention of these teachers is much higher than the national average.

Not surprisingly, Troops to Teachers is winning glowing reviews from educational administrators, teachers and legislators. Education Secretary Richard Riley praised the program as an new model for recruiting high quality teachers.

School principals and superintendents who have employed Troops to Teachers participants are overwhelmingly supportive of the program. In a 1995–1996 survey, over 75 percent of the principals and superintendents rated Troops to Teachers participants as above average or higher.

The authorization of this successful program is set to expire at the end of this year. My colleagues and I have introduced the Troops to Teachers Program Improvement Act in an effort to reauthorize the program and strengthen some aspects of it so it operates more efficiently and more effectively, and targets the educational needs of our students.

I hope my House colleagues will join me in preserving this education success story by cosponsoring the Troops to Teachers Program Improvement Act.

INDIA MISSILE TEST SHOULD BE SEEN IN CONTEXT OF CHINESE THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in light of India's test launch of the Agni missile on Sunday, I want to state today or stress today that the U.S. should look at India's action in light of China's threat to the Indian subcontinent. We should view this step by India in the context of the ongoing threat posed by China, and the fact that Pakistan's missile development program has developed so quickly because of Chinese support.

The weekend's developments further demonstrate the need for a U.S. policy with regard to South Asia that turns away from the current stance of confrontation with India and towards recognition of India's legitimate security needs. We should have increased consideration for the prospects of greater Indo-U.S. cooperation in responding to the threats posed by China.

Mr. Speaker, last week's visit by the Chinese premier to Washington also raised important questions about how China, a potential adversary, and India, a potential partner threatened by China, are treated in terms of U.S. policy.

Last week official Washington witnessed the arrival of Premier Zhu with fanfare and ceremony at the White House, suggesting the visit of an international leader who was a trusted friend and partner. But during the premier's visit, as with other high level meetings between the United States and China, we kept hearing of the need for engagement, despite the fact that China has a terrible human rights record and has actually stepped up the pressure on dissidents; despite the fact that China threatens her neighbors, including Taiwan, and provides missile technology to unstable regimes like Pakistan; and despite, and I stress again, despite the growing evidence of Chinese espionage of American nuclear weapons secrets.

Yet, at the same time, when it comes to our relations with the world's largest democracy, that is India, we keep that country at arm's length, ever wary of their intentions and motives.

If pure economics were the only consideration, our policy double standard with the two Asian giants still would not make any sense, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, because India's population is almost as large as China's, and will surpass China early in the next century. India offers opportunities for American trade and investment at least comparable to China, and India does not threaten fundamental U.S. interests, which is more than we can say about China.

Furthermore, India, a country that holds regular elections at the national and local levels, is seriously committed to improving her human rights situation and the treatment of all minority communities, again, much more than can be said for China.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we need to shift our focus from simply condemning India for becoming a nuclear power, which whether we like it or not is a reality, to adjusting our thinking to this new reality and working to promote peace, security, confidence-building, and nonproliferation in South Asia.

Within our U.S.-South Asia policy, our narrow India-Pakistan focus overlooks the role of China. I believe that China is the real threat to India, as well as to U.S. interests and to regional security. It is in this context that India's potential role as a partner for peace and stability should be understood. Even if the current climate for partnership is not ideal, at least we should stop seeing India as a threat.

In particular, India has legitimate concerns about China's support for Pakistan's nuclear and missile programs. A Rand study published last year indicated that technical help from China, as well as North Korea, is responsible for the accelerated development of Pakistan's missile program. In addition, China invaded India in 1962, and continues to have designs on Indian territory. Since the U.S. should also view China as a potential adversary, there is a growing convergence of American and Indian objectives for responding to China.

Mr. Speaker, in a previous statement on the Floor of the House of Representatives in February I said that the U.S. should pay attention to the emerging notion of minimum deterrence in the Indian subcontinent, combined with a declared policy of no first use of nuclear weapons.

I have always believed that our goal should be to make India a partner in the American foreign policy goal of minimizing the threat of nuclear war. One way of accomplishing this is to take the long overdue step of accepting India as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. While I recognize there is opposition to this step, we must find ways to make India a partner for peace for purposes of confidence-building, and also avoiding the dangers of isolation.

THE VINDICATION OF SUSAN MCDOUGAL AND THE CONFIRMATION OF BILL LANN LEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning there are several things on my mind that I would like to share with this body. In particular, let me acknowledge and congratulate the vindication of Susan McDougal. When asked the question, what happened in that case and how did she feel, she clearly acknowledged the fact that all of us knew would come to light: Susan McDougal told the truth, that there was no substance in Whitewater to attribute illegal activities to the President and First Lady of the United States. During her tenure, truth was not enough for the special prosecutor and the special Independent Counsel, but a jury in Arkansas has vindicated her.

The same thing with the contempt charge for the President. A sad day, a sad occurrence. But it was what we argued in the Committee on the Judiciary, which was this was a civil matter that would be handled by the civil courts. Today that has occurred, or yesterday that has occurred.

Unfortunately, the tragedy of impeachment proceeded because others disagreed and felt that matters that could have been handled by the courts were the responsibility of this body to take on the highest act that this body could take in the impeachment of a president.

I am very happy, however, that the people of the United States saw the facts of this situation, and that this individual, the President of the United States, was not impeached, or was not convicted of these particular acts.

With that, let me also bring to the attention of this body the need to move forward with the confirmation of the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Bill Lann Lee. This gentleman has served in this position for almost 2 years as the Acting Attorney General. Yet, it has not been seen fit to confirm him by the other body.

He has worked tirelessly and within the laws of the land. He is an outstanding civil rights attorney. He is a first generation Asian American. He has worked in the civil rights area for some 23 years. He has spent his time with his nose to the grindstone. He has in fact worked very hard, but he has not worked viciously, or with vindictiveness.

I have seen him work in my district, coming to Houston and joining me in a town hall meeting on hate crimes after the death of James Barrett, Junior. He has also worked with cases like the shooting death of Pedro Oregon, so he is concerned about law enforcement, but he is also concerned about justice, as well.

Mr. Lann Lee is someone who brings the kind of practical experience and leadership to the Justice Department that is needed. He has maintained a sense of dignity, and realizes that, although when we talk about civil rights there are those who will raise their voices and say, well, we have already crossed that hurdle, America is beyond that, there is no need to address those issues, and of course people will speak without facts, but I can assure them, with the devastating opinions like that in Texas, which has denied access of Hispanics and African-Americans to institutions of higher learning, with job discrimination against women in the work force, with the lack of equal pay for equal work, I can assure Americans that although they may want to turn their heads and may not want to hear about civil rights, it is important for those of us who uphold the law to not turn our heads, to not be afraid of the truth, but go forward and take the higher ground, and work with those of good will and good faith and ensure that this is truly a land of equal opportunity.

Bill Lann Lee does nothing but follow the law. He is not in any way changing the law. He is not interpreting the law, making the law in his own form. He is following the law of the land, which is affirmative action; not quotas, but the outreach to individuals to give them an opportunity, to give them a helping hand, not a handout.

He is following the law on fighting against discrimination of women in the workplace. He is following the law on being against the hate crimes like those perpetrated against James Byrd, Junior. He is following the law when he is investigating the allegations of police brutality that are not a respecter of color, creed, or religion, but happen across the Nation. He is following the law when he protects good law enforcement, as well.

As indicated by Sandy Bernard, who was president or is president of the 150,000 member American Association of University Women, in an editorial in the Houston Chronicle on Monday, April 12, 1999, ''For more than a year Lee has done an outstanding job as the Acting Assistant Attorney General, enforcing our Nation's civil rights laws effectively, fairly, and vigorously. His work on behalf of women is impressive, and he is moving forward.''

We cannot ask Bill Lann Lee, Mr. Speaker, to change the laws that he has to enforce. What we can simply do is say, do your job. He should be confirmed and confirmed now.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the article in the Houston Chronicle of Monday, April 12, 1999.

The article referred to is as follows:

GET PAST POLITICS, APPROVE BILL LANN LEE NOMINATION

Civil rights laws are designed to protect equal opportunity, but these laws are meaningless without a strong leader to enforce them. That leader is Bill Lann Lee. The Senate must confirm Lee as assistant attorney general for civil rights if we are going to guarantee equal protection for all.

For more than a year, Lee has done an outstanding job as the acting assistant attorney general enforcing our nation's civil rights laws effectively, fairly and vigorously.

His work on behalf of women is impressive. He has challenged public-sector employment practices that have excluded women from many traditionally male jobs. He has enforced Title IX—the law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education—in many federal training and educational programs.

As chair of the National Task Force on Violence Against Health Care Providers, created after the murder of Dr. Barnett Slepian, he has vigorously protected reproductive health care providers. He has made prevention and prosecution of hate crimes a top priority of the division under his leadership.

Prior to his current position, Lee worked for two decades as a civil rights attorney and a champion of equal opportunity. He negotiated settlements in cases that successfully broke down workplace barriers, especially those that kept women from advancing. Lee made a name for himself by bringing about positive change through the law and building consensus and partnerships—something we need more of in Washington.

So what is the problem? I comes down to politics. In 1997 the Senate, Judiciary Committee held up Lee's nomination though he was clearly qualified for the job. Some senators thought that Lee would support ''unconstitutional'' affirmative action policies. Yet these policies are the law of the land. In fact, Lee has strictly adhered to recent Supreme Court rulings on affirmative action.

If our elected officials have an issue with the law, they should not take it out on those appointed to uphold the law. Interestingly, recent votes in the House and Senate have been supportive of affirmative action. It seems the Senate Judiciary Committee would rather hold the nation to its own agenda than allow a vote where the outcome may be disagreeable to them.

The American Association of University Women was sure of Lee's ability when he was first nominated a year ago, and we are only more convinced today. Lee's 23-year history of fighting discrimination and working for justice speaks for itself. His excellent work over the past year should be rewarded with a confirmation so he can continue his job.

By confirming Bill Lann Lee, the Senate will demonstrate that it can rise above political pettiness and prove its commitment to advancing civil rights for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the nation of a continuing injustice. I rise to tell the nation of an attorney with impeccable credentials and qualifications to be the next Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights at the United States Department of Justice. I rise today to remind you of the story of Bill Lann Lee.

It is now more than two years since his appointment to fill the position of Assistant Attorney General. Yet, his appointment to be the next Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division has been frozen for more than two years in the Senate. The Senate has refused to complete the confirmation process.

Mr. Lee is one of the country's leading civil rights attorneys, with a long and distinguished history of defending the rights of all Americans. Mr. Lee's distinguished legal career has spanned more than 23 years. He has tirelessly spent his career seeking equal opportunity for all people and working diligently against discrimination in all forms, including employment, housing, voting and education. Mr. Lee has extensive experience in civil rights law.

Yet despite all these accomplishments, his confirmation remains unfinished. A man whose experience in civil rights law includes extensive work in employment discrimination, health care, prevention of lead poisoning in poor children, access to public transportation, and equal access to education.

I know first hand Mr. Lee brings a reasoned approach to his post. He has served the interests of his client, the American people without hesitation. During the last two years, he has served the nation as the Acting Assistant Attorney General. He has won my respect with his straightforward approach and on many occasions he has responded to the needs of the 18th Congressional District. Mr. Lee came to Houston to participate in a Town Hall Meeting on Hate Crimes.

During his two years as Acting Assistant Attorney General the Civil Rights Division has enforced the laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, and other factors. Known as a skilled consensus builder, he has tirelessly worked to improve civil rights for all Americans.

Bill Lann Lee brings the kind of practical experience and leadership to the Justice Department that is needed. His leadership of the Civil Rights Division has included many issues including the monitoring of elections and investigating the police as well as protecting citizens with disabilities. One needs to look no further than events in Jasper, TX and New York City to see the leadership of Bill Lann Lee.

I praised President Clinton in 1997 when he made this appointment and I continue my support today. It is long past the time that the Senate should have taken action to confirm Bill Lann Lee as the nation's Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to complete this process. Congress needs to reaffirm its commitment to civil rights and we can send no greater sign than to confirm Bill Lann Lee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded not to refer to the personal conduct of the President of the United States.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING) at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are thankful, gracious God, that with all our differences of tradition and experience, and with the contrasts between us that mark our individuality, we are still bound together by Your creative spirit. We are grateful, O God, this spirit can unite us and make us whole, that this spirit can show us the way to live in harmony and concord, that this spirit can show us the power of faith and hope and love. Breathe into our hearts and souls, O God, this spirit of unity and peace, and may we so learn to live our lives that we testify to the wonder of Your grace. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. COSTELLO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and urging the President to assert clearly United States opposition to such a unilateral declaration of statehood.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution concerning the 20th Anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act.

SUPPORT H.J. RES. 37, REQUIRING TWO-THIRDS VOTE IN CONGRESS FOR PASSAGE OF TAX INCREASES

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the Federal Government will reach out its big hands and its sticky fingers and stick them into the pockets of every hard-working man and woman in this country.

Two days from today, April 15, Mr. Speaker, the tax man comes into every working family's home to collect his dues. Well, enough is enough.

That is why I am supporting H.J. Res. 37, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution and requires the House and the Senate to garner a two-thirds majority vote for passage of any legislation that will result in a tax increase.

At a time when the Republican Party is trying to whittle down the tax bite of the Federal Government, to ease the tax burdens on American families, the least we can do is enact common sense legislation to make it harder to raise taxes.

Taxes are currently too high, and now this country is starting to run a budget surplus. The last thing Congress should do is dig deeper into the pockets of hard-working taxpayers.

We should all support tax cuts, support a constitutional amendment that makes it more difficult to raise taxes, and by doing this we will be supporting America and its future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any small change that may be left in our pockets.

CHINA SHOULD NOT BE ADMITTED TO WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, last year Members vowed that China would not violate any African trade program we passed. Well, guess what, reports quote Chinese leaders as saying China will set up assembly plants in Africa with Chinese equipment, Chinese technology and, guess what, Chinese workers as well.

To further quote this madness, they said China is determined to circumvent any U.S. quotas on Chinese products.

Disgusting. And after all this, certain Members and certain individuals at the White House still want to admit China to the World Trade Organization. Beam me up. What is next here, a monument to Mao Tse-tung right in Washington?

I yield back a $200 billion trade deficit that threatens every man, woman and child in America, as well as our national security.

VOLUNTEER MIAMI FAIR A SUCCESSFUL VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, April 17, South Florida will once again become the center of opportunity as the second annual Volunteer Miami fair commences.

At Miami-Dade Community College's Wolfson Campus, hundreds of South Floridians will gather to demonstrate their commitment to their communities and their willingness to serve. At Volunteer Miami we will learn ways in which to utilize our talents and skills and focus our energy on promoting positive, effective change for South Florida.

Martin Luther King stated, ''Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. You don't have to have a college degree to serve. You don't have to make your subject and verb agree to serve. You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.''

In my district, the rewards reaped by volunteerism has been immeasurable.

I thank Dr. Eduardo Padron, David Lawrence and Valerie Taylor for making this service extravaganza possible, and I thank the hundreds of dedicated volunteers who know that, by sharing a little of their time, they can truly make a difference.

I hope that my congressional colleagues will be inspired to organize similar volunteer fairs in their districts to unleash the power behind volunteerism.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the House that April is Child Abuse Prevention Month.

The most recent data compiled by the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse shows now that more than 3 million cases of child abuse and neglect are reported annually. That number is shocking considering that child abuse is preventable.

Research shows substance abuse and the lack of parenting skills to be the main causes. We can respond by ensuring that alcohol and drug treatment programs and parenting classes are funded and accessible.

Of course, our strongest weapons are knowledge, awareness and compassion. Every responsible adult can help by learning more about the problem, by supporting parents and children at risk in their communities, and by reporting incidents of abuse.

A group of my constituents in Grand Island, Nebraska, has again this year made blue ribbons available to us to acknowledge Child Abuse Prevention Month. It is a small symbol of our commitment to fighting and ending the problem, and I hope all of my colleagues will wear theirs proudly.

AIR WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA NOT SUPPORTED BY AMERICAN PEOPLE, JUST LIBERAL MEDIA

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last night the Fox Network reported costs of $3 billion for the air war against Yugoslavia, and that was before it was reported that General Clark has now asked for several hundred more U.S. aircraft.

Yesterday, in The Washington Post, Columnist Robert Novak reported that we had bought Russia's neutrality with another $4.6 billion IMF loan. We will spend many billions in addition more on ground troops and reconstruction costs after Milosevic comes down. All of this against a tiny country that was no threat whatsoever to us, and where we made things many times worse by our bombings.

Last week the largest talk radio program in Knoxville asked if we should send ground troops into Kosovo. Only one caller was in favor. Everyone else was strongly opposed.

Our very liberal national media is doing everything it possibly can to escalate this war, so the true story will probably never be adequately reported, and that is that this war is a great miscalculation being carried out at almost obscene expense to the American people.

TORNADO IN SOUTHWEST OHIO

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday a terrible tornado ripped through the heart of the district I represent in Southwest Ohio. Eight hundred homes were destroyed or damaged. The Cities of Blue Ash, Montgomery, and Loveland, Symmes, Sycamore and Deerfield Townships were the hardest

hit. Dozens of businesses were damaged and destroyed, four people killed, 34 injured, and hundreds of southwest Ohioans are tonight without a home. Our hearts go out to these families who are now trying to put their lives back together.

The good news is that they are getting help. There has been a remarkable outpouring of support from their neighbors to help people pull their lives back together. I spent the last few days working along with State and local officials, the Red Cross, other volunteers, police and fire fighters, and Federal officials from SBA and FEMA.

People from every neighborhood in our region have come to help. Folks in our area have really rallied behind these hard-hit communities. Our prayers go out to the families, and our thanks and appreciation go out to all the hard-working volunteers, emergency management personnel and local officials who, I believe, have done an outstanding job at a very difficult time.

But we need more help. I urge President Clinton to take prompt action on Ohio Governor Bob Taft's request that Southwest Ohio be declared a Federal disaster area.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later today.

MADRID PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 769) to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 769

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 ''Madrid Protocol Implementation Act''.

SEC. 2. PROVISIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE MADRID AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION OF MARKS.

The Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1051 and following) (commonly referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946'') is amended by adding after section 51 the following new title:

''TITLE XII—THE MADRID PROTOCOL

''SEC. 60. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this title:

''(1) MADRID PROTOCOL.—The term 'Madrid Protocol' means the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, adopted at Madrid, Spain, on June 27, 1989.

''(2) BASIC APPLICATION.—The term 'basic application' means the application for the registration of a mark that has been filed with an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

''(3) BASIC REGISTRATION.—The term 'basic registration' means the registration of a mark that has been granted by an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

''(4) CONTRACTING PARTY.—The term 'Contracting Party' means any country or intergovernmental organization that is a party to the Madrid Protocol.

''(5) DATE OF RECORDAL.—The term 'date of recordal' means the date on which a request for extension of protection that is filed after an international registration is granted is recorded on the International Register.

''(6) DECLARATION OF BONA FIDE INTENTION TO USE THE MARK IN COMMERCE.—The term 'declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce' means a declaration that is signed by the applicant for, or holder of, an international registration who is seeking extension of protection of a mark to the United States and that contains a statement that—

''(A) the applicant or holder has a bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce,

''(B) the person making the declaration believes himself or herself, or the firm, corporation, or association in whose behalf he or she makes the declaration, to be entitled to use the mark in commerce, and

''(C) no other person, firm, corporation, or association, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form of the mark or in such near resemblance to the mark as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, firm, corporation, or association, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.

''(7) EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—The term 'extension of protection' means the protection resulting from an international registration that extends to a Contracting Party at the request of the holder of the international registration, in accordance with the Madrid Protocol.

''(8) HOLDER OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—A 'holder' of an international registration is the natural or juristic person in whose name the international registration is recorded on the International Register.

''(9) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.—The term 'international application' means an application for international registration that is filed under the Madrid Protocol.

''(10) INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.—The term 'International Bureau' means the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

''(11) INTERNATIONAL REGISTER.—The term 'International Register' means the official collection of such data concerning international registrations maintained by the International Bureau that the Madrid Protocol or its implementing regulations require or permit to be recorded, regardless of the medium which contains such data.

''(12) INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—The term 'international registration' means the registration of a mark granted under the Madrid Protocol.

''(13) INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION DATE.—The term 'international registration date' means the date assigned to the international registration by the International Bureau.

''(14) NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.—The term 'notification of refusal' means the notice sent by an Office of a Contracting Party to the International Bureau declaring that an extension of protection cannot be granted.

''(15) OFFICE OF A CONTRACTING PARTY.—The term 'Office of a Contracting Party' means—

''(A) the office, or governmental entity, of a Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks, or

''(B) the common office, or governmental entity, of more than 1 Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks and is so recognized by the International Bureau.

''(16) OFFICE OF ORIGIN.—The term 'office of origin' means the Office of a Contracting Party with which a basic application was filed or by which a basic registration was granted.

''(17) OPPOSITION PERIOD.—The term 'opposition period' means the time allowed for filing an opposition in the Patent and Trademark Office, including any extension of time granted under section 13.

''SEC. 61. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS BASED ON UNITED STATES APPLICATIONS OR REGISTRATIONS.

''The owner of a basic application pending before the Patent and Trademark Office, or the owner of a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office, who—

''(1) is a national of the United States,

''(2) is domiciled in the United States, or

''(3) has a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment in the United States,

may file an international application by submitting to the Patent and Trademark Office a written application in such form, together with such fees, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

''SEC. 62. CERTIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.

''Upon the filing of an application for international registration and payment of the prescribed fees, the Commissioner shall examine the international application for the purpose of certifying that the information contained in the international application corresponds to the information contained in the basic application or basic registration at the time of the certification. Upon examination and certification of the international application, the Commissioner shall transmit the international application to the International Bureau.

''SEC. 63. RESTRICTION, ABANDONMENT, CANCELLATION, OR EXPIRATION OF A BASIC APPLICATION OR BASIC REGISTRATION.

''With respect to an international application transmitted to the International Bureau under section 62, the Commissioner shall notify the International Bureau whenever the basic application or basic registration which is the basis for the international application has been restricted, abandoned, or canceled, or has expired, with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration—

''(1) within 5 years after the international registration date; or

''(2) more than 5 years after the international registration date if the restriction, abandonment, or cancellation of the basic application or basic registration resulted from an action that began before the end of that 5-year period.

"SEC. 64. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION SUBSEQUENT TO INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

''The holder of an international registration that is based upon a basic application filed with the Patent and Trademark Office or a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office may request an extension of protection of its international registration by filing such a request—

''(1) directly with the International Bureau, or

''(2) with the Patent and Trademark Office for transmittal to the International Bureau, if the request is in such form, and contains such transmittal fee, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

"SEC. 65. EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE MADRID PROTOCOL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of section 68, the holder of an international registration shall be entitled to the benefits of extension of protection of that international registration to the United States to the extent necessary to give effect to any provision of the Madrid Protocol.

''(b) IF UNITED STATES IS OFFICE OF ORIGIN.—An extension of protection resulting from an international registration of a mark shall not apply to the United States if the Patent and Trademark Office is the office of origin with respect to that mark.

"SEC. 66. EFFECT OF FILING A REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—A request for extension of protection of an international registration to the United States that the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office shall be deemed to be properly filed in the United States if such request, when received by the International Bureau, has attached to it a declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce that is verified by the applicant for, or holder of, the international registration.

''(b) EFFECT OF PROPER FILING.—Unless extension of protection is refused under section 68, the proper filing of the request for extension of protection under subsection (a) shall constitute constructive use of the mark, conferring the same rights as those specified in section 7(c), as of the earliest of the following:

''(1) The international registration date, if the request for extension of protection was filed in the international application.

''(2) The date of recordal of the request for extension of protection, if the request for extension of protection was made after the international registration date.

''(3) The date of priority claimed pursuant to section 67.

"SEC. 67. RIGHT OF PRIORITY FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES.

''The holder of an international registration with an extension of protection to the United States shall be entitled to claim a date of priority based on the right of priority within the meaning of Article 4 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property if—

''(1) the international registration contained a claim of such priority; and

''(2)(A) the international application contained a request for extension of protection to the United States, or

''(B) the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection to the United States is not later than 6 months after the date of the first regular national filing (within the meaning of Article 4(A)(3) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property) or a subsequent application (within the meaning of Article 4(C)(4) of the Paris Convention).

"SEC. 68. EXAMINATION OF AND OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION; NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.

''(a) EXAMINATION AND OPPOSITION.—(1) A request for extension of protection described in section 66(a) shall be examined as an application for registration on the Principal Register under this Act, and if on such examination it appears that the applicant is entitled to extension of protection under this title, the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

''(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), a request for extension of protection under this title shall be subject to opposition under section 13. Unless successfully opposed, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused.

''(3) Extension of protection shall not be refused under this section on the ground that the mark has not been used in commerce.

''(4) Extension of protection shall be refused under this section to any mark not registrable on the Principal Register.

''(b) NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.—If, a request for extension of protection is refused under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall declare in a notification of refusal (as provided in subsection (c)) that the extension of protection cannot be granted, together with a statement of all grounds on which the refusal was based.

''(c) NOTICE TO INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.—(1) Within 18 months after the date on which the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office a notification of a request for extension of protection, the Commissioner shall transmit to the International Bureau any of the following that applies to such request:

''(A) A notification of refusal based on an examination of the request for extension of protection.

''(B) A notification of refusal based on the filing of an opposition to the request.

''(C) A notification of the possibility that an opposition to the request may be filed after the end of that 18-month period.

''(2) If the Commissioner has sent a notification of the possibility of opposition under paragraph (1)(C), the Commissioner shall, if applicable, transmit to the International Bureau a notification of refusal on the basis of the opposition, together with a statement of all the grounds for the opposition, within 7 months after the beginning of the opposition period or within 1 month after the end of the opposition period, whichever is earlier.

''(3) If a notification of refusal of a request for extension of protection is transmitted under paragraph (1) or (2), no grounds for refusal of such request other than those set forth in such notification may be transmitted to the International Bureau by the Commissioner after the expiration of the time periods set forth in paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be.

''(4) If a notification specified in paragraph (1) or (2) is not sent to the International Bureau within the time period set forth in such paragraph, with respect to a request for extension of protection, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused and the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request.

''(d) DESIGNATION OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In responding to a notification of refusal with respect to a mark, the holder of the international registration of the mark shall designate, by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office, the name and address of a person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person, or mailing to that person, a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.

"SEC. 69. EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

''(a) ISSUANCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—Unless a request for extension of protection is refused under section 68, the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request and shall cause notice of such certificate of extension of protection to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

''(b) EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—From the date on which a certificate of extension of protection is issued under subsection (a)—

''(1) such extension of protection shall have the same effect and validity as a registration on the Principal Register, and

''(2) the holder of the international registration shall have the same rights and remedies as the owner of a registration on the Principal Register.

"SEC. 70. DEPENDENCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES ON THE UNDERLYING INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

''(a) EFFECT OF CANCELLATION OF INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—If the International Bureau notifies the Patent and Trademark Office of the cancellation of an international registration with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration, the Commissioner shall cancel any extension of protection to the United States with respect to such goods and services as of the date on which the international registration was canceled.

''(b) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RENEW INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—If the International Bureau does not renew an international registration, the corresponding extension of protection to the United States shall cease to be valid as of the date of the expiration of the international registration.

''(c) TRANSFORMATION OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION INTO A UNITED STATES APPLICATION.—The holder of an international registration canceled in whole or in part by the International Bureau at the request of the office of origin, under Article 6(4) of the Madrid Protocol, may file an application, under section 1 or 44 of this Act, for the registration of the same mark for any of the goods and services to which the cancellation applies that were covered by an extension of protection to the United States based on that international registration. Such an application shall be treated as if it had been filed on the international registration date or the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection with the International Bureau, whichever date applies, and, if the extension of protection enjoyed priority under section 67 of this title, shall enjoy the same priority. Such an application shall be entitled to the benefits conferred by this subsection only if the application is filed not later than 3 months after the date on which the international registration was canceled, in whole or in part, and only if the application complies with all the requirements of this Act which apply to any application filed pursuant to section 1 or 44.

"SEC. 71. AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.

''(a) REQUIRED AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.—An extension of protection for which a certificate of extension of protection has been

issued under section 69 shall remain in force for the term of the international registration upon which it is based, except that the extension of protection of any mark shall be canceled by the Commissioner—

''(1) at the end of the 6-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Commissioner, unless within the 1-year period preceding the expiration of that 6-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Commissioner; and

''(2) at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Commissioner, and at the end of each 10-year period thereafter, unless—

''(A) within the 6-month period preceding the expiration of such 10-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Commissioner; or

''(B) within 3 months after the expiration of such 10-year period, the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with the fee described in subparagraph (A) and an additional fee prescribed by the Commissioner.

''(b) CONTENTS OF AFFIDAVIT.—The affidavit referred to in subsection (a) shall set forth those goods or services recited in the extension of protection on or in connection with which the mark is in use in commerce and the holder of the international registration shall attach to the affidavit a specimen or facsimile showing the current use of the mark in commerce, or shall set forth that any nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark. Special notice of the requirement for such affidavit shall be attached to each certificate of extension of protection.

''SEC. 72. ASSIGNMENT OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

''An extension of protection may be assigned, together with the goodwill associated with the mark, only to a person who is a national of, is domiciled in, or has a bona fide and effective industrial or commercial establishment either in a country that is a Contracting Party or in a country that is a member of an intergovernmental organization that is a Contracting Party.

''SEC. 73. INCONTESTABILITY.

''The period of continuous use prescribed under section 15 for a mark covered by an extension of protection issued under this title may begin no earlier than the date on which the Commissioner issues the certificate of the extension of protection under section 69, except as provided in section 74.

''SEC. 74. RIGHTS OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

''An extension of protection shall convey the same rights as an existing registration for the same mark, if—

''(1) the extension of protection and the existing registration are owned by the same person;

''(2) the goods and services listed in the existing registration are also listed in the extension of protection; and

''(3) the certificate of extension of protection is issued after the date of the existing registration.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date on which the Madrid Protocol (as defined in section 60(1) of the Trademark Act of 1946) enters into force with respect to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 769, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 769, the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

House Resolution 769 is the implementing legislation for the Protocol Related to the Madrid Agreement on the Registration of Marks, commonly known as the Madrid Protocol. The bill is identical to legislation introduced in the preceding three Congresses, and will send a signal to the international business community, United States businesses, and trademark owners that the 106th Congress is determined to help our Nation, and particularly our small businesses, become part of an inexpensive, efficient system that allows the international registration of marks.

As a practical matter, Mr. Speaker, ratification of the Protocol and the enactment of H.R. 769 will enable American trademark owners to pay a nominal fee to the United States Patent and Trademark Office which will then register the marks in the individual countries that comprise the European Union, or more commonly known as the EU. Currently, American trademark attorneys must hire attorneys or agents in each individual country to acquire protection. This process is both laborious and expensive, and discourages small businesses and individuals from registering their marks in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 769 is an important and noncontroversial bill that will greatly help those American businesses and other individuals who need to register their trademarks overseas in a prompt and cost-effective manner. I implore my colleagues to pass the bill today, and want to express my thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the subcommittee, and the entire subcommittee membership and staff for that matter, who have worked very cooperatively in getting the bill to this point.

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

□ 1115

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

I rise in support of H.R. 769, a bill to implement the Madrid Protocol Agreement providing for an international registration system for trademarks.

I am strongly of the belief that the one-stop shop provided for in the Madrid Protocol whereby trademark applicants can file one application in their own country and in their own language and, in so doing, achieve worldwide protection for their trademarks is in the interest of American businesses.

But while the Protocol took effect 2 years ago, it may never achieve its purpose unless and until the U.S. elects to participate. However, the State Department has not forwarded the treaty to the Senate for ratification because of continuing concerns on the part of the United States regarding the voting rights of intergovernmental members of the Protocol.

In particular, under the Protocol, the European Union receives a separate vote in addition to the votes of its member states. The State Department is concerned that it is a violation of the concept of one vote per country and could set an unfortunate precedent in future international agreements.

While the State Department pursues its concerns with European Commission officials, I believe it is important that we in this body signal our support for the substantive provisions of the Protocol. I know of no opposition to these provisions, nor to this bill. I urge its support.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 769.

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.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1189) to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1189

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PERFORMANCES AND DISPLAYS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS.—Section 110(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A) a direct charge'' and inserting ''(i) a direct charge''; and

(2) by striking ''(B) the transmission'' and inserting ''(ii) the transmission''.

(b) EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS.—Section 112(e) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(1)'';

(3) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''(3)'' and inserting ''(2)'';

(B) by striking ''(4)'' and inserting ''(3)'';

(C) by striking ''(6)'' and inserting ''(5)''; and

(D) by striking ''(3) and (4)'' and inserting ''(2) and (3)''; and

(4) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''(4)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(3)''; and

(B) by striking ''(5)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(4)''.

(c) DETERMINATION OF REASONABLE LICENSE FEES FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPRIETORS.—Chapter 5 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating the section 512 entitled ''**Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors**'' as section 513 and placing such section after the section 512 entitled ''**Limitations on liability relating to material online**''; and

(2) in the table of sections at the beginning of that chapter by striking

''512. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors.''

and inserting

''513. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors.''

and placing that item after the item entitled

''512. Limitations on liability relating to material online.''.

(d) ONLINE COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT LIABILITY.—Section 512 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending the caption to read as follows:

''(e) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''INJUNCTIONS.—''; and

(2) in paragraph (3) of subsection (j), by amending the caption to read as follows:

''(3) NOTICE AND EX PARTE ORDERS.—''.

(e) INTEGRITY OF COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—Section 1202(e)(2)(B) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''category or works'' and inserting ''category of works''.

(f) PROTECTION OF DESIGNS.—(1) Section 1302(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''1 year'' and inserting ''2 years''.

(2) Section 1320(c) of title 17, United States Code, is amended in the subsection caption by striking ''ACKNOWLEDGEMENT'' and inserting ''ACKNOWLEDGMENT''.

SEC. 2. OTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C.—The section heading for section 1400 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1400. Patents and copyrights, mask works, and designs''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF CONFLICTING PROVISION.—Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce.''.

(c) CLERICAL CORRECTION TO TITLE 35, U.S.C.—Section 3(d) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking '', United States Code''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1189.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1189, to make technical corrections to title 17 of the United States Code and other laws. An amended version of this bill is presented for passage under suspension of the rules.

The amendment to the reported bill makes further technical corrections to title 17 and other laws. As a result of two major copyright bills which were signed in law late in the 105th Congress, several technical errors need to be corrected in order to prevent confusion. H.R. 1189 corrects these errors by making purely technical amendments to the Copyright Act and other laws. H.R. 1189, Mr. Speaker, does not make any substantive changes in the law.

I am unaware of any opposition to this amendment, and I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 1189.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support also of H.R. 1189, a bill making technical corrections in title 17, the Copyright Act.

If ever a bill were truly technical, this is it. Our committee labored long, hard, and successfully last Congress to produce landmark legislation in the copyright area. The brevity of the bill before us today is testimony to a job well done by all concerned in that effort, and I commend those people.

I commend this technical corrections bill to my colleagues.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1189, 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.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER MEDAL OF VALOR ACT OF 1999

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 46) to provide for a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 46

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 ''Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MEDAL.

The President may award, and present in the name of Congress, a Medal of Valor of appropriate design, with ribbons and appurtenances, to a public safety officer who is cited by the Attorney General, on the advice of the Medal of Valor Review Board, for extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty.

SEC. 3. BOARD.

(a) BOARD.—There is established a permanent Medal of Valor Review Board (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the ''Board''). The Board shall—

(1) be composed of 11 members appointed in accordance with subsection (b); and

(2) conduct its business in accordance with this Act.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The members of the Board shall be appointed as follows:

(A) Two shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(B) Two shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) Two shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(D) Two shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(E) Three shall be appointed by the President, one of whom shall have substantial experience in firefighting, one of whom shall have substantial experience in law enforcement, and one of whom shall have substantial experience in emergency services.

(2) PERSONS ELIGIBLE.—The members of the Board shall be individuals who have knowledge or expertise, whether by experience or training, in the field of public safety.

(3) TERM.—The term of a Board member is 4 years.

(4) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the membership of the Board shall not affect the powers of the Board and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(5) OPERATION OF THE BOARD.—

(A) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairman and not less than twice each year. The initial meeting of the Board shall be conducted not later than 30 days after the appointment of the last member of the Board.

(B) QUORUM; VOTING; RULES.—A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum to conduct business, but the Board may establish a lesser quorum for conducting hearings scheduled by the Board. The Board may establish by majority vote any other rules for the conduct of the Board's business, if such rules are not inconsistent with this Act or other applicable law.

(c) DUTIES.—The Board shall select candidates as recipients of the Medal of Valor from among those applications received by the National Medal Office. Not more often than once each year, the Board shall present to the Attorney General the name or names of those it recommends as Medal of Valor recipients. In a given year, the Board is not required to choose any names, but is limited to a maximum number of 6 recipients. The Board shall set an annual timetable for fulfilling its duties under this Act.

(d) HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and

places, administer such oaths, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Board considers advisable to carry out its duties.

(2) WITNESS EXPENSES.—Witnesses requested to appear before the Board may be paid the same fees as are paid to witnesses under section 1821 of title 28, United States Code. The per diem and mileage allowances for witnesses shall be paid from funds appropriated to the Board.

(e) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Board may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Board considers necessary to carry out its duties. Upon the request of the Board, the head of such department or agency may furnish such information to the Board.

(f) INFORMATION TO BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.—The Board shall not disclose any information which may compromise an ongoing law enforcement investigation or is otherwise required by law to be kept confidential.

SEC. 4. BOARD PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), each member of the Board shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board.

(2) All members of the Board who serve as officers or employees of the United States, a State, or a local government, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for those services.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Board shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of service for the Board.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.—The term ''Public Safety Officer'' has the same meaning given that term in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 7. OFFICE.

There is established within the Department of Justice a national medal office. The office shall staff the Medal of Valor Review Board and establish criteria and procedures for the submission of recommendations of nominees for the Medal of Valor.

SEC. 8. CONFORMING REPEAL.

Section 15 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 is repealed.

SEC. 9. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.

The Attorney General shall consult with the Institute of Heraldry within the Department of Defense regarding the design and artistry of the Medal of Valor. The Attorney General shall also consider suggestions received by the Department of Justice regarding the design of the medal, including those made by persons not employed by the Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 46.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 46 is called the Public Safety Officer Medal Act of Valor. It creates a national medal for public safety officers who exhibit extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty. While law enforcement agencies at all levels present their own award and medals to those who demonstrate bravery, the United States Government has no medal in recognition of acts of courage and valor committed by public safety officers. This legislation is an attempt to rectify the failure of the United States to award a prestigious medal for public safety officer heroism.

Every now and then, a police officer or a fire fighter confronts a critical choice that could make the difference between life and death. Such moments are not about duty, they are about acting beyond what duty requires. They are about taking major risks of serious injury or even loss of life for the sole reason of saving another person's life. When our men and women in blue make this heroic choice, they distinguish themselves from the vast majority of the public who will probably never be tested in this way. A national medal is the least we can do to express our appreciation for such devotion.

Mr. Speaker, legislation identical to H.R. 46 passed the House by voice vote in the last Congress, but unfortunately, the Senate failed to act before adjournment. I am hopeful that the Senate will see its way clear to pass this act before National Police Week in May. What better way to express our thanks to our men and women in blue than to pass this legislation creating a national medal, given by the President, in the name of the Congress, honoring extraordinary acts of valor?

I might add, of course, and I said this earlier, this not only would apply to police officers but also fire fighters.

Significantly, this award is not limited only to State and local police officers. Federal agents could certainly be nominated for a medal. State and local fire fighters and emergency personnel will also be eligible. Thus, the bill will encompass all public safety officers at all levels of government.

The selection process established by H.R. 46 is simple and inexpensive. The bill creates a permanent Medal of Valor Review Board, comprised of 11 members serving 4-year terms, who shall review and select recipients of the award each year. The board members must be individuals who have knowledge or expertise in the field of public safety. The board is not required to chose any names in a given year but may select up to six recipients annually.

The legislation also establishes a National Medal Office within the Department of Justice, which will establish criteria and procedures for the submission of names of nominees from the law enforcement community and the public. The National Medal Office will staff the Medal of Honor Review Board.

The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 46 and estimates that full implementation of the legislation would cost only about $250,000 annually. I believe this is a very small price for the Federal Government to pay to express its gratitude for our Nation's most heroic public safety officers and to set the example nationally that we need to set to encourage those who perform such acts.

I also want to note that this legislation will not displace the Medal of Honor as our country's most significant award. America's entire system of medals and awards, which has become known as the Pyramid of Honor, was established by an act of Congress in 1918. That act was passed to protect the integrity of the national Medal of Honor, but it had the far-reaching effect of establishing degrees of distinguished service and clearly delineating the type of deed necessary for the awarding of a medal.

H.R. 46 is patterned after the Medal of Honor, but it will not disrupt its place at the top of the pyramid.

Finally, H.R. 46 requires the Attorney General to consult with the Institute of Heraldry, an office housed within the Department of Defense which designs and creates medals and ribbons. The staff at the Institute of Heraldry puts great thought into every aspect of a medal, and every color and detail is significant. To avoid overlapping with a previously established medal, the Attorney General is required to consult with the Institute.

Mr. Speaker, we can never fully know what inspires a person to commit an act of bravery, even to risk his or her own life to save the life of a stranger. Congress must, however, find significant and positive ways to express our thanks and to encourage such acts. I believe that creation of this medal is one way to recognize the frequent and too often unsung acts of valor committed by public safety officers.

This legislation is supported by nearly every national law enforcement association, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the National Troopers Coalition, and the Law Enforcement Alliance of America.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), for his support in this legislation and his cooperation in quickly moving the bill to the floor. I look forward to working with my friend from Virginia this Congress to find common ground in the battle against crime.

I also want to thank Nicole Nason on the subcommittee staff for her hard work on this bill. Nicole is leaving the subcommittee, and we will certainly miss her service. We wish to thank her for everything she has done in the past and wish her the best in the future.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) in support of H.R. 46. This bill would establish a Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor to be awarded periodically to a selected public safety officer for extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty. It provides for the Department of Justice to solicit, review, and screen nominations from the law enforcement community for the award. Final decisions on the award would be made by a board appointed by the President and congressional leadership from both parties.

I am a cosponsor of the bill, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and other members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the Committee on the Judiciary by a unanimous vote. It will not only allow members of the law enforcement community to recognize extraordinary heroism within that profession, but will establish a mechanism for calling that extraordinary valor to the attention of the world.

I urge Members to vote for the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on this important legislation to provide for a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary courage. By passing this legislation, we continue the tradition of honoring those who exhibit great courage and bravery in the line of duty.

I am a proud co-sponsor of this legislation to honor our nation's public safety officers—police officers, firefighters and emergency medical personnel. Each year, the President would award this medal to a worthy public safety officer.

Already in our small towns, counties and cities, local heroes are honored for their acts of bravery. For example in Texas, we honor peace officers and public servants who are injured in the line of duty through the Fleetwood Memorial Foundation.

Here in Congress, we honor the extraordinary heroism and bravery of our citizens through the Congressional Medal of Honor. Members of the armed services are honored with the prestigious Purple Heart and Prisoner of War Medal.

It is important to recognize the public servants of our communities because so often their work is overlooked. We witness the acts of heroism performed by our police officers, firefighters and emergency medical personnel every day.

These Officers make a choice to serve their communities. While feelings toward Law Enforcement vary with each individual, all citizens must realize that the role of a peace officer is an important and necessary one.

By supporting this bill, we salute the choices and sacrifices made by peace officers. This legislation will positively influence the way we view law enforcement and it will remind us of the everyday heroic acts that take place in our communities.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 46.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONGRATULATING EL SALVADOR ON SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF FREE AND DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 110) congratulating the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free and democratic elections on March 7, 1999.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 110

Whereas on March 7, 1999, the Republic of El Salvador successfully completed its second democratic multiparty elections for President and Vice President since the signing of the 1992 peace accords;

Whereas these elections were deemed by international and domestic observers to be free and fair and a legitimate nonviolent expression of the will of the people of the Republic of El Salvador;

Whereas the United States has consistently supported the efforts of the people of El Salvador to consolidate their democracy and to implement the provisions of the 1992 peace accords;

Whereas these elections demonstrate the strength and diversity of El Salvador's democratic expression and promote confidence that all political parties can work cooperatively at every level of government; and

Whereas these open, fair, and democratic elections of the new President and Vice President should be broadly commended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the House—

(1) congratulates the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador for the successful completion of democratic multiparty elections held on March 7, 1999, for President and Vice President;

(2) congratulates President-elect Francisco Guillermo Flores Perez and Vice President-elect Carlos Quintanilla Schmidt on their recent victory and their continued strong commitment to democracy, national reconciliation, and reconstruction;

(3) congratulates El Salvadoran President Armando Calderón Sol for his personal commitment to democracy, which has helped in the building of national unity in the Republic of El Salvador;

(4) commends all Salvadoran citizens and political parties for their efforts to work together to take risks for democracy and to willfully pursue national reconciliation in order to cement a lasting peace and to strengthen democratic traditions in El Salvador;

(5) supports Salvadoran attempts to continue their cooperation in order to ensure democracy, national reconciliation, and economic prosperity; and

(6) reaffirms that the United States is unequivocally committed to encouraging democracy and peaceful development throughout Central America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 110.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1130

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the statement of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations regarding this bill.

''The chairman of our Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), introduced this resolution congratulating the Salvadoran people on their most recent free elections. I am pleased to see such a positive, bipartisan expression of support for El Salvador. On March 23, the Senate agreed to a similar measure, Senate Resolution 73, which enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

''It is fitting that we should congratulate the president-elect of this country, Guillermo Flores, and vice president-elect Carlos Quintanilla on their electoral victory. The Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front and its candidates, who secured 29 percent of the vote, were also present. The transformation of the FMLN into a political party competing for power in open democratic elections is one of El Salvador's key achievements.

''It is equally fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we should recognize outgoing President Armando Calderon Sol. President Calderon Sol's quiet leadership has continued El Salvador's successful implementation of the 1992

peace agreement. Faced with the trials of Hurricane Mitch and an economic downturn, he has ably led El Salvador in binding the wounds of more than a decade of civil conflict. Moreover, President Calderon Sol will certainly be remembered for his achievements in privatizing state-owned enterprises, including the historic privatization of El Salvador's pension system.

''I urge my colleagues,'' the gentleman from New York says, ''to unanimously support H. Res. 110.''

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 110 which congratulates the government and the people of El Salvador on the successful completion of its second free and democratic election since the signing of the 1992 peace accords. I strongly commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) for bringing it forward.

It is appropriate to call attention to the democratic process in El Salvador. Just a decade ago, the situation in El Salvador and all throughout Central America was much different than what we see today. Groups on all sides have dropped arms, formed political parties and given the people a fair and just voice. We are right to pause today and commend El Salvador for the stunning transition in the past decade and their successful completion of transparent free and fair elections in which everyone can participate.

Now, this is not to say that all of the problems that led to the violence of the 1980s are resolved. There is still much need for improvement in El Salvador. Turnout was much lower at this election than in the last several in the country, less than 50 percent, because people had a difficult time getting to the polls or actually voting once they arrived at the polls due to disorganization. Many low-income and poor Salvadorans are also questioning whether democracy works for them because inequality and poverty still dominate. It is the role, then, of President-Elect Flores to lead the way in generating more opportunity for Salvadorans so that the benefits of democracy and the motivation to go to the polls is felt by all citizens. We, the United States, need to maintain our commitment to the people of El Salvador.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of El Salvador on their recent election. Since the signing of the peace accords ended their brutal civil war in 1992, Salvadorans have made great strides toward true democracy, reaching lasting peace, and creating a better life for all Salvadorans.

I am very glad to stand here today and talk about elections and democracy in El Salvador—instead of civil war and death squads. When I first visited El Salvador in the 1980s, political parties only knew how to resolve their problems through war.

Now, instead of firing bullets at one another, political parties argue their differences in the National Assembly, build coalitions with one another, and work together in their common interests.

This election is yet another tremendous accomplishment. I would like to congratulate new President Francisco Flores on his election victory, and congratulate the Salvadoran people for holding a free and fair election. Each election, since the signing of their Peace Accords, has been more open and free—and the recent Presidential election continued in that pattern.

Of course I don't want to paint too rosy a picture here. Many serious problems in El Salvador continue to exist. Crime is at record levels, the tremendous poverty that existed before the war remains alarmingly high, and the judicial system continues to stumble.

Even as we talk about a successful election in El Salvador today, a great deal can be accomplished in that area as well. Better organization, a method of precinct voting, and the establishment of a new election registry are necessary election reforms that must be accomplished.

I challenge the Salvadoran people and their government to work hard to achieve these reforms, erase the poverty and inequality that exists, and continue to work together for the better of the country.

And I believe we should be there to help. I know President Flores has many difficult challenges ahead, and I look forward to working with him to do what I can to help Salvadorans continue to move forward. With that in mind, I also challenge this country—the United States—to temember our role in El Salvador.

As we congratulate Salvadorans on yet another step toward democracy, I believe it is also time we acknowledge some of our errors in the past, and make a stronger commitment to assisting all Salvadoran people in their effort to reach those democratic goals.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I rise in support of H. Res. 110, a bill which congratulates El Salvador on its recent Presidential elections.

On Sunday, March 7, the people of El Salvador went to the voting polls to choose a new President and Vice-President. This election marked the second successful Presidential election and third general election since the signing of the 1992 Peace Accords which ended 12 years of brutal civil war in that small country.

H. Res. 110, introduced by myself and several members of the Subcommittee, congratulates the government and the people of El Salvador for completing this successful multiparty election which was deemed to be free and fair by an international observer group which included a member of my Subcommittee staff.

This election, in which every registered political party received votes, represented a clear expression of the will of the people of El Salvador; reaffirmed the success of the Peace Accords; and demonstrated the strength and diversity of the democratic process in El Salvador.

Since 1994, current President Armando Calderon Sol has worked tirelessly to ensure that the peace accords have been properly implemented and that El Salvador progressed both politically and economically out of the post-war era.

For that effort, and for the continued cooperation of the opposition FMLN leadership, El Salvador should be commended.

Now, President-elect Francisco Flores will lead a new government into the new century and I am confident he will continue the progress made thus far in national reconciliation and reconstruction.

We wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of El Salvador have made great strides over the past seven years. This election serves to validate a key element of that progress and reaffirms their strong commitment to the democratic process.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 110, a resolution congratulating the Government and the people of the Republic of El Salvador on successfully completing free and democratic elections. On March 7, 1999, El Salvador held free and fair elections for president and vice-president. I would like to take this time to personally congratulate President-elect Francisco Guillermo Flores Perez and Vice President-elect Carlos Quintilla Schmidt on their recent victory and their continued commitment to democracy. This election was yet another milestone in the normalization of the democratic process in El Salvador, and I wish to commend this nation for its efforts.

El Salvador has come a long way since the 1980's, when the nation was in the midst of a terrible civil war. Many of you will recall that the war cost the lives of tens of thousands of Salvadorans and left the country in shambles. Now, the Salvadorans have replaced bullets with ballots. It was the strong leadership and guidance, coupled with courage, demonstrated by former President Alfredo Cristiani that rescued the country and paved the way for El Salvador's future. His successor, President Armando Calderon Sol, elected in a free and fair contest, held the same commitment to democracy and kept this nation moving forward. The stark contrast between war-torn El Salvador and the El Salvador of today is a tribute to its people and its leaders.

In a time where peace and unity are not always the goal of the majority, I believe Americans must continue to show support for our Salvadoran neighbors and their continued progress through this long and fragile process of democratization. I hope you will join me in congratulating El Salvador on this latest and most remarkable accomplishment.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original six cosponsors, I come to the floor in strong support of House Resolution 110. I wish to congratulate the Salvadoran people and President-elect Francisco Guillermo Florez Perez and Vice President-elect Carlos Quintanilla Schmidt on the free and fair conduct of the Presidential elections of March 7, 1999.

Since the signing of the 1992 peace accords, the Republic of El Salvador has conducted two democratic elections for President

and Vice President. The peaceful and orderly manner in which these elections have been carried out, with the participation of ten parties representing the entire political spectrum, is proof of El Salvador's commitment to democracy, national reconciliation and reconstruction. Specifically, it demonstrates their ability to implement the provisions of the 1992 peace accords.

The United States must continue to support the efforts of the people of El Salvador to ensure political stability and the strengthening of the democratic process.

This progress however is being threatened in the wake of Hurricane Mitch. It is paramount that the United States take the lead in helping the region recover from the devastation of the hurricane. If it does not, we risk the unraveling of a fragile democracy and a return to the political instability that the region experienced for decades and threatened our national interests.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution congratulating the people and government of El Salvador on the free and democratic elections held last month.

The people of El Salvador know that the transition to democracy is rarely easy. However, in only a few short years, El Salvador has made great progress. Both international and domestic observers agree that the recent multiparty Presidential and Vice Presidential elections were free and fair.

These elections showed the strength and diversity of El Salvador's new democracy. They showed that political parties can engage in the type of substantive, peaceful debate that would have been unheard of only a few years ago.

But the demands of democracy do not stop with free elections. El Salvador has shown a commitment to democratic ideals by embracing a free press, freedom of religion, and freedom of association. Because there is no government in the world today that couldn't benefit from improvement, I encourage the people and government of El Salvador to seize upon their recent success and work toward improving their new democracy and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, dozens of nations are at a crossroads today. Because democracies are not always neat and tidy, many will be tempted to take the easy path. But the easy path leads toward authoritarianism and inevitably to exploitation. The path toward democracy is sometimes difficult and it is often unsightly. But El Salvador's success stands out as an example of what can be accomplished by choosing the path toward democracy.

Today we congratulate those who have made democracy possible in El Salvador.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 110.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING QATAR FOR COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRATIC IDEALS AND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) congratulating the State of Qatar and its citizens for their commitment to democratic ideals and women's suffrage on the occasion of Qatar's historic elections of a central municipal council on March 8, 1999, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 35

Whereas His Highness, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani, the Emir of Qatar, issued a decree creating a central municipal council, the first of its kind in Qatar;

Whereas on March 8, 1999, the people of the State of Qatar held direct elections for a central municipal council;

Whereas the central municipal council has been structured to have members from 29 election districts serving 4-year terms;

Whereas Qatari women were granted the right to participate in this historic first municipal election, both as candidates and voters;

Whereas this election demonstrates the strength and diversity of the State of Qatar's commitment to democratic expression;

Whereas the United States highly values democracy and women's rights;

Whereas March 8 is recognized as International Women's Day, and is an occasion to assess the progress of the advancement of women and girls throughout the world; and

Whereas this historic event of democratic elections and women's suffrage in the State of Qatar should be honored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) commends His Highness, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani, the Emir of Qatar, for his leadership and commitment to suffrage and the principles of democracy;

(2) congratulates the citizens of the State of Qatar as they celebrate the historic election for a central municipal council; and

(3) reaffirms that the United States is strongly committed to encouraging the suffrage of women, democratic ideals, and peaceful development throughout the Middle East.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD and say the remarks that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), were he here, would be delivering. He is at the White House today. I would like to give his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is House Concurrent Resolution 35, a concurrent resolution congratulating the State of Qatar and its citizens for their commitment to democratic ideals and women's suffrage on the occasion of Qatar's historic elections of a central municipal council on March 8, 1999.

The gentleman from New York is the primary sponsor of this measure and wanted to particularly thank the co-chairs of the Congressional Women's Caucus, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), for their support for these elections and their cosponsorship of this resolution.

Qatar is a strong ally of the United States in the Persian Gulf and is moving toward the 21st century under the leadership of His Highness, Sheikh Hamad, the Emir of Qatar. That leadership includes expanding the civic contribution to Qatar's governance.

Our colleagues will agree that the United States highly values democracy and women's rights. So we were more than pleased to learn of the successful municipal elections that Qatar had conducted in which women, as well as men, were granted the right to vote and run as candidates.

House Concurrent Resolution 35 applauds the Emir of Qatar for his leadership and commends the citizens of Qatar for participating in this important civic function. Clearly, this election demonstrates the strength and diversity of the State of Qatar's commitment to democratic expression.

House Concurrent Resolution 35 also reaffirms that the United States is strongly committed to encouraging the suffrage of women, of democratic ideals, and peaceful development throughout the Middle East.

We therefore were pleased to learn that the Qatari Government is in the process of drafting a constitution. This document, once adopted, will cause the creation of a Qatari parliament.

Mr. Speaker, in discussions with Qatari officials, they informed us that the State of Qatar considers the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as their structural model. Congress therefore looks forward to these developments and to maintaining and strengthening its relationship with Qatar.

House Concurrent Resolution 35 celebrates an important milestone in the development of Qatar, and I urge our colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to all its citizens by lending their support to this important resolution.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 35, regarding the recent historic

elections of a central municipal council in Qatar, and I strongly commend the cochairs of our Women's Caucus, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who traveled to Qatar to monitor these elections.

Mr. Speaker, the decree issued by the Emir of Qatar establishing the central municipal council was the first of its kind. The council was structured to have members from 29 election districts serving 4-year terms. For the first time in Qatar history, open elections were ordered and in an unprecedented decision women were granted the right to participate both as candidates and as voters. While these elections were at the municipal level, they were an important expression of a commitment to democratic ideals and the first step toward advancing women's rights in the region. The elections took place on March 8, 1999, a day also celebrated as International Women's Day, further emphasizing the significance of women's suffrage. It is important for the United States Congress to recognize this historic event and to support it as a turning point towards democracy and equal rights for women in Qatar.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today in support of H. Con. Res. 35 to honor the State of Qatar and its citizens on the historic elections that took place there on March 8. I am pleased to have this opportunity to share my recent experiences in Qatar.

I had the great honor to travel to this Persian Gulf country as an election observer with my colleague SUE KELLY, with whom I serve as co-chair of the Women's Caucus.

This marks an historic step toward women having seats at all tables, not only the kitchen table, but the peace table, the economic development table, and international affairs table. All of these opportunities begin with full voting privileges for both men and women—a first among the Gulf Cooperation Council countries of the world.

By comparison, Kuwait has an elected parliament which exercises limited legislative and oversight powers, but women are not allowed to vote.

Oman has an elected Consultative Council, however only selected male and female citizens are enfranchised and the Sultan retains the final say over the composition of the Council.

Bahrain had an elected parliament which was dissolved by the Emir in 1975.

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Saudi Arabia have no elected institutions.

I congratulate the citizens of Qatar on this important step for women. It took America 145 years to give women the right to vote; it took Qatar only 27 years. It is wonderful to see Qatar giving rights to women while other countries like Afghanistan are taking them away. In Afghanistan, women and girls are not permitted to work or to go to school, and they have limited access to health care or prenatal care.

We live in a world economy and we must recognize that elections and democracy help us in our shared world. An elected government is a more stable government. Qatar's step toward democracy directly benefits the United States because it leads us toward stability and peace. It is important for our nation to support the democratic steps of our allies in the Persian Gulf.

It is important to remember that democracy is a journey, not a destination. With the historic step of allowing both men and women to participate in its first-ever municipal elections, Qatar has taken the first step toward embracing democracy.

The Emir, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani, is committed to democracy and has even talked of continuing towards democracy by having an elected parliament. He has already made great strides in education and economic development. I was proud to represent the United States and meet with members of Parliament from United Kingdom, France, Germany, Lebanon, Jordan, Morocco, Oman and Kuwait—who came to witness these historic elections.

I was impressed by how carefully planned the election was. Two hundred and forty-two candidates ran in 29 election districts to serve four-year terms on a central municipal council. Six women ran for office. While none of the women won, Dr. Wadha Al Suwaidi came in second in her district by only 28 votes to Nasser Faleh al Dosari.

I had the opportunity to meet with many candidates. They were well educated, and well prepared. Many had very impressive credentials as ambassadors, teachers, and each had prepared a platform of issues on everything from libraries, bridges, and garbage to parks, nurseries, and recycling.

The scene on election day was extraordinary. It looked a lot like an American election, complete with banners, posters and campaign materials. The election was held on a national holiday and schools and many businesses were closed. Many schools were used as polling places, and candidates set up nearby tents to continue campaigning throughout the day.

We saw many long lines in Qatar, and there was a better than 95 percent voter turnout of the registered voters. It reminded me of the long lines seen during South Africa's first election with people standing in lines for hours in the hot sun.

It was a very fair election. They even sealed the ballot boxes with wax during prayer breaks.

I met with many of the candidates. One of the female candidates who I met, Mouza Abdullah Al-Maliki, has been working for the vote for several years. In 1993, she was part of a group that petitioned the previous Emir for the vote. She is very grateful to have the vote. She told me, ''It means democracy, it means freedom, it means awareness for women in all aspects of her life.''

To celebrate the first ever direct elections in which women have been allowed to participate in the Gulf, it is important that we pass H. Con. Res. 35 congratulating Qatar on its historic elections. I hope that we will be able to move this bill quickly to show America's support for democracy and universal suffrage throughout the world.

ADDITIONAL FACTS

Dr. Wadha al Suwaidi came in second in her district by only 28 votes to Nasser Faleh al Dosari. This is very significant because 50 women in her district didn't vote.

Of the approximately 600,000 people in the country, there are 150,000 Qatari citizens. Of these, about 75,000 are eligible (over age 18 and not a member of the police or military force.) Approximately 23,000 registered, which was split almost 50–50 between men and women.

I saw our American embassy in Qatar, which was recently evacuated. It stood—exposed and vulnerable—right on a busy intersection. Our embassy workers are currently working in makeshift areas, some are even working out of their homes. I hope that work on the new embassy continues, and that our state department personnel will soon be able to work in a safer environment.

In Lebanon, 3 of 128 Members of Parliament are women. One of them is Mouauad Naela whose daughter lives in New York City.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank Chairman GILMAN, and Ranking Member GEJDENSON for giving me time to share my support for H. Con. Res. 35, as well as observations from my trip to Qatar last month.

I recently visited Qatar with my colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY, to witness their historic election on March 8, and lend encouragement to the process that they are beginning. While we were in Qatar, we had the opportunity to meet with the women candidates and Qatari citizens, as well as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Foreign Minister and the Emir's wife, Shaykha Mouza who has been a leader in the effort to bring American institutions of higher education to Qatar in addition to organizing the municipal council elections, which took place on March 8.

In many countries in that region, women lead very sheltered lives and are unable to do many activities that we take for granted. Women are often unable to drive, much less go on to study in college. In Qatar, we saw women doing these things. We saw them everywhere you would expect to see women here in the U.S. interacting in a perfectly normal way, the same way that we do in many instances. This is rather progressive stance for many countries in this region.

On election day, as I traveled with other members of the delegation to the election sites, I was quite pleased to see the widespread support for the elections and the candidates. The election sites were full of life. Campaign materials and supporters were abundant. Qataris were lined up waiting to have their chance to cast their vote. What is more, I think that there are lessons we could learn from the candidates in Qatar as they sat together, sharing coffee with each other, each wishing the other success, even though they were running against one another. They were there together celebrating the beginnings of democracy and representation.

I also thought that the elections were well organized, those who worked at the polling sites did so with the dignity and excitement one would expect for a nation's first endeavor towards democracy.

I realize that there has been concern about the relatively low number of people eligible to vote in the elections. There are approximately 160,000–180,000 citizens in the nation. Just as in the United States there is eligibility criteria for voting. In order to be able to vote, you must be the daughter or son of a father who is a Qatari citizen and was born and raised there. As in the U.S., 18 is the minimum voting age, and the last criteria is, interestingly enough, that the person cannot be a member of the military or be employed by the Ministry

of the Interior. The Qataris have concerns about mixing politics and their military forces. The final number of those eligible to vote has not been reported. However, we do know that of the approximate 22,000 people registered to vote, approximately 45% were women.

The queen, Shaykha Mouza spoke to the issue of the careful balance that needs to be struck between the traditional, conservative aspects of their society and the drive to move towards a parliamentary democracy. This is only the first election for a municipal council which is advisory in nature, but it is a valid step. I believe that it is important for us and for Qatar, that we pass this resolution congratulating the Emir's efforts on behalf of his nation.

As we all know, governing is a difficult task. It is a deliberative and often slow process, but the important thing is that the process moves forward. We need to salute and congratulate this nation for their step forward and encourage them to continue on their journey to the great experiment called democracy.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 35, as amended.

The question was taken.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MICROENTERPRISE FOR SELF-RELIANCE ACT OF 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 136 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 136

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1143) to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1145

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Ewing). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 136 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1143, the Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999. The purpose of the legislation is to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries. The rule provides for the customary 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule XIII requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report against consideration of the bill. In addition, the rule provides that the bill shall be read by section. The rule permits the Chair to grant priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments and considers them as read.

Further, as has become standard practice in this Congress, the Chair is allowed to postpone recorded votes and to reduce the time for electronic voting on postponed votes, and finally the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, to keep with our record of fair rules for the 106th Congress, I am pleased to report that this resolution is yet another open rule that affords any Member the opportunity to offer any germane amendments.

House Resolution 1143 is much needed legislation to enhance credit opportunities for microenterprises in developing countries. These businesses are so small, 10 or fewer employees, and the average loan is so low; most are less than $300; that they are thought of as microenterprises as opposed to small businesses. Microenterprises are the economy of the very poorest segment of the economy in developing countries, and estimates of their number range from one-third to perhaps one-half of the world's businesses.

Microenterprises have been an area of interest for U.S. foreign assistance for many years. In 1994, the USIA, USAID, formally launched the microenterprise initiative in partnership with Congress to expand funding for that department's microenterprise programs. The summit's goal for that year was to target half of the microenterprise resources to serve the poorest with loans under $300.

The ability to obtain credit is one of the most important factors in starting or expanding a microenterprise. Often these loan amounts are so low that a commercial bank would not find them profitable, or an entrepreneur has very little in the way of collateral, so the bank would consider them too risky. Yet most micro-loan institutions boast repayment rates of 97 percent or better, putting them at least on a par with major banks who lend to more affluent and traditional borrowers. I believe that supporting microentrepreneurs is an excellent investment in dramatically improving the quality of life of millions throughout the world. Providing access to loans can help low-income entrepreneurs expand their inventory or even hire additional employees and can truly enhance a person's self-esteem by giving him or her a genuine opportunity in life.

In addition, microfinance can serve as a powerful tool for building a more inclusive financial sector which serves the broad majority of the world's population, including the very poor and women, and thus generates more social stability and prosperity. This legislation states that the United States should coordinate among the G–7 nations to bolster support for the microenterprise sector by leveraging our investment with that of other donor nations.

H.R. 1143 appropriately makes microenterprise development an important component of U.S. foreign economic policy and assistance by expanding on the commitment of the USAID in its 1994 microenterprise initiative. I believe that in improving the access of the poorest, especially women, to much needed financial resources in developing countries will lead to the development of free, open and equitable international economic systems and contribute to the spread of freedom and human dignity in the world.

I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), my dear colleague from the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), and the others who have worked so hard on this legislation for their efforts in bringing this very important bipartisan bill forward. I strongly support H.R. 1143 and

urge all of my colleagues to support both this open rule and the underlying important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), for yielding me the time.

This is an open rule. It will allow for full and fair debate on H.R. 1143 which is called the microenterprise bill for self-reliance. It is an act of 1999 of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

As my colleague from Florida has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle, they will have the opportunity to offer germane amendments.

This is a bipartisan bill that reflects broad congressional support.

A microenterprise is a small business with as few as one or as many as ten employees. Loans to these companies or small businesses are among the most cost-effective ways to help the poor lift themselves out of poverty.

I became familiar with the potential of microenterprise to reduce poverty because of the House Select Committee on Hunger, and I used to chair the international task force of the committee, and later I was chairman of the full committee. The Hunger Committee held hearings, we issued reports, we conducted public forums to inform Congress and the public on the importance of microcredit to reducing hunger and poverty around the world. In one report the Hunger Committee concluded that small loans to microenterprises can significantly raise the living standards of the poor, increase food security and bring about sustainable improvements in local economies. The committee further concluded that credit to microenterprises is one way to help end the cycle of poverty and hunger among urban and rural landless poor in developing countries. The bill before us today strengthens and enhances the United States leadership in the field of microenterprise development to fight hunger and poverty in the world.

I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) of the Committee on International Relations for their commitment to microenterprise and other poverty alleviation programs and for their hard work in bringing this important legislation to the floor. Special thanks is also due to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) for his instrumental leadership on this issue.

The bill is very similar to a measure that was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and myself in the 105th Congress. An amended version of the bill passed the House on a 393 vote to 21, but it got stalled in the Senate. I am particularly pleased that today's bill very closely resembles the original Amo Houghton bill and Hall bill from the last Congress than the version which passed the House.

No U.S.A. program is more effective in assisting poor people to end their own poverty than microenterprise development. The dollars have a multiplier effect since they are recycled to new beneficiaries when loans are repaid.

This bill is a good bill, and it will improve the lives of many of the world's poor with a minimum of cost. It is an open rule that was adopted by a voice vote of the Committee on Rules. I urge adoption of the rule and of the bill.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and I would like to thank my friend from Miami, Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this time.

The underlying bill is vital to the economic growth of developing countries. H.R. 1143 is a bipartisan bill cosponsored by my friend from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL), and a number of others and is designed to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries.

For a number of years I have been proud to be a supporter of microenterprise programs. I support H.R. 1143 because it moves us forward and sets the direction for the future of microenterprise programs.

One of the most important elements of this legislation is the requirement to increase the amount of assistance devoted to credit activities designed to reach the poorest sector in developing countries and to improve the access to the poorest, particularly women, to microenterprise credit in developing countries. We have been informed by the World Bank that more than 1.2 billion people in the developing world, one-fifth of the world's entire population, subsists on less than $1 a day. Today this Congress sends a message that America not only supports the political and religious freedom of all people, but also advocates the economic freedom of people in nations across this globe. The bill will make microenterprise development an important element of United States economic policy and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan once said that part of our foreign policy to maintain peace abroad was to promote market-oriented solutions to international problems, telling the story abroad of America's free enterprise way of life. As the United States leads the way in developing a new global financial architecture, I believe that microenterprise will play an indispensable role in that quest.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation as it moves forward.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much for yielding this time to me, and I ask to be able to speak for 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for this time and join in by applauding this rule and, as well, acknowledging the vitality of the microenterprise program in developing nations. According to the World Bank, more than 1.2 billion people in the developing world, or one-fifth of the world's population, as we have just heard the previous speaker acknowledge, lives on less than $1 a day, and for Americans that is obviously a stark figure and a shocking figure. But at the same time there is hope, there is genuine desire to do better, and particularly for those small businesses and small-opportunity individuals in developing nations.

Wherever one goes and visits, whether or not it is the continent of Africa, whether or not it is in South America that is close to Texas and Central America, they will find those individuals that simply say, ''If you'll give me a fishing rod instead of a fish, I can make a difference.''

We had an opportunity in the session, the work recess session, to join a presidential mission dealing with the tragedy of HIV AIDS in Africa. Interestingly enough, one would ask how does the microenterprise program deal with the question of HIV AIDS? Mr. Speaker, the real issue along with the tragedy of AIDS, and prevention, and education, the impact on children, the number of offerings that will come about because of the tragedy of AIDS in Africa, is the idea of giving communities an opportunity to self invest and to create businesses where they can stay in these rural areas as opposed to traveling from place to place.

□ 1200

We met, for example, an elderly grandmother who was taking care of a number of her grandchildren due to the tragedy of them losing their parents to HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, one might find it curious and interesting, but she was making banana beer. Part of her efforts

were through the support of USAID. Of course, many of these programs interact, but the enterprise program impacts on giving opportunity to those who have ideas to ensure that there is a return on their investment.

In February 1997, a global microcredit summit was held in Washington to launch a plan to expand access to credit for self-employment to the 100 million of the world's poorest families by 2005. I cannot imagine us in any way doing something more effective, more efficient and more far-reaching than to help those individuals who wish to help themselves in developing nations. One of the points we have heard is that we do want to build our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I support the microenterprise program and hope that we can continue to expand it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the open rule for H.R. 1143, a bill to assist microenterprises in developing countries. This bill will authorize grant assistance to further the development of microenterprises in developing countries. The grants are to be provided to businesses, governments and other organizations in both the United States and abroad to expand the availability of financial services, credit and training for microentrepreneurs. In this manner these grants will assist the poorest of the poor in their endeavors to expand their incomes and their businesses.

The most recent statistics provided by the World Bank, indicate that 1.2 billion people in the developing world, or one-fifth of the world's population, subsist on less than $1 a day. That is right, they live on less than $1 a day. Women in poverty generally have larger workloads and less access to educational and economic opportunities than their male counterparts. This in turn means that women in these countries lack stable employment and frayed social safety nets.

Many in the developing world turn to self-employment to generate their livelihoods. I know first hand, from my trips to Africa that a large percentage of the workers are self-employed. The poor have shown remarkable courage in the face of poverty and have demonstrated an uncanny ability to expand their incomes and business when they have access to loans at reasonable rates.

It is the unfortunate truth that entrepreneurs are frozen in poverty because they cannot obtain sufficient credit at reasonable rates to build their asset base or expand their otherwise viable self-employment activities. It is not unusual for interest rates to be as high as 10 percent per day.

Similar measures have already proven successful in these developing countries. Nongovernmental organization such as the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, in Kenya, and networks such as Accion International, have been particularly successful in lending to poorest of the poor. This measure helps both the business and the individual to develop a sense of accomplishment.

I urge members to support this open rule which allows for bipartisan debate.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us, H.R. 1143. As we look at the reports issued by the World Health Organization, which document, as we have heard, that one-fifth of the world's population lives in extreme poverty and that poverty is one of the leading causes of death worldwide, the problem of how to help poor families appears so immense and widespread that it seems impossible to manage.

This, Mr. Speaker, is where microcredit comes in. It is a new vision for ending world poverty and it provides access to credit for the world's poor to convert their ideas into thriving small businesses. People like Salomie Chung and Elisa Crespo from my hometown of south Florida, who with the assistance of Kathleen Gordon of Working Capital Florida and Gail Neumann of Results-Miami no longer need to worry about survival and basic existence because they are now successful entrepreneurs.

These are just a few domestic examples, but microcredit is now at work in some form in over 40 countries.

Overall, the rate of repayment of the more established programs ranges from 95 to 99 percent. Foreign assistance used under the microcredit program is loaned and paid back with interest and is then recycled and used for new loans, thus, reaching even more of the world's poor.

Microcredit is an economically viable program which furthers U.S. development goals and humanitarian purposes, but it needs our unequivocal support to continue its mission and to build on its success.

That is the objective, Mr. Speaker, of the bill before us, House Resolution 1143. It expands upon previous legislation and ensures that at least one-half of overall resources allocated for microcredit within USAID are to be directed to programs serving the poorest of the poor with loans under $300. This could mean that tens of thousands more of the poorest will have the opportunity to empower themselves out of the state of poverty that they are currently in.

The bill before us helps to guarantee the survival of programs which are endangered by crises beyond the control of the programs and of the borrowers. It calls for further action and initiative to be explored to help enhance the development of microcredit institutions.

As H.R. 1143 states, the development of microenterprise is a vital factor in the stable growth of developing countries and in the development of free, open and equitable international economic systems.

It is, therefore, in the best interest of the U.S. and of the United States Congress to support its growth and its expansion. By supporting H.R. 1143 and microcredit in general, we are investing in the human spirit and the desire of the world's poor to use their creativity, their talents and their skills to control their own destiny.

For the future welfare of the men, women and children worldwide who suffer the pain inflicted by poverty, I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1143.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 1143, which establishes assistance to microenterprise programs in developing countries. This bill is very important for a number of reasons which we have already heard. It establishes in law our support for microenterprise. Congress has not provided full authorization up until now for microenterprises in developing countries.

Second, this bill sets aside increased resources for microenterprise programs for the next 2 years.

Third, it ensures that half of the funding goes to programs which serve the very poor in loans of $300 or less. I recently saw some of these programs in Petra in Jordan, and in Marrakesh in Morocco.

I have been a longtime supporter of microenterprise lending. Several years ago, my senior legislative assistant went to Bangladesh to view the Grameen Bank and microenterprise at work in that country. As many know, the Grameen Bank was one of the first to establish such a program and to make microloans available to the poorest of the poor.

The premise of the Grameen Bank and other microenterprise programs is that the capitalist system in these countries does not have to be only for the rich, and credit should be seen as a human right. If we are looking for one single action that will enable the poor to overcome their poverty, we should choose credit. Charity and handouts help maintain and deepen poverty by taking away initiative. Human beings thrive on challenges, not on charity.

The Grameen Bank is now owned by the poor people of Bangladesh and it works exclusively with poor people. The less one has, the higher priority one has for loans. If one has nothing, they get the highest priority.

Ninety percent of the shares are owned by the borrowers. The board of directors consists of 13 members, nine of whom are elected by the borrowers and shareholders. It serves over 2.4 million borrowers, and the payback rate is 98 percent, money which can then be re-lent to others. So far, this program has lent out and has been repaid with over $2 billion in Bangladesh alone.

There are many examples of how these microloans have changed the life of the borrower. My legislative assistant spoke to a woman in a village in central Bangladesh. Five years earlier when she was living in complete poverty with her six children starving, she

turned with some hesitation to the Grameen Bank.

Five years after her first loan, she graciously invited my assistant into her home, introduced her children who are all in school, and proudly showed off the cow that she had bought and the material she retails to support her family.

The first years were not easy. In fact, she told of selling the milk from her cow when her children were still hungry, but she knew she had to repay the bank loan to get another one and she knew that that was the way out of her poverty.

As my assistant left, she asked for her to pray that there would be no more widows in her village because life for a widow is just too hard.

In a neighboring village, a young woman of 26 owned two goats, one cow, ten hens and two acres of land and was earning twice the national average income. Her son was in the eighth grade in a country where not quite half the children complete the fifth grade. She had had a hard life as she was abandoned at 3 months by her parents, raised by a neighbor, married at 12, abandoned again at 13, this time by her husband when she was pregnant. She had never earned more than $37 a year and owned no land.

After her visit to the Grameen Bank, she began her own career which allowed her children to get to school and her to have a living wage.

Replicated throughout the world and now in the United States also, microcredit programs are working to eliminate poverty worldwide. Working in partnership with groups like Results, they have set a goal of reaching 100 million of the world's poorest families.

This bill is very important. It is a crucial piece that will help us reach our world and national goals. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1143.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the rule is open and it is a very, very good bill. This bill provides a lot of relief, a lot of help for hundreds of thousands of people across the world. We even do microenterprise very well in some States in our own country. It is a very good policy. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and all the speakers who have so eloquently portrayed why the underlying legislation is so important and why we need to move forward with it today. I also support the rule. It is a fully open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to House Resolution 136 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1143.

□ 1211

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1143) to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes, with Mr. EWING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many of us have heard or seen the phenomenal success of microenterprise programs around the world. These programs reach the poorest of the poor with small loans that help them to work their way out of poverty.

The record of these programs is impressive, with the poorest clients repaying their loans at rates between 95 and 98 percent. Unlike other assistance programs, we do not give funds away. We lend them to people once considered the worst credit risks on earth.

Microenterprise programs proved that with access to credit, the poor can repay their loans and work their way out of poverty.

The bill before the House is a result of almost 4 years of consensus building between the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the ranking Democratic member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and many of us have worked for a number of years on microenterprise development programs from their first beginnings at the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh to today when microfinancing institutions are some of the largest lenders in many developing countries.

The bill also builds on the work in the last Congress, the Houghton-Hall bill. The authors of that legislation will recognize that much of the language in this bill came directly from their bill.

This legislation started as a renewal of our bipartisan cooperative effort with the administration, including AID and the First Lady's office, to strengthen microfinance programs. We will recall the President's visit to Uganda where he visited a microfinance project and declared that this was one of the most successful ways to help the poor in developing countries to work their way out of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, this bill accomplishes several key goals. First, it contains the essential language that half of all microenterprise resources go directly to support programs that provide $300 loans or lower to the poorest of the poor.

This requirement traces back to the highly successful microcredit summit convened by Results to dedicate the international community to reaching half of the world's poor with credit programs by the year 2005.

□ 1215

The bill adds a new section to the Foreign Assistance Act governing grants to microfinance institutions, authorizing $152 million in appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and $167 million for fiscal year 2001.

I will note that these are consensus figures of the Microenterprise Coalition, advocacy and practitioners alike, and they are not strongly opposed by the administration.

The bill authorizes the micro and small credit program of AID that has helped many microentrepreneurs grow from small- to medium-sized businesses. The bill has also two major new sections that lay the foundation for the future growth of the microfinance sector.

First, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the bill establishes a microfinance loan facility to help rescue institutions which the U.S. taxpayer has supported with liquidity and support to prevent collapse.

We have all witnessed the destruction caused by Hurricane Mitch in Central America. The destruction nearly caused the collapse of several key microfinance institutions that the U.S. helped to build from the ground up. The ad hoc rescue package assembled by Brian Atwood at AID rescued these institutions so they can now head to recovery.

We have also had other near collapses, and the facility will help address these emergencies in a more systematic way.

Secondly, the bill calls for a number of reports by the President to lay out the future growth of these institutions, including a Federal charter. Using these reports, we hope to lay out a road map for the growth of the microfinance section over the next 10 years.

This legislation has 26 original cosponsors and has been endorsed by the Microenterprise Coalition, including RESULTS and FINCA. It is my understanding that the administration has moved mightily and now has only some concerns with the legislation, and does not oppose its adoption today.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and I have one amendment that will make some technical changes to the bill, to its loan facility, that were worked out with AID. Other than that, I am not aware of any other amendments that will be offered today.

I urge the support of this legislation. It is a good bill.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 1143.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is a product of many years of hard work on behalf of microenterprise. I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for several years of hard work on this issue.

I would also like to recognize two great leaders who have done so much to advance the cause of microcredit lending to the poor and to empower women in developing countries. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and AID administrator Brian Atwood have worked tirelessly to make sure that the United States takes a leadership role to expand access to credit for self-employment to 100 million of the world's poorest families. One-fifth of the world's population exists on less than $1 a day, and 32,000 children die each day from preventable malnutrition.

I had the opportunity to visit Ghana and South Africa last week, and I met with many women entrepreneurs who were the primary income earners for their families. Access to just a small amount of capital, I was told, would help them raise the standard of living for their entire families.

Many of the poor who do not have access to microenterprise programs are forced to pay interest rates of 10 percent per day to money lenders. In contrast, interest rates on microcredit loans average between 2 percent and 5 percent per week. The return rate on these loans is between 95 percent and 99 percent.

Let me briefly explain what this bill does. It permanently establishes two new sections in statutory law to govern microenterprise grants and loans. Under the grants section, it authorizes grants to support microlending programs. These grants are generally used to start new microlending programs. It authorizes $152 million for fiscal year 2000, and $167 million for fiscal year 2001 for microenterprise programs. It mandates 50 percent of all microenterprise resources to be used for poverty lending, defined as institutions that provide credit and other financial services to the poorest with loans of $300 or less in 1995 dollars.

Currently, 68 percent of loans are $300 or less, and about 47 percent of total resources support poverty lending.

This bill creates a loan facility inside of AID. The facility will provide concessional loans to United States-sponsored microfinance institutions to prevent bankruptcy caused by natural disasters, national wars, civil conflict, or national financial crises. The facility would be supervised by representatives of the Department of the Treasury, AID, and two representatives from the NGO community. It requires the President to prepare a report to Congress on the most cost-effective methods for increasing the access of poor people to credit, other financial services, and related training.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1143, the Microenterprise Self-Reliance Act. The low-cost loans and training opportunities provided by this program create unimaginable opportunity and hope for people living in the poorest and most desolate areas of the world.

As a Member who is personally committed to the growth and prosperity of Central and South America, I have witnessed firsthand the benefits of microenterprise and the microcredit programs to the poorest of the poor. Through these programs, the U.S. has been able to encourage economic growth and self-dependency in countries less fortunate than our own.

The minimal cost of the microenterprise program yield great benefits and have a tremendous long-term impact on the future economic and social development of many nations, specifically those in Central America.

I would like to give, if I may, a couple of individuals cases that I personally have seen, first that occurred in El Salvador maybe 10 or 12 years ago. They took us to a tailor shop where this gentleman volunteered to give me a three-piece suit, cut to my standard style and size and everything, for $100. I don't know how the rest of the Members feel, but this was unbelievable.

I found out that this gentleman in his time of need found out that he could get a sewing machine for $100 that he borrowed from the microenterprise. With that $100 and a pair of scissors, he started producing clothes. At the time that I saw him there, he had four sewing machines and the whole operation, and his $100 now had become $3,000 that he was able to invest. That was in El Salvador.

Several years later when we were in Nicaragua we asked, why in the world don't microenterprises come to Nicaragua? In this particular case they took us to a shopping area of downtown Managua and showed us a young lady there who had borrowed $200 to start off with. She put vegetables and flowers and seeds and so forth for sale. After 3 years in that small investment of about $200, I asked her what her inventory was. It was a little grocery store by then. She had $7,000 worth of groceries there.

All of this was done by small loans that were immediately paid back. Their loan qualities were unbelievable the way they paid it back, just as the statistics have already shown. I would just like to recommend highly that this is a wonderful program and we ought to do something about it.

In many impoverished countries there are no secure financial institutions where people can apply for loans, no training facilities to teach people a trade, and no encouraging signs of growth and prosperity. The microenterprise programs make these resources available, and allow people who once had no hope of sustaining a livable wage, it gives them a real chance to become self-sufficient.

As the U.S. continues to promote assistance, as opposed to handouts, I think it is important for us to applaud programs that grant an opportunity for growth. I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, which has proven to benefit the international community that needs our help most, the poorest of the poor.

Please support the Microenterprise Self-Reliance Act.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the spirit of bipartisanship to support the goals and the objective of microenterprises in developing countries.

Many of the world's poorest workers are self-employed. These entrepreneurs are trapped in poverty because they cannot obtain credit at a reasonable rate that will allow them to build their assets and expand their businesses.

The global credit program for microenterprises provides funds that will increase the flow of credit from the formal financial sector to the micro entrepreneurs, with a view to improving their productivity, income, and employment level.

Over the past years we have learned firsthand the dramatic impact that microenterprise has had on the lives of millions of the world's poorest families, enabling many of them to pull themselves out of poverty. Our support for microenterprise needs to be strengthened, and our resolve and commitment to ensure that we meet the goals and objectives of microenterprise fortified.

Two examples were shared recently by RESULTS with my office. In Uganda a woman borrowed money to invest in her brick-making company. She was producing 1,000 bricks, and she borrowed money, and she has now increased it to 5,000 bricks. She uses the money to school her children, to allow them to have a better opportunity than herself.

The second example is in El Salvador, a woman borrowed $57 to increase her bread-making business. She has been so successful she has now bought out her supplier.

These examples are indeed proof that this program is a success, not only for the people it is intended for, but also their ability to pay back the loans exceeds that in the private sector.

We must recommit ourselves to ensuring that 100 million of the world's poorest families are afforded the opportunity that many of us take for granted, the opportunity to direct and shape our future by investing our skills, talents, and energy into building, sustaining, and expanding small businesses.

H.R. 1143 grants that opportunity and assurance by authorizing grant assistance of $152 million in the fiscal year 2000, $167 million in fiscal year 2001, to further the development of microenterprise in developing countries. This is a modest investment that can have a powerful impact on the eradication of poverty.

Microcredit is not charity, nor is it big government gone astray, but rather, microcredit is a sound and wise investment that deserves priority and protection. Without a focused effort to empower individuals in the poorest regions of the world, dire poverty will continue to plague our global community, draining our capital resources, sapping our political will, and destroying countless human lives worldwide.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this desperately needed legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, Section 4(b)5 of the bill states that ''Assistance provided under this subsection may only be used to support microenterprise programs and may not be used to support programs not directly related to the purposes described in paragraph (1).''

I would ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH), do I understand correctly that this language prohibits requirements not directly related to the enterprise for which credit is extended from being imposed on a microcredit beneficiary as a condition on their eligibility for assistance?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman that this is correct.

This colloquy, for the purposes of the record and for my colleagues, has been worked out with the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and with his full concurrence.

The answer to the question is, that is correct.

Mr. BALLENGER. Requirements not directly related to the microenterprise cannot be considered as a factor affecting the amount or terms of the assistance that microcredit applicants are eligible to receive?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes, that is correct. Funds provided by this bill may be used only to support microenterprise programs. A requirement that a microcredit applicant fulfill some unrelated precondition would constitute support for something other than microenterprise programs. Thus, such requirements are expressly prohibited by section 4(b)5.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thus, to take an extreme example, a program funded by this bill could not require that an applicant be sterilized before she is eligible for microenterprise assistance?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. Section 4(b)5 would prohibit funding of any program that attempted to impose such a condition.

Mr. BALLENGER. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the vice chairman of the Committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

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

□ 1230

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me this time.

I am an original cosponsor and strong supporter of this bill. This Member first became familiar with the microenterprise concept during the 99th Congress. At that time, an organization known by its acronym of FINCA, F-I-N-C-A, worked closely with poverty stricken areas of Latin America and South America. The concept of microenterprises, I think had not had much visibility at all on Capitol Hill or in America until we learned about FINCA's good work.

Having since visited numerous developing countries while serving on the Committee on International Relations, this Member can testify to the utter despair and grinding poverty that is all too commonplace throughout so much of the world and to the hope which microenterprise programs can provide.

Much of the grinding poverty could be redressed by just a few dollars' worth of tools and raw materials. In countries where the average wage may be no more than 50 cents a day, as little as $10 can provide someone with the reed to make straw mats or leather for shoes. Just a few dollars can stock a peddler's cart and allow him or her to rise above helpless poverty.

Microenterprise initiatives will not make anyone rich, but it will pay for tuition for a child's basic education or the cost of a concrete surface to replace an old dirt floor, or a pump where the water is not tainted. Importantly, microenterprise can provide these small luxuries, or I would say basic elements of life, but they come only to those who are willing to combine these small loans with hard work.

Recipients of these loans certainly do work hard. It is reported that recipients repay the principal within the first month in many cases, and 95 to 98 percent of recipients repay the loans on time. Indeed, that repayment rate is incredibly good as compared to commercial banks' repayments. It also serves, I think, as a strong testament to recipients' receptivity to these programs.

The legislation before this body today gives an important boost to existing microenterprise programs like the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, where microenterprise has had great positive effects for a whole generation of women; or BancoSol, which now has the largest number of clients of any financial institution in Bolivia. This legislation will ensure their survival.

H.R. 1143 sets forth the guidelines to ensure that the needs of the poorest of the poor are addressed. One-half of all microenterprise resources are devoted to loans of $300 or less.

Importantly, the legislation establishes a facility specifically devoted to countries devastated by war or natural disasters. This is a particularly important provision, Mr. Chairman. It means all is not lost when torrential flooding destroys an entire economy, as was the case last year in Bangladesh. It means that people in war-torn regions can return home and try to start life anew, as has been the case in Rwanda and Cambodia.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1143 speaks to the best part of our collective conscience. Through this legislation, the U.S. is offering hope to those who have no hope, a helping hand to those who want to make for themselves a better life.

This Member congratulates the author of this initiative, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations. It is largely through his efforts that microenterprise has become such an important part of our foreign assistance efforts.

This Member would also thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking Democrat on the committee, for his constructive efforts to move this legislation forward.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me this time and for his support of the legislation.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, first, to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), sitting in for the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), I thank her so much for yielding me the time. I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) as

well as the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), our ranking member, and the entire committee for bringing to us such an important bill.

As has been mentioned, whether in Bangladesh, India, Africa, or some other country of the world, including the United States, microcredit, the assistance to small businesses, primarily women I might add, is the difference between success and failure in so many children's lives.

As has been said earlier, the World Bank reports that 1.2 billion people in the world exist on less than $1 a day. That is 20 percent of the world's population exist on less than $1 per day.

This microenterprise legislation provides for the children of these families hope for the future. It provides a way where their parents, in many cases women, can have their own businesses, can earn their own fees and dollars and then send their children to school to receive an adequate education.

I commend the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and all of those who brought this bill to the floor.

I recently returned from overseas and had another first-hand look at some very successful microenterprise operations. They are in fact working. They are the difference between success and failure, not only in the woman's life, who in many cases is the breadwinner, is the nurturer of the family, is the person that instills strength and self-confidence in children, that one can be what one wants to be.

It has been reported that microenterprise, also the loans are repaid at a much higher rate than traditional lending practices; that, not only are the businesses successful, but the payback in large measure has been paid back.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us move H.R. 1143 out of this Chamber and to the signature of the President. It is the difference between success and failure. Microenterprising is a tool not only used in this country but in the poorest of the poor countries of the world to say that this is a wonderful world. When we work together, we can save many children's lives and offer them hope for the future.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the very distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for yielding me this time and for leading the debate on our side of the aisle today and for her support for this program.

This is a neat, wonderful concept, and it is something that we can agree on, which also says a lot as well. We ought to be looking for more of these ideas.

It is a testament to the strength of the human spirit, this program. It has taught a couple of things. One is that poor people would much rather that we give them loans than grants, that we have confidence in their ability to pay money back, that all they really need is a little seed money to get started.

The second thing it teaches us is that the most underused economic resource in this world are the women of the world who have always been doing most of the work but very seldom have they ever had any real control, particularly economic control, over their lives.

So the programs that work are the ones that go out and find the women in the villages that know what is going on and have the fortitude and the determination to provide for their families and give them the resources. Boy, the ideas that they come up with and the kind of effort that they put into these little microenterprise efforts, they are just heartwarming.

It should be known also that these microenterprise banks charge a lot of money in interest, a lot of them, more interest than we would want to pay. Yet, invariably, the vast majority of these loans get paid off. It is just unbelievable what people can do with just a little seed money if given the confidence and the resources.

So I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and all the others on the Republican side and certainly the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), our ranking member, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and all of the members of the committee.

We have got a good thing going here. It costs us very little money. The only people that seem to have some reluctance about this is the White House. I read their statement of administration policy, and I cannot really figure out what they are trying to say and what their objection would be. But I am sorry that they do not get fully behind this, because they have done a lot to make microenterprise programs work. They should have endorsed this piece of legislation. But I know that they are going to fully fund it, and they are going to get behind it, particularly USAID, and make it work.

We cannot always control the situations, and we have had some real catastrophes that have prevented people in Third World countries from being able to pay back their loans. Bangladesh comes to mind. So we need some provision to make sure that money is available. This provides that. It ensures that there is going to be this revolving fund available.

This is the right way to do it. We are institutionalizing it. This is going to get a unanimous vote, I hope, and it deserves one. The people of the Third World, to take advantage of this, deserve the little seed money that this provides to them.

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

I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for his kind remarks and also for his acknowledgment and recognition of the competence and the tenacity and the commitment of women to economic development and job creation.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield for just a moment, we men have always known that; it is just seldom that we ever admitted it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for coming out front and talking about it publicly.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1143, the Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999. I support this bill because I have witnessed first-hand the uplifting effects of microcredit on the economic and humanitarian conditions of struggling nations around the world. I have closely monitored its enormously positive influence on women and ethnic minorities, those most likely to face discrimination in creating small businesses and establishing social support networks in their communities. H.R. 1143 would allow these essential developments to continue and expand, aiding the stability of new democracies and enabling all citizens a stake in their future directions.

The microcredit program, more than any other government initiative, is founded on the free market ideals central to America's greatness. By providing small amounts of start-up capital to aspiring entrepreneurs, productive businesses can be established which, in a collective manner, change society for the better. For example, when a woman in a small African nation borrows a few dollars to set up a crafts shop, she does far more than better her family's financial situation. She may create employment opportunities for others in her small community, she may held to break generations of poverty in her town, she may generate income that will allow the creation of even more commerce, she may break down age-old stereotypes of women's social roles, and she may make it possible for untold numbers of women to realize the opportunities provided to her by the blessing of microcredit.

As the distinguished Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), J. Brian Atwood, explained: ''Microenterprise is one of our most effective tools to foster bottom-up growth and to give women an opportunity to make a place for themselves in business and in their communities.'' For only a minimal investment—few loans exceed $300, and the return rate is nearly 100 percent—we can peacefully alter centuries of history, one entrepreneur at a time.

H.R. 1143 will strengthen this much-needed program by authorizing increased funds ($152 million in FY 2000 and $167 million in FY 2001) and ensuring that at least 50 percent of microenterprise resources be used for poverty lending to the neediest participants in Third World economies. Furthermore, H.R. 1143 would permanently establish two new provisions in law to govern grants and loans, and it would create a loan facility inside USAID to help U.S.-sponsored microfinance institutions survive natural disasters, civil wars, and national financial crises.

I applaud these reforms, and I commend International Relations Committee Chairman BENJAMIN A. GILMAN and Ranking Member

SAM GEJDENSON for their hard work in working out the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to recognize the extraordinary commitment of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton to the microenterprise program. Since the earliest days of the Clinton Presidency, Mrs. Clinton has used her exceptional brilliance and influence to promote this initiative around the world. Long before other opinion leaders understood the importance of targeted microcredit investments, she was proclaiming the benefits of this program for women and families in a host of nations. I would also like to note the impressive contributions of Administrator Atwood in implementing this essential component of our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1143.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1143, the Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999. Microcredit is the process of providing small loans to very poor people at commercial interest rates for the startup or expansion of small business ventures. It has been successful in promoting economic growth and ending the worst aspects of poverty in some of the most destitute places in the world.

Unfortunately, despite its proven track record, microcredit has not been utilized to its full potential. Funding for microcredit within the U.S. Agency for International Development has not kept pace with the growing capacity to lend. Despite the fact that in 1994 USAID set the goal of directing half of overall microenterprise funds to programs serving the poorest people in loans of $300 or less by the end of 1996, only about 41 percent of these funds are currently reaching this target population.

The Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999 calls for $152 million in fiscal year 2000 and $167 million in fiscal year 2001 and designates half of all microenterprise funds as loans of $300 or less for the neediest people in the world. Along with helping the world's poorest people, this legislation increases work skills and improves the economies of the developing nations where microcredit initiatives are in place. Currently, approximately 1.2 billion people—one fifth of the world population—live in extreme poverty. As long as poverty continues to plague so many millions, there will be no lasting peace or stability in our world.

Microcredit is one of the most cost-effective and successful ways to combat poverty and help achieve peace. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1143.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. The concept of microlending has existed for over two decades, created by Muhammed Yunus through the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh. This concept has enjoyed incredible success and has improved the lives of millions of people, especially women. The Grameen Bank has inspired microlending programs in fifty-six other countries and has been copied by 5,000 international institutions. In fact, this system has even been adopted by the Women's Self-Employment Project in Chicago to successfully wean unwed mothers off of welfare.

I am very pleased that the U.S. Congress is not only condoning U.S. participation in the microcredit system but expanding and improving our involvement in these programs with this legislation. I have seen the incredible impact that a small loan can have on a single family in the developing world. A short-term loan of $75 used to be unaccessible for most people in these countries. However, through the Grameen Bank and bilateral microcredit programs, these loans are now available and becoming more widespread. The reason for this success and expansion is due to the unparalleled rate of repayment. In 1997, the Grameen Bank had a 94 percent repayment rate.

Unfortunately, microcredit programs have been drastically impacted by the recent natural disasters and financial crises in various regions of the world. However, these events should not be interpreted as failures in microcredit programs, but as opportunities for expanding the program. Farmers in Nicaragua are in desperate need of a few dollars to replant their crops. Weavers in Thailand have seen their currency plummet and just need a small amount of investment to keep their fledgling businesses stay afloat. While Grameen Bank loan repayment rates plunged to 68 percent immediately after the floods in Bangladesh last year, these rates rebounded to 88 percent in just a few months. H.R. 1143 will expand these credit programs and provided the cushion necessary to enable the financial institutions and other organizations operating these microcredit programs to help those that are in the most desperate need. This legislation provides some of the important infrastructure programs necessary for many countries struggling from recent crises to move from disaster assistance to economic development.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1143, the ''Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999.'' H.R. 1143 would provide vital assistance in the form of credit and other financial services to microentrepreneur programs as part of a global approach to aiding the world's poorest individuals.

Many people in this world rely on self-employment as a necessary means for their livelihood. In this regard, the importance of the role of microentrepreneurs in our global economy cannot be overlooked. The general philosophy of the microenterprise industry is to bring new sources of income to segments of the population where job opportunities are low by providing small amounts of credit to those whom have not had access to commercial credit. Microfinance programs are critical to the fight against hunger and poverty. Such programs are a leveraging tool for decreasing dependence on foreign assistance. H.R. 1143 authorizes grants to support microlending programs in the amount of $152 million for FY 2000 and $167 million for FY 2001. Fifty percent of these funds must be used for loans of $300 or less.

Last year, the Financial Times reported that ''though Latin American has moved furthest towards the commercialization of microfinance, it is also commonplace in other developing countries, and the World Bank estimates that more than $7 billion of microcredit is outstanding.''

A report released by the U.N. last year acknowledges the success of microcredit in Latin America and Asia. However, the report states that ''it is not clear if the extent to which microcredit has spread, or can potentially spread, can make a major dent in global poverty.'' The report based this conclusion on the assertion that ''the poorest of the poor'' are usually ''not in a position to undertake an economic activity partly because they lack business skills and even the motivation for business.'' While I support H.R. 1143, I make this point for the purpose of impressing upon this Congress the importance of ensuring that the extension of funds to poor microentrepreneurs is in reality contributing to the battle against poverty and hunger.

Innovative ways of bringing economic vitalization to areas of the world that sorely lack any financial sustainability should be a priority for any global financial architecture. H.R. 1143 contributes to that strategy and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by section, and each section shall be considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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 ''Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999''.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

The Congress makes the following findings and declarations:

(1) According to the World Bank, more than 1,200,000,000 people in the developing world, or one-fifth of the world's population, subsist on less than $1 a day.

(2) Over 32,000 of their children die each day from largely preventable malnutrition and disease.

(3)(A) Women in poverty generally have larger work loads and less access to educational and economic opportunities than their male counterparts.

(B) Directly aiding the poorest of the poor, especially women, in the developing world has a positive effect not only on family incomes, but also on child nutrition, health

and education, as women in particular reinvest income in their families.

(4)(A) The poor in the developing world, particularly women, generally lack stable employment and social safety nets.

(B) Many turn to self-employment to generate a substantial portion of their livelihood. In Africa, over 80 percent of employment is generated in the informal sector of the self-employed poor.

(C) These poor entrepreneurs are often trapped in poverty because they cannot obtain credit at reasonable rates to build their asset base or expand their otherwise viable self-employment activities.

(D) Many of the poor are forced to pay interest rates as high as 10 percent per day to money lenders.

(5)(A) The poor are able to expand their incomes and their businesses dramatically when they can access loans at reasonable interest rates.

(B) Through the development of self-sustaining microfinance programs, poor people themselves can lead the fight against hunger and poverty.

(6)(A) On February 2–4, 1997, a global Microcredit Summit was held in Washington, District of Columbia, to launch a plan to expand access to credit for self-employment and other financial and business services to 100,000,000 of the world's poorest families, especially the women of those families, by 2005. While this scale of outreach may not be achievable in this short timeframe, the realization of this goal could dramatically alter the face of global poverty.

(B) With an average family size of five, achieving this goal will mean that the benefits of microfinance will thereby reach nearly half of the world's more than 1,000,000,000 absolute poor people.

(7)(A) Nongovernmental organizations, such as those that comprise the Microenterprise Coalition (such as the Grameen Bank (Bangladesh,) K–REP (Kenya), and networks such as Accion International, the Foundation for International Community Assistance (FINCA), and the credit union movement) are successful in lending directly to the very poor.

(B) Microfinance institutions such as BRAC (Bangladesh), BancoSol (Bolivia), SEWA Bank (India), and ACEP (Senegal) are regulated financial institutions that can raise funds directly from the local and international capital markets.

(8)(A) Microenterprise institutions not only reduce poverty, but also reduce the dependency on foreign assistance.

(B) Interest income on the credit portfolio is used to pay recurring institutional costs, assuring the long-term sustainability of development assistance.

(9) Microfinance institutions leverage foreign assistance resources because loans are recycled, generating new benefits to program participants.

(10)(A) The development of sustainable microfinance institutions that provide credit and training, and mobilize domestic savings, are critical components to a global strategy of poverty reduction and broad-based economic development.

(B) In the efforts of the United States to lead the development of a new global financial architecture, microenterprise should play a vital role. The recent shocks to international financial markets demonstrate how the financial sector can shape the destiny of nations. Microfinance can serve as a powerful tool for building a more inclusive financial sector which serves the broad majority of the world's population including the very poor and women and thus generate more social stability and prosperity.

(C) Over the last two decades, the United States has been a global leader in promoting the global microenterprise sector, primarily through its development assistance programs at the United States Agency for International Development. Additionally, the United States Department of the Treasury and the Department of State have used their authority to promote microenterprise in the development programs of international financial institutions and the United Nations.

(11)(A) In 1994, the United States Agency for International Development launched the ''Microenterprise Initiative'' in partnership with the Congress.

(B) The initiative committed to expanding funding for the microenterprise programs of the Agency, and set a goal that, by the end of fiscal year 1996, half of all microenterprise resources would support programs and institutions that provide credit to the poorest, with loans under $300.

(C) In order to achieve the goal of the microcredit summit, increased investment in microcredit institutions serving the poorest will be critical.

(12) Providing the United States share of the global investment needed to achieve the goal of the microcredit summit will require only a small increase in United States funding for international microcredit programs, with an increased focus on institutions serving the poorest.

(13)(A) In order to reach tens of millions of the poorest with microcredit, it is crucial to expand and replicate successful microcredit institutions.

(B) These institutions need assistance in developing their institutional capacity to expand their services and tap commercial sources of capital.

(14) Nongovernmental organizations have demonstrated competence in developing networks of local microfinance institutions and other assistance delivery mechanisms so that they reach large numbers of the very poor, and achieve financial sustainability.

(15) Recognizing that the United States Agency for International Development has developed very effective partnerships with nongovernmental organizations, and that the Agency will have fewer missions to carry out its work, the Agency should place priority on investing in those nongovernmental network institutions that meet performance criteria through the central funding mechanisms of the Agency.

(16) By expanding and replicating successful microcredit institutions, it should be possible to create a global infrastructure to provide financial services to the world's poorest families.

(17)(A) The United States can provide leadership to other bilateral and multilateral development agencies as such agencies expand their support to the microenterprise sector.

(B) The United States should seek to improve coordination among G–7 countries in the support of the microenterprise sector in order to leverage the investment of the United States with that of other donor nations.

(18) Through increased support for microenterprise, especially credit for the poorest, the United States can continue to play a leadership role in the global effort to expand financial services and opportunity to 100,000,000 of the poorest families on the planet.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to make microenterprise development an important element of United States foreign economic policy and assistance;

(2) to provide for the continuation and expansion of the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to the development of microenterprise institutions as outlined in its 1994 Microenterprise Initiative;

(3) to support and develop the capacity of United States and indigenous nongovernmental organization intermediaries to provide credit, savings, training and technical services to microentrepreneurs;

(4) to increase the amount of assistance devoted to credit activities designed to reach the poorest sector in developing countries, and to improve the access of the poorest, particularly women, to microenterprise credit in developing countries; and

(5) to encourage the United States Agency for International Development to coordinate microfinance policy, in consultation with the Department of the Treasury and the Department of State, and to provide global leadership in promoting microenterprise for the poorest among bilateral and multilateral donors.

SEC. 4. MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT GRANT ASSISTANCE.

Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second section 129 (as added by section 4 of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–320)) as section 130; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 131. MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT GRANT ASSISTANCE.

''(a) FINDINGS AND POLICY.—The Congress finds and declares that—

''(1) the development of microenterprise is a vital factor in the stable growth of developing countries and in the development of free, open, and equitable international economic systems;

''(2) it is therefore in the best interest of the United States to assist the development of microenterprises in developing countries; and

''(3) the support of microenterprise can be served by programs providing credit, savings, training, and technical assistance.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—(1) In carrying out this part, the President is authorized to provide grant assistance for programs to increase the availability of credit and other services to microenterprises lacking full access to capital and training through—

''(A) grants to microfinance institutions for the purpose of expanding the availability of credit, savings, and other financial services to microentrepreneurs;

''(B) training, technical assistance, and other support for microenterprises to enable them to make better use of credit, to better manage their enterprises, and to increase their income and build their assets;

''(C) capacity building for microfinance institutions in order to enable them to better meet the credit and training needs of microentrepreneurs; and

''(D) policy and regulatory programs at the country level that improve the environment for microfinance institutions that serve the poor and very poor.

''(2) Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) shall be provided through organizations that have a capacity to develop and implement microenterprise programs, including particularly—

''(A) United States and indigenous private and voluntary organizations;

''(B) United States and indigenous credit unions and cooperative organizations;

''(C) other indigenous governmental and nongovernmental organizations; or

''(D) business development services, including indigenous craft programs.

''(3) In carrying out sustainable poverty-focused programs under paragraph (1), 50 percent of all microenterprise resources shall be used for direct support of programs under this subsection through practitioner institutions that provide credit and other financial

services to the poorest with loans of $300 or less in 1995 United States dollars and can cover their costs of credit programs with revenue from lending activities or that demonstrate the capacity to do so in a reasonable time period.

''(4) The President should continue support for central mechanisms and missions that—

''(A) provide technical support for field missions;

''(B) strengthen the institutional development of the intermediary organizations described in paragraph (2);

''(C) share information relating to the provision of assistance authorized under paragraph (1) between such field missions and intermediary organizations; and

''(D) support the development of nonprofit global microfinance networks, including credit union systems, that—

''(i) are able to deliver very small loans through a vast grassroots infrastructure based on market principles; and

''(ii) act as wholesale intermediaries providing a range of services to microfinance retail institutions, including financing, technical assistance, capacity building and safety and soundness accreditation.

''(5) Assistance provided under this subsection may only be used to support microenterprise programs and may not be used to support programs not directly related to the purposes described in paragraph (1).

''(c) MONITORING SYSTEM.—In order to maximize the sustainable development impact of the assistance authorized under subsection (a)(1), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall establish a monitoring system that—

''(1) establishes performance goals for such assistance and expresses such goals in an objective and quantifiable form, to the extent feasible;

''(2) establishes performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the achievement of the goals and objectives of such assistance;

''(3) provides a basis for recommendations for adjustments to such assistance to enhance the sustainable development impact of such assistance, particularly the impact of such assistance on the very poor, particularly poor women; and

''(4) provides a basis for recommendations for adjustments to measures for reaching the poorest of the poor, including proposed legislation containing amendments to improve paragraph (3).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) There are authorized to be appropriated $152,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $167,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 to carry out this section.

''(B) Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subparagraph (A) are authorized to remain available until expended.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 5. MICRO- AND SMALL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT CREDITS.

Section 108 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151f) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 108. MICRO- AND SMALL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT CREDITS.

''(a) FINDINGS AND POLICY.—The Congress finds and declares that—

''(1) the development of micro- and small enterprises are a vital factor in the stable growth of de- veloping countries and in the development and stability of a free, open, and equitable international economic system; and

''(2) it is, therefore, in the best interests of the United States to assist the development of the enterprises of the poor in developing countries and to engage the United States private sector in that process.

''(b) PROGRAM.—To carry out the policy set forth in subsection (a), the President is authorized to provide assistance to increase the availability of credit to micro- and small enterprises lacking full access to credit, including through—

''(1) loans and guarantees to credit institutions for the purpose of expanding the availability of credit to micro- and small enterprises;

''(2) training programs for lenders in order to enable them to better meet the credit needs of microentrepreneurs; and

''(3) training programs for microentrepreneurs in order to enable them to make better use of credit and to better manage their enterprises.

''(c) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall establish criteria for determining which entities described in subsection (b) are eligible to carry out activities, with respect to micro- and small enterprises, assisted under this section. Such criteria may include the following:

''(1) The extent to which the recipients of credit from the entity do not have access to the local formal financial sector.

''(2) The extent to which the recipients of credit from the entity are among the poorest people in the country.

''(3) The extent to which the entity is oriented toward working directly with poor women.

''(4) The extent to which the entity recovers its cost of lending to the poor.

''(5) The extent to which the entity implements a plan to become financially sustainable.

''(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—Assistance provided under this section may only be used to support micro- and small enterprise programs and may not be used to support programs not directly related to the purposes described in subsection (b).

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) There are authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 to carry out this section.

''(B) Amounts authorized to be appropriated under subparagraph (A) shall be made available for the subsidy cost, as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, for activities under this section.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the cost of administrative expenses in carrying out this section.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this subsection are in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 6. MICROFINANCE LOAN FACILITY.

Chapter 1 of part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding the following new section:

''SEC. 132. UNITED STATES MICROFINANCE LOAN FACILITY.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to establish a United States Microfinance Loan Facility (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Facility') to pool and manage the risk from natural disasters, war or civil conflict, national financial crisis, or short-term financial movements that threaten the long-term development of United States-supported microfinance institutions.

''(b) SUPERVISORY BOARD OF THE FACILITY.—(1) The Facility shall be supervised by a board composed of the following representatives appointed by the President not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 1999:

''(A) 1 representative from the Department of the Treasury.

''(B) 1 representative from the Department of State.

''(C) 1 representative from the United States Agency for International Development.

''(D)(i) 2 United States citizens from United States nongovernmental organizations that operate United States-sponsored microfinance activities.

''(ii) Individuals described in clause (i) shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

''(2) The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development or his designee shall serve as Chairman and an additional voting member of the board.

''(c) DISBURSEMENTS.—(1) The board shall make disbursements from the Facility to United States-sponsored microfinance institutions to prevent the bankruptcy of such institutions caused by (A) natural disasters, (B) national wars or civil conflict, and (C) national financial crisis or other short term financial movements that threaten the long-term development of United States-supported microfinance institutions. Such disbursements shall be made as concessional loans that are repaid maintaining the real value of the loan to microfinance institutions that demonstrate the capacity to resume self-sustained operations within a reasonable time period. The Facility shall provide for loan losses with each loan disbursed.

''(2) During each of the fiscal years 2001 and 2002, funds may not be made available from the Facility until 15 days after notification of the availability has been provided to the congressional committees specified in section 634A of this Act in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under that section.

''(d) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the last representative to the board is appointed pursuant to subsection (b), the chairman of the board shall prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the policies, rules, and regulations of the Facility.

''(e) FUNDING.—(1) Not more than $5,000,000 of amounts made available to carry out sections 103 through 106 of this Act for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 may be made available to carry out this section for each such fiscal year.

''(2) Amounts made available under paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts available under other provisions of law to carry out this section.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

''(2) UNITED STATES-SUPPORTED MICROFINANCE INSTITUTION.—The term 'United States-supported microfinance institution' means a financial intermediary that has received funds made available under this Act for fiscal year 1980 and each subsequent fiscal year.''.

SEC. 7. REPORT RELATING TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF MICROFINANCE INSTITUTIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the

President, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prepare and transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the most cost-effective methods for increasing the access of poor people to credit, other financial services, and related training.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report described in subsection (a)—

(1) should include how the President, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, will jointly develop a comprehensive strategy for advancing the global microenterprise sector in a way that maintains market principles while assuring that the very poor, particularly women, obtain access to financial services; and

(2) shall provide guidelines and recommendations for—

(A) instruments to assist microenterprise networks to develop multi-country and regional microlending programs;

(B) technical assistance to foreign governments, foreign central banks and regulatory entities to improve the policy environment for microfinance institutions, and to strengthen the capacity of supervisory bodies to supervise microcredit institutions;

(C) the potential for federal chartering of United States-based international microfinance network institutions, including proposed legislation;

(D) instruments to increase investor confidence in microcredit institutions which would strengthen the long-term financial position of the microcredit institutions and attract capital from private sector entities and individuals, such as a rating system for microcredit institutions and local credit bureaus;

(E) an agenda for integrating microfinance into United States foreign policy initiatives seeking to develop and strengthen the global finance sector; and

(F) innovative instruments to attract funds from the capital markets, such as instruments for leveraging funds from the local commercial banking sector, and the securitization of microloan portfolios.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 8. UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS GLOBAL LEADER AND COORDINATOR OF BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS AND POLICY.—The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the United States can provide leadership to other bilateral and multilateral development agencies as such agencies expand their support to the microenterprise sector; and

(2) the United States should seek to improve coordination among G-7 countries in the support of the microenterprise sector in order to leverage the investment of the United States with that of other donor nations.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of State should seek to support and strengthen the effectiveness of microfinance activities in United Nations agencies, such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), which have provided key leadership in developing the microenterprise sector; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should instruct each United States Executive Director of the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) to advocate the development of a coherent and coordinated strategy to support the microenterprise sector and an increase of multilateral resource flows for the purposes of building microenterprise retail and wholesale intermediaries.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 3, beginning on line 22, strike ''While this scale'' and all that follows through line 25.

Page 17, line 15, strike ''part 1'' and insert ''part I''.

Page 19, line 2, strike '', and'' and insert '', or''.

Page 19, after line 16, insert the following:

''(d) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

''(1) POLICY PROVISIONS.—In providing the credit assistance authorized by this section, the board should apply, as appropriate, the policy provisions in this part applicable to development assistance activities.

''(2) DEFAULT AND PROCUREMENT PROVISIONS.—

''(A) DEFAULT PROVISION.—The provisions of section 620(q) of this Act, or any comparable provisions of law, shall not be construed to prohibit assistance to a country in the event that a private sector recipient of assistance furnished under this section is in default in its payment to the United States for the period specified in such section.

''(B) PROCUREMENT PROVISION.—Assistance may be provided under this section without regard to section 604(a) of this Act.

''(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF CREDIT ASSISTANCE.—(A) Credit assistance provided under this section shall be offered on such terms and conditions, including fees charged, as the board may determine.

''(B) The principal amount of loans made or guaranteed under this section in any fiscal year, with respect to any single borrower, may not exceed $30,000,000.

''(C) No payment may be made under any guarantee issued under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misrepresentation for which the party seeking payment is responsible.

''(4) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.—All guarantees issued under this section shall constitute obligations, in accordance with the terms of such guarantees, of the United States of America and the full faith and credit of the United States of America is hereby pledged for the full payment and performance of such obligations to the extent of the guarantee.

Page 19, line 17, strike ''(d)'' and insert ''(e)''.

Page 19, strike line 23 and all that follows through line 5 on page 20 and insert the following:

''(f) FUNDING.—(1)(A) Of the amounts made available to carry out this part for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001, up to $5,000,000 may be made available for—

''(i) the subsidy cost, as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, to carry out this section; and

''(ii) subject to subparagraph (B), the cost of administrative expenses to carry out this section.

''(B) Of the amount made available under subparagraph (A) to carry out this section for a fiscal year, not more than $500,000 may be made available for administrative expenses under subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(2) Amounts made available under paragraph (1) are in addition to amounts available under any other provision of law to carry out this section.

Page 20, line 6, strike ''(f)'' and insert ''(g)''.

Page 20, line 16, strike ''and each'' and insert ''or any''.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was crafted in conjunction with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the administration to fund the microfinance loan facility.

The amendment provides that up to $5 million may be used to leverage up to $30 million to rescue a U.S.-supported microenterprise institution whose financial situation has been undermined by natural catastrophes or other events out of the control of that institution.

We have seen key microfinance institutions undermined in Bangladesh and Central America where it is hard to run a bank after all your clients have been killed or made homeless by a flood or by a hurricane. With the ad hoc rescue packages we have assembled in the past, we have been able to not only prevent the collapse of U.S.-backed microfinance institutions, but to turn them into lending agents of the recovery process, especially in Honduras.

This amendment would help create a microfinance loan facility to ensure that we no longer have to put together ad hoc packages to rescue such institutions. I think it is a good amendment, and I hope it has the full support of the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 1245

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1143) to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution

136, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1143, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1:15 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1:15 p.m.

□ 1337

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT) at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 46 by the yeas and nays, and H.Con.Res. 35 by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER MEDAL OF VALOR ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 46.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 46, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Paul
Sanford

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Armey
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Carson
Cooksey
Davis (IL)
DeLay
DeMint
Goss
Hastings (FL)
Hoekstra
Lantos
Largent
Oberstar
Rangel
Taylor (NC)
Tierney
Wexler

□ 1401

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the 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. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 81, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CONGRATULATING QATAR FOR COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRATIC IDEALS AND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the

concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 35, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 35, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Carson
Davis (IL)
DeMint
Goode
Hastings (FL)
Hoekstra
Lantos
Largent
Oberstar
Rangel
Tierney
Wexler

□ 1413

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). 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.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time previously allotted to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

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

There was no objection.

HEARTBROKEN FAREWELL TO JOYCE CHIANG

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am truly heartbroken today to rise to say a final farewell to my friend and former staff member, Joyce Chiang.

On January 9, Joyce vanished from her neighborhood. On April 1, she was found on the shore of the Potomac River in southern Fairfax County. Word yesterday of positive identification brought an end to the long vigil kept by her friends and family, and brought an end to the hope that we would see her bright smile once again.

Joyce was born in Chicago, but she lived in California, and she was a California girl. Bright, beautiful, smart as a whip, she volunteered as an intern in my Los Angeles office when she was still a teenager.

In 1990, while a student at Smith College, she spent January in my Washington office as an LBJ intern. At the end of the month, she had to rush back to Smith, because she was Senate Finance Committee Chair of the Smith College Student Government Association, and she had to plan for budget season. In her senior year, Joyce's fellow students elected her to be president of their student body.

Last year, as my daughter was deciding where she might want to go to college, she sought Joyce's advice and, as

a result, she is today a student at Joyce's alma mater, Smith College at Northhampton, Massachusetts.

Joyce graduated from Smith in 1992 and showed up in my office looking for a day job so she could go to law school at night at Georgetown University. I was delighted to give her that job, knowing the benefit was more mine than hers.

True to form, she was a wonderful friend and staffer. In the years from 1992 until 1995, she advanced in responsibility until she became my expert advisor on immigration law. That expertise led the INS to offer her a job as a special assistant to the Director of the Office of Congressional Relations.

Upon her completion of law school, she transferred to the INS office of General Counsel where she was primarily responsible for coordinating and directing the myriad of activities required to implement the 1996 Immigration Act.

Joyce was not only hardworking, bright, and selfless, her personality was so engaging that she literally lit up any room she entered. She was both within and without a beautiful person. That I had the opportunity to know her and work with her will always be a memory of great joy to me.

I cherished her friendship as I do that of her two brothers, Roger and John, and her mother, Judy. I know that they have found some consolation in learning just how many people loved their daughter and sister. Hundreds of her friends from Smith College, from Capitol Hill, from the INS, from Georgetown Law School, and from her community and neighborhoods came together to search for her, to stand vigil in both Washington and Los Angeles, and to pray for her and her family.

I send to Roger, John and Mrs. Chiang my deepest sympathy and love, and pray that they will find comfort in knowing the full extent to which Joyce's life fit the words of the Prophet Micah: ''What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?''

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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUPPORT MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO SACRIFICE THEIR LIVES FOR OUR NATION

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we as a Congress and as a nation are very concerned about the current conflict in the Balkans. It is sad that too many times we do not think of our military or address the problems they face until they are called to duty. Only then are we reminded of the critical role they play in defending this great country and our interests.

Like so many of my colleagues, I do appreciate and value the service of our Nation's armed forces, whether at war or at peace. In the Third District of North Carolina, which I am proud to represent, we are fortunate enough to have four military bases.

I have had the opportunity to spend many hours meeting privately, off base, with dozens of military pilots, commanders, and enlisted personnel. These men and women will tell us what many of my colleagues will, our military's quality of life is far below what it should be. In fact, low pay levels have forced almost 12,000 of our enlisted military families to accept food stamps to survive.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. A junior enlisted soldier at an E1 rank receives approximately $11,500 in basic pay for his service in addition to a housing allowance. But, Mr. Speaker, this same soldier also pays over $3,000 in taxes on that salary.

These are the men and women called upon to defend this Nation. They are placed in harm's way to protect the freedoms my colleagues and I enjoy every day. How can we expect our troops to focus on, or successfully complete, their missions if they are worried about their husbands, wives, and children back home that are struggling to put food on the table?

Our troops accept the ultimate responsibility. They sacrifice their lives for this country, and they accept it voluntarily. Yet, despite the critical job they undertake, many are paid so little they are forced to take on second jobs. Many others are left to rely on government assistance to feed their families.

Last month, I introduced a bill to provide our enlisted military families who are eligible for food stamps with a $500 tax credit. It should not take a conflict like that in Kosovo to remind us of the important part our armed services play in protecting the freedoms of this Nation, but it often does.

Now, as we turn on the evening news and can see our military in action, Congress has an excellent opportunity to show its support for our Nation's troops and work to address the needs of our military. While this $500 tax credit cannot alone guarantee military families will not have to receive food stamps, it can, together with the anticipated increase in basic pay, help show our support and appreciation for our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the amount of encouragement we have already received in the House for this bill. But I will be asking each and every one of my colleagues from both parties to join me in support of this effort. Now is the best time to show our military that we value their job and their sacrifice.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting our military families and join me in supporting H.R. 1055.

God bless our troops, Mr. Speaker, and God bless America.

CHINESE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the House's attention again a continuing problem with Chinese illegal immigration in Guam.

This past Tuesday, on April 6, 82 were apprehended while preparing to come on shore. On Wednesday, April 7, nine more Chinese illegal immigrants were discovered by a U.S. naval vessel whose permits to work on Saipan in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, had expired, and they had decided to try their luck on Guam and boarded a small 18-foot boat bound for Guam.

On Friday, April 9, 93 illegal immigrants were apprehended as their boat ran aground on a reef off of Ritidian Point.

On Sunday, April 11, 38 suspected illegal immigrants, including two women, were caught off of Agat where they arrived on the dilapidated wooden boat.

The number of apprehended Chinese illegal immigrants in Guam caught since January of this year is now up to 473. On a per capita basis, this would be like 5,000 illegal immigrants washing up on the shores of Florida.

A couple of weeks ago, I informed this body about the criminal and inhumane ramifications of this wave of illegal immigrants into Guam. The Chinese are smuggled by crime syndicates which charge them anywhere from $10,000 to $30,000 each. They set sail in squalid quarters and are sometimes abused by their smugglers. They travel over the open seas for over 20 days.

Upon successfully completing the trip, they are made indentured servants and have to pay off their debt to the smugglers who brought them to the U.S.

With the arrival this week of almost 200 illegal immigrants, we see the rise of other factors in Guam. Guam is undergoing current economic crisis caused by the Asian downturn, and we have no basis upon which to deal with them. Yet the INS has gone bankrupt and refuses to house these illegal immigrants and refuses to process them into the United States mainland because they have no funds.

So the Government of Guam has taken on the responsibility to house these illegal immigrants at a cost of

$97 a day in facilities now holding over 400 occupants when they were designed to hold only about 150.

Unlike other areas inside the U.S. mainland, Guam does not have large charitable organizations capable of handling these people. Another factor has been the environmental cost of the waves of illegal immigrants. The ship which ran into the reef on Friday has leaked fuel into Guam's waters, damaging the reef and killing other marine life.

According to the INS officer in charge on Guam, Mr. David Johnston, the waves of illegal immigrants will not stop unless some action is taken immediately. What I have suggested through H.R. 945 is to change the INA in order not to allow or narrow the gap for claiming political asylum in Guam.

What these Chinese syndicates do is use the political asylum claim on Guam in order to further their efforts and to profit from human misery and then bring them into the U.S.

Another thing that we must do is that there is currently a proposal in the White House which has not seen complete fruition, and that is to form an interagency task force to deal with issues of insular areas. This is a critical need. It is important that the White House immediately, sometime this week, convene an interagency task force meeting involving the Department of Justice, the Department of Transportation with the Coast Guard, the Department of Defense and the Department of State in order to address this crisis in Guam.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, last evening I indicated that I would be back to finish today what I started yesterday as to why I introduced legislation that calls on the Congress to be full partners when we determine which civil war we will enter or which we will not. That certainly is the responsibility of the Congress.

□ 1430

My legislation basically says that no DOD money can be used to send ground troops into Kosovo unless approved by the Congress of the United States.

Now, it is right to condemn Milosevic for driving ethnic Albanians out of Kosovo, particularly after the bombing began. And, of course, unfortunately, at the same time, as I mentioned yesterday, we play up to China.

Now, Yugoslavia has 114,000 military and they are the size of Kentucky. China is the size of the United States and they have 2.8 million military. They have another reserve of 1.2 million. They are the worst human rights violators in the world. Their own statistics indicate that they execute more in 1 year than all of the rest of the countries in the world, and yet we play up to them. We know that they send nuclear and chemical arms to rogue nations that we have to deal with.

Again, I hear a lot of people in the well now supporting this issue who were not here when 1.8 million Sudanese found death through either starvation or because of execution. What was the difference? Where were we then? Who was here in the well claiming that somehow or other we should enter that civil war? What about 2.6 million refugees in Afghanistan at the present time, and the other 1.5 million who the Afghan government has dislocated? Who is crying about our involvement there or whether we should be involved?

As I indicated yesterday, when the administration came before us and said we are going into Bosnia for a year, I asked what are we going to do in a year? It began in the 4th Century, the problems in the Balkans. It began in the 4th Century with the fall of the Roman Empire. It was exacerbated in the 10th Century with the rise of the Ottoman Empire. What will we do in a year to undo all the hatred that has been built through all of those centuries? And of course the answer, as we now know it, is nothing. Four years later and $7 billion later we are still there.

And when the White House came before us and said we are going into Haiti for a year, I said this will be the 11th time; the last time we were there 15 years. What will we do differently this time? The answer is nothing, because again we are still there and still spending the money of our taxpayers.

I got to the point where I talked about apples and oranges because people like to somehow or other say this has something to do with Hitler and Nazi Germany. That is nonsense. It has nothing to do with that at all. There is no correlation at all.

What happened at that particular time is the free world did the same stupid thing we do always. After a war, we melt down our defenses. We sat there and we watched Germany build the largest war machine anyone could ever imagine. And so when poor old Chamberlain has to go and try to do a little negotiating to buy time, we blame him as an appeaser. What else could he have done?

We saw a big military buildup in Germany not with the idea of staying within Germany, of course, but with the idea of moving all over the continent, and perhaps all over the world. So there are no similarities in that particular situation.

It is important that we as a Congress be part of this decision-making process when we decide that we are going to enter someone's civil war. Why? Number one, the draft. We positively have to come with the draft. We have spread our forces so thin that the Secretary of the Army last week was out recruiting on his own, trying to get people to join, because we have depleted our forces dramatically. So we better be involved because the draft will be an issue.

We better be involved because body bags will be coming back. We better be involved because, as someone said in an article this weekend, an all-volunteer army is dangerous. It is dangerous because it is used very quickly without much thought. Yes, I am concerned about three GIs. I am also very concerned that GIs would have been where they were. What kind of planning was that? I am also concerned about our raining bombs and missiles on trains carrying passengers who have nothing against us and have not participated in the efforts going on in Kosovo at the present time.

So, again, I call on my colleagues. Join with me and merely say that the Congress of the United States has to be very much involved when we determine which civil war is to our interest and our security and which is not. We will be making decisions, and draft will be one of those decisions, and that will change public opinion dramatically.

RECOGNITION OF DISTINGUISHED U.S. VETERAN JOE P. POE, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of the Congress a distinguished United States veteran by the name of Joe Poe from Dunn, North Carolina.

As our Nation focuses on the mission of our men and women in uniform in Yugoslavia and other parts of the world, I rise to pay tribute to one who has already served. Joe, his wife Marilyn, and their children suffer from undiagnosed Gulf War related illnesses.

Joe served in the United States Army for 20 years before retiring in 1992. His assignments have included serving in the 82nd Airborne and the 101st Airborne Divisions, as a drill sergeant in Panama in Operation Just Cause. He also served in support of joint special operations, and as a team sergeant for a forward surgical team in Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield.

During his career, one of Joe's greatest contributions was helping write and implement the Army's doctrine on forward surgical teams. He is the recipient of the Bronze Star, the Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, and other high honors, decorations and badges.

The Gulf War should have been Joe's last battle, but it was not to be. Following his service, Joe began to experience disabling side effects as a result of his service in the Persian Gulf. Six years later, and thanks to the determination of Joe, his family and the efforts of Kate Darwin, a dedicated social worker on my staff, Joe became designated as 100 percent disabled and became one of the first acknowledged

cases of Gulf War related illnesses by the United States Department of Defense. I am grateful to Kate and commend her for her tireless efforts battling the Federal bureaucracy on behalf of Joe and other veterans.

Even though his speech has slowed considerably now, the whole world listens to Joe Poe. He spends countless hours on the internet contacting other Gulf War veterans and lawmakers to organize them to support Gulf War veterans and their causes.

Late last year, with limited time remaining in the legislative session, Joe and other North Carolina veterans arrived in Washington to press lawmakers to pass legislation on behalf of Gulf War Veterans. As a result of their efforts, H.R. 4035, the Drugs and Informed Consent Act, and H.R. 4036, the Persian Gulf Veterans Health Act were passed, thanks to Joe and his boundless determination and his continuous effort.

I learned things from this. Never underestimate Joe Poe and never underestimate the unshakable will of the human spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I provide for the RECORD an article dated September 30, 1997, from the Daily Record of Dunn, North Carolina, on Joe Poe.

ONCE FIGHTING FOR COUNTRY, NOW FIGHTING FOR HIS LIFE

JOE POE WORKS EVERY DAY TO FIND ANSWERS FOR HIM AND OTHERS ABOUT WHAT HAS CAUSED HIS GULF WAR ILLNESS.

(By Andy Rackley)

Talk with Dunn's Joe Poe and it is easy to understand why so many people have rallied around him and feed off his determination.

Visit with Mr. Poe for more than 10 minutes and it is also easy to see why friends, family members and casual acquaintances call him an unsung hero.

Mr. Poe, a 20-year retired Army veteran, was once the lean, mean fighting machine which invokes the spirit of the elite soldiers in the U.S. Army. He tells of numerous military stories with a fire in his eye which keeps even the non-interested drawn into his tales.

However, the final few years of Mr. Poe's service saw him journey to what he thought would be his final battle—less than a year before his retirement—on the desert basin of the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Poe was team sergeant for a forward surgical team during the Gulf War. There were only two such teams. The team was part of a doctrine in which Mr. Poe's brilliant mind helped design.

NOW USES CANE

Now, a little more than six years after Mr. Poe's participation in the Gulf War, Mr. Poe's mind is still beaming with brilliance, however, it has slowed somewhat.

The soldier which used to walk several clicks (kilometer) in an hour with a 60-pound rucksack on his back, now has to walk with the use of a cane and can barely support his own weight. The man who helped rewrite the Army's doctrine on forward surgical teams, now takes about 30 minutes to type a paragraph on a computer. Regardless of the obstacle and the limitations caused by his illness, he gives a smile and carries on in his fight.

According to Mr. Poe and his family, he has Gulf War illness. He has been poked and prodded by numerous hospitals from Fayetteville to Winston-Salem to Washington, D.C. The prognosis is always different. And the prognosis is never Gulf War Syndrome. He suffers from numerous symptoms like migraines, memory loss, concentration problems, balance, speech, vision-loss and others.

Though frustrated sometimes to tears over the government's attitude toward he and other veterans' suffering from an unknown illness, Mr. Poe still arrives at work early in the mornings—except when he just can't seem to make it in—at the family's business. American Artisans on South Clinton Avenue in Dunn. Though he is no longer able to work with the business, he goes there and digs in for a daily battle of researching information on Gulf War illness, developing and linking numerous veterans groups across the state and nation, and being a support link for other veterans.

DEAD ANIMALS FOUND

He is uncertain of how he contracted the disease, but he does tell frightening stories of his time spent in the Gulf War to include dead animals being found near his camp and mysterious colored clouds. Mr. Poe was near the ammunition depot where Iraqi chemical weapons were destroyed.

He said there were more than 1,600 other reports of mysteriously dead animals. ''DoD (Department of Defense) said the animals died from a natural occurrence of anthrax,'' he said. ''Maybe one or two or maybe a herd, but not 1,600 different reports of animals dead and the flies on them dead, too. It had to be something more.''

He also tells of multiple detections of nerve agents by several units near his camp to include his unit. Mr. Poe was one of the people who gave a report to DoD about the detection of nerve agents. Mr. Poe and his three teammates all suffer from some type of illness.

According to Mr. Poe's wife Marilyn, her husband was already sick by the time he returned from the Gulf. ''We—the children and I—knew something was wrong He had numerous problems and symptoms which you could not define as to one sickness. Everything was steady and in slow progression until 1995 when Joe's speech became dramatically affected, he had trouble walking and just getting around. And he has continued to get worse,'' she said.

FAMILY SHOWING SYMPTOMS

Mrs. Poe and the children have also began to feel signs of the sickness. Mrs. Poe has come down with multiple sclerosis and the children are having problems with their joints. These are the biggest concerns Mr. Poe has. Is his sickness affecting those around him? He has limited his time spent with others in church or eating out with the family because of his fears and concern for others.

''We just want answers,'' Mrs. Poe said. ''I think a lot of the doctors we've seen are also frustrated. A lot of them don't know what is going on or how to help. And those who may know something in the Veterans' hospital may not be able to help because of higher authorities. We just want help before it is too late.''

Mr. Poe doesn't have an answer to the illness facing he and fellow veterans, but every day he adds another piece of information to his Gulf War illness collection. Other veterans say Mr. Poe's fight each day is a huge step for all Gulf War veterans.

One of those people who call Mr. Poe a hero is his wife. ''One thing about Joe is that he has always done things for the benefit of others whether it was his role as a husband, his role as a father or soldier. He always gave it his all and then some. What amazes me is that even with his situation, he is still thinking of others.''

FIGHTING FOR OTHERS

Mike Ange, another local veteran affected with Gulf War Illness, said Mr. Poe is definitely a modern-day hero. ''He has a tremendous medical problem that nobody really knows how to fight. Despite that, he gets up every day and spends most of the day fighting not just for himself, but for others as well.''

Larry Perry, spokesperson for the Desert Storm Veterans of the Carolinas Association, echoes those remarks. ''Joe puts unbelievable amounts of time and energy into this fight. It takes guys like Joe to win this thing. His fight, I hope, will one day lead us to victory.''

Mrs. Poe said their fight has been solidified by the great community they live in. ''I can't say enough about Dunn. The people believe in Joe's fight and they are very supportive. People like those at First Baptist Church who have gone above and beyond what is normally expected. And U.S. Rep. Bob Etheridge who stands behind Joe and other veterans,'' she said.

The Poes have sent their blood off to be tested for mycoplasmal infections at the Institute for Molecular Medicine in Irvine, CA. However, the testing procedure has been put on hold until funds can be raised to continue research. The testing of veterans' blood by the medical institute is not financially-supported by the Department of Defense. The Poe's blood samples are two of 500 waiting to be sampled. Out of the 500 samples, 200 of those are from North Carolina.

Mr. Poe and other veterans plan to hold annual meetings to help disseminate up-to-date information on Gulf War Illness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago we balanced the budget for the first time in 29 years. Now we must meet our next great challenges, making sure that Social Security and Medicare are there for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I like tax cuts, I like them as much as the next person, that is why I voted for $95 billion worth of tax cuts in the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. But with Social Security and Medicare set to go broke in the years 2034 and 2015 respectively, it should go without saying that fixing Social Security and Medicare should have first priority over any more tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, with due respect, my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have put together a budget that does not put one penny toward extending the life of either Social Security or Medicare. Instead, in my judgment, my good friends on the Republican side of the aisle are ready to squander $780 billion worth of our surplus on open-ended irresponsible tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment we ought to save Social Security and Medicare first before we spend any more of the surplus on any more tax cuts.

TRIBUTE TO OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVANT, DR. PHILLIP GORDEN, DIRECTOR OF NIDDK

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment this afternoon to praise a truly outstanding public servant of the Federal Government, someone who has contributed to healthier lives for literally millions of Americans. I speak of Dr. Phillip Gorden, who is stepping down this year after 13 years as head of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases.

As a member of the appropriations subcommittee which funds the National Institutes of Health, I have had the opportunity to work with Dr. Gorden for the past 5 years. He is one of the Nation's preeminent health care professionals, and I am proud to say he is a fellow Mississippian. Dr. Gorden's hometown of Baldwin, Mississippi, is in my congressional district, and I know he maintains close ties to his Mississippi roots. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, he and I are among the few people in Washington, D.C. who subscribe to the Baldwin News, a small but very informative weekly newspaper in North Mississippi.

After earning an undergraduate degree from Vanderbilt University and then graduating from the Vanderbilt School of Medicine, Dr. Gorden completed residency and a fellowship at Yale University before joining the NIH back in 1966. He began his career as a senior investigator in the clinical endocrinology branch at the NIDDK and later became its clinical director. He assumed the position of NIDDK director in 1986.

I share the strong interest Dr. Gorden has in supporting the NIH's mission to acquire new knowledge to prevent and treat disease and disability. I have seen firsthand the results of his commitment to this important mission. Dr. Gorden's effective leadership has led the institute to great advances in fighting some of the most chronic and debilitating diseases which afflict the American people.

On his watch, Dr. Gorden has seen the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases grow to become the fifth largest NIH institute, with a budget expected to top $1 billion when NIDDK celebrates its 50th anniversary next year.

The institute's research efforts have brought breakthrough discoveries in the prevention and treatment of diabetes, digestive ailments, nutritional disorders, diseases of the kidney, urological tract and blood.

In his final testimony before our subcommittee this year, Dr. Gorden expressed great optimism about the prospects for the NIDDK as it prepares for the 21st Century. He said we are on the brink of enormous clinical progress and pointed to extraordinary research momentum propelling us toward major medical advances. His leadership has been a key factor in making these advances possible.

Though he will soon leave as head of the institute, Dr. Gorden has charted an ambitious and steady course for the NIDDK as it begins both a new century and its second 50 years of service to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate for us to recognize outstanding public servants for a job well done. Our thanks today go to Dr. Phillip Gorden for his lifetime commitment to improving the quality of life for his fellow citizens. Millions of Americans are living healthier lives as a result of the research Dr. Gorden and his colleagues have done and continue to do at NIH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXPRESSION OF SORROW AT TRAGIC DEATH OF JOYCE CHIANG

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, like the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) who spoke before me, and like the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. LOIS CAPPS) who will speak after me, I rise to express sorrow at the tragic death and to commemorate the short but inspirational life of Joyce Chiang.

□ 1445

On January 9, Joyce was last seen in Dupont Circle, and she was not seen thereafter. A body was discovered on April 1, and yesterday that body was positively identified as being Joyce.

Joyce lived a life of public service and public involvement, starting with her involvement with the student body government at Smith College, where she served as student body president, continuing here in the House of Representatives on the staff of the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), and continuing to her service at the INS, where she spearheaded the implementation of the 1996 immigration bill.

Joyce never stopped contributing, never stopped involvement in public life. And Joyce was an incredible human being to all who knew her. As everyone who I have talked to says, and we all say the same thing, she lit up a room every time she walked in.

Those who knew Joyce were not surprised at what was an incredible and unprecedented outpouring from her friends when she became missing. I participated in the first of many vigils for Joyce held at Dupont Circle, and hundreds showed up to express their concern and their love of Joyce. And almost immediately, posters of Joyce appeared all over the City of Washington, urging people to contact authorities if they had any knowledge of her whereabouts.

Not only her friends, but also and especially her family missed and worried about Joyce. Her family endured with courage and religious faith the unendurable 3 months knowing that their sister, their daughter was missing.

Our heart goes out to her brother Robert, in Texas, and her brother Roger, who lives here in the District of Columbia and who spent so much time publicizing Joyce's absence in the hope that someone would be able to identify Joyce's whereabouts, hopefully to help us find her, help the authorities find her during her life.

And I am proud to represent and my heart goes out to two residents of the San Fernando Valley, her mother Judy, who has spent so long and prayed so hard for Joyce, and especially to my very close friend, my successor in State government and Joyce's brother, John, who has lived through with his family what I just cannot imagine living through, 3 months of Joyce's absence.

Joyce will be remembered by so many. She was an inspiration to so many, and she will be missed by so many.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for yielding.

And with our mutual colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), I simply want to join on this sad day to remember Joyce Chiang and send my most heartfelt condolences to her family and her many friends, her friends particularly here on Capitol Hill.

As the mother of two grown daughters, I can only imagine the suffering of this family, and the anguish, over the past 3 months. I realize that mere words can be of little consolation at a time like this, but I do hope that the warm memories and very fond recollections that Joyce inspired will provide some comfort over time.

I did not know Joyce like my colleagues, but I feel connected to her through her brother Roger, who has been the family's courageous public voice over these past several weeks. And Roger is from my family, that is, the University of California at Santa Barbara family. He was a student of my husband Walter, an active UCSB alumnus, and is a close friend of many of the young people who worked for Walter and work with me.

To Roger and to the countless others who loved Joyce, my heart is with them today.

KOSOVO REFUGEES: AN EXODUS OF BIBLICAL PROPORTIONS

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, an exodus from Kosovo of biblical proportions is taking place. Thousands upon thousands of refugees stream across the border 24 hours a day.

There was a newspaper headline in Europe that said ''Europe's turn in the killing fields.'' That writer must have seen what I saw, a catastrophe that should have been anticipated. Ethnic Albanian refugees from Kosovo are now paying a heavy price for this poor judgment.

I just returned from a 4-day visit to the Balkans. I went to focus on humanitarian conditions and the massive numbers of refugees flooding out of Kosovo each day. I traveled to Kukes and Morina on the Kosovo-Albania border. And when I left, an estimated 270,000 to 300,000 refugees had crossed the border.

The scene there is heart-wrenching. Our first introduction was the stench, the overpowering smell of urine and feces from refugees with no place to go to the bathroom. In many places the ground was covered with feces. It will not be long before disease breaks out, especially among the people who are already dehydrated, malnourished, and sick. Four cases of measles had been confirmed as of last Tuesday.

Refugees are everywhere, camped on hillsides, along the road, in parks and plazas, and in parking lots. Most arrive as an extended family in carts and trailers being pulled by farm tractors or, in some cases, by horses. Some arrive in cars, but many are on foot, an unending procession of people who had been threatened; and many have been separated from their families.

Everyone had a bad story. There is no need to document the reports, but every report was different: ''I lost my husband.'' ''I lost my wife.'' ''I lost my son.'' ''I lost my daughter.'' And we should now have people documenting that for a war crimes trial but also for history.

The country of Albania has responded admirably to this entire crisis. It is a poor country but it has opened up its heart and its homes. Still, in spite of the tremendous effort of people on the scene, the refugee situation is still a disaster. The Clinton administration, the international community, and NATO were ill prepared to deal with this crisis they should have anticipated. The information was there, but those who decided the course of events, particularly the Clinton administration, did not listen.

People on the ground in Kosovo before the bombing campaign began warned that the Serbs could begin to brutalize ethnic Albanians.

Some comments and suggestions:

The brutality has been taking place for too long. Serbian President Milosevic is the father of the Kosovo tragedy, as he was in Bosnia and even before. Beginning in the fall of 1991, when Serbs shelled and bombed and laid siege to Vukovar, he has continued this pattern of destruction. This is just another chapter.

Two, Milosevic is an evil man who has directly caused nearly a decade of terror and killing. Nine Serb generals have just been warned that they may be named as war criminals. Should Milosevic head the list? And the answer is ''yes.''

Three, there is a life-and-death crisis in Albania. President Clinton should immediately send a high-level delegation of NSC, State Department, and Defense to go on the scene, people who can make decisions.

Four, massive amounts of infrastructure supplies and communications equipment are needed at the border, along with people to assemble and operate.

Five, there is a huge shortage of food and people are starving today. But once the influx of refugees ends, the problem of sustaining them for a longer period is no less critical.

Six, refugees report that a vast number of houses and buildings and infrastructures have been destroyed. Every family said, ''My house had been burned.'' ''My house had been destroyed.'' We need to help them rebuild, and that will take a long time for them to return.

Seven, it is doubtful that Kosovo can ever again be part of the Yugoslav Federation. It will take a long time to implement workable solutions. In time, Albanians will tire of having to deal with the refugees who infringe upon their normal life. Most Kosovo refugees have no documentation, no identity cards, no medical history, no records. This will take a long time to reconstruct. And everyone I spoke to said they want to go home.

Lastly, we must do everything possible to help the suffering refugees. These victims of war have lost their homes, their livelihoods, and in many cases their identities. Additionally, having witnessed firsthand their struggle to survive and having seen their fear and their tears, I believe our country, the United States of America, and NATO's resolve with our partners must be to stop once and for all the brutality of Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following report of our visit to Albania:

REPORT BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FRANK R. WOLF OF VIRGINIA, VISIT TO ALBANIA: REFUGEES—AN EXODUS OF BIBLICAL PROPORTIONS, APRIL 4–7, 1999

This report provides details of my trip to Albania on April 4–7, 1999. I met briefly with Albanian leaders in Tirana and spent the bulk of my time at the Kosovo-Albanian border near Morina and the nearby town of Kukes. Thousands upon thousands of refugees streamed across the border, 24 hours a day. They desperately need lifesaving care now and will require sustaining aid for a long time until all the problems resolving around Kosovo are solved, and they can once again return home.

An exodus from Kosovo of biblical proportions is taking place, I saw a newspaper headline yesterday, ''Europe's turn in the killing fields.'' That writer must have seen what I saw, a catastrophe that should have been anticipated. Ethnic Albanian refugees from Kosovo are now paying a heavy price for this poor judgment.

I just returned from a four-day visit to Albania—my second since mid-February. I went this time to focus on humanitarian conditions and needs with tens of thousands of refugees streaming across the border from Kosovo each day.

By the time we left on Wednesday, an estimated 270,000–300,000 refugees had cross the border from Kosovo. They have added about 10 percent to the Albanian population in a matter of only a few days.

We arrived in Tirana on Eastern Sunday courtesy of Americares—one of the many non-governmental organizations (NGO's) saving lives, delivering food, water, blankets, medicine and other items desperately needed in large quantities.

Our airplane, a Belgian Air Force C–130 Hercules, seconded to Americares, was loaded with baby food, flour, and other emergency supplies. About 20 passengers were on board, mostly print and TV journalists and Americares staff and volunteers. A few NBC people from the TODAY show were there. We crowded in amid relief supplies, wherever there was room to sit.

The Tirana airport is just beginning to come alive with relief supplies and equipment arriving from many nations. U.S. Air Force personnel, with their positive attitude and ''can do'' spirit, have set up a tent city to get the planes off-loaded and the goods dispersed. They are doing a great job, and planes do not linger on the ground.

We left Tirana very early the next morning for Kukes, a northern Albania town nearest the border crossing. It is a drive of six to nine hours or more, depending on traffic, weather and luck. We travelled with USAID's Disaster Response Team (DART) which was going to assess and coordinate relief efforts.

It is the only road to Kukes. It is the only road available to transport relief supplies to Kukes. It is the only road for newly arriving refugees to travel out of Kukes to the villages, towns and cities throughout Albania where they will stay, or be moved to other countries.

It is a treacherous road—a dangerous road through mountains and valleys with steep drop-offs of hundreds of feet. It is barely two lanes wide with no barriers to prevent going over the edge. The roadway is dotted with flower adorned memorials to earlier accidents and fatalities.

We bounced from pothole to pothole around tight S curves, dodging traffic going in both directions. Worse, the roadbed in a number of places is being undercut by the passage of heavy trucks. Chunks of road are just falling off. As more and more relief trucks make the trip, the roadway may deteriorate to the point where it is impassable.

Officials are looking at creating an airstrip near Kukes capable of handling up to C–130 Hercules aircraft. They need to hurry.

In Kukes we joined with Catholic Relief Services (CRS). Like other NGO's, CRS is doing a remarkable job with what they have to work with. The overall relief effort was late in getting started, is slow in coming up to speed and, thus far, is overwhelmed by the vast number of refugees.

Our first introduction to the area was the stench—the overpowering smell of urine and feces from the enormous numbers of refugees with no place to go to the bathroom. In

many places, the ground was covered with feces. It won't be long before disease breaks out under these conditions, especially among people who are already dehydrated, malnourished and sick. Four cases of measles had been confirmed by Tuesday and the NGO's were trying to arrange a massive inoculation program.

The number of people in Kukes was startling. This is a town of 23,000 inhabitants which is growing by tens of thousands each day. About 30,000 refugees are estimated to cross the border every day, 24 hours a day. Only about 15,000 to 20,000 refugees are transported from Kukes daily to other places. The population continues to swell. The most common estimates are that about 80,000 refugees were in Kukes on Tuesday and Wednesday.

They are everywhere, camped on hillsides, along the road, in parks and plazas, and in parking lots. Most arrive as an extended family in trailers being pulled along by tractors, or in some cases, by horse. Some arrive in cars, but many are on foot. Their only possessions are carried on their back. Our time at the Morina border crossing was an overpowering, emotional experience. We saw an unending procession of people and families, each with a horrific story to tell. Many had been travelling for days under constant threat of being harmed or killed by Serb militia.

Perhaps just reaching the border was an emotional release for them. There were many more women, children and elderly than younger men. Tears were streaming down their faces—many sobbed uncontrollably. We had an interpreter and the tales they told were chilling.

An 18-year-old boy from the village of Blac was randomly pulled out of line and shot to death—in front of his mother and family. They wouldn't even let his mother kiss him goodbye.

An elderly paralyzed woman was given 10 minutes to leave her home. There wasn't even time to get her medicine. As they moved away, the family home was set afire—blazing behind them.

Everyone has a story. Most have had their homes destroyed. There is a need to document these reports while they are still fresh, not only for war crimes, but for history as well.

The refugees have little food, water, shelter, sanitation or medical care. We went with a CRS feeding mission on Monday night. It was scheduled after dark to keep the hungry people from seeing what was going on and getting out of hand at food distribution points. But it didn't work. As soon as the distributors showed up, starving people began clamoring and struggling for food. The trucks were overwhelmed and had to speed away to keep people from being injured. Police were helping as much as they could but they are too few. We saw individual policemen on duty for 24 hours straight. Many Albanian families, and especially some in Kukes, were warm, welcoming and generous. Many opened their homes to refugees they did not know and had no earlier connection with.

I visited two apartments in Kukes to see for myself. In one, the residents vacated their two-room apartment so that a Kosovar family of 17 could have a place to stay. The grandfather was blind and just sat facing a wall. There was a baby girl, just weeks or perhaps a few months old. They had been a thriving family in Kosovo, but now have nothing, not even an idea of what the future holds.

In the next two-room flat, 10 refugees stayed in one room and 17 in the other. The host Kukes residents stayed with them, all sleeping on the floor.

Albania is a poor country in wealth, but rich in generosity.

We also sat in on a coordinating meeting of NGO's who are struggling to cope, many themselves on the edge of exhaustion and sickness. The room was filled with coughing and sneezing—respiratory cases about to happen.

The talk was of how to provide the most help. Who could do what? Who could best ease the shortfall of supplies? The overall conclusion was one of inadequacy, of being overwhelmed, of having too little to share among too many. And the talk was especially about poor logistics and communications.

The refugees situation in Albania, in spite of the tremendous effort of people on the scene, is a disaster. I think the Clinton administration, the international community and NATO were ill-prepared to deal with this crisis they should have anticipated. The information was there, but those who decided the course of events, particularly the Clinton administration, did not listen.

Satellite imagery could detect the large lines of refugees forming along the way to the borders, but this information has not been available to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) with overall coordinating responsibility.

People on the ground in Kosovo before the bombing began warned of the possibility that Serbs would begin to brutalize ethnic Albanians. I visited Kosovo in February, a few days before Rambouillet talks broke down ending hope for a truce with NATO peacekeepers in Kosovo. Many Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), UNHCR and NGO representatives and diplomats predicted then that ethnic Albanians would be attacked before NATO troops could arrive. In Kosovo, nearly every Serb family is armed, not with Saturday-night specials, but with Kalishnakov automatic rifles. The Serbs Army and Police are heavily armed, too. Real concern existed that, hidden from western observers, helpless and unprotected ethnic Albanians would be brutalized. That is exactly what happened. Had this been anticipated by decision-makers, measures to provide relief and the basis for survival of refugees could have been put in motion. Shiploads, and caches of relief supplies then could have been positioned nearby.

Even now, when it is clear that enormous problems exist, too little is being done. There is much talk of providing for the long run. But people are dying today. Massive amounts of life-giving supplies are needed now.

I would like to close with a few comments and recommendations.

1. This brutality has been taking place for too long. Serbian President Milosevic is the father of the Kosovo tragedy as he was in Bosnia and even before. Beginning in the fall of 1991 when Serbs shelled, bombed and laid siege to Vukovar, Croatia, Milosevic has continued a pattern of destruction. Kosovo is just the latest chapter.

2. Milosevic is an evil man who has directly caused nearly a decade of terror, killing and destruction. Nine Serb generals have just been warned that they may be named as war criminals for their actions in Kosovo. Shouldn't Milosevic head the list?

3. There is a life and death crisis in Albania. President Clinton should immediately send high level people from the National Security Council, State and defense department—people who can make decisions on the scene—to the border crossings in Kukes. A decision-maker/policy person has yet to visit there. And that's where you have to go to see what is really happening. Too many visitors stop briefly in Tirana and quickly move on, thinking they know what is taking place. They don't. Today, the refugee problem is hemorrhaging at the border. That's where the compress now needs to be applied. Once the influx of refugees ends, and they are placed throughout Albania, the same amounts of massive help and support must be re-targeted to provide long-term assistance.

4. Massive amounts of infrastructure supplies and communications equipment are needed at the border along with people to assemble and operate them. It is not enough to ship a load of tents. People to erect them, dig toilets and purify water must be there as well. Equipment alone is insufficient. Operators and technicians must be there, too. When refugees stop coming to the border, these needs will continue throughout Albania where massive numbers of refugees will be housed.

5. There is a huge shortage of food, and people are starving today. Once the influx of refugees ends, the problem of sustaining them for a longer period will be no less critical. Albania can't feed itself. Food is the country's largest component of imports. Albania is going to need help.

6. Albania also has difficulty maintaining law and order, even in Tirana. In many remote areas, police protection is non-existent. Unemployment is very high, and there is no capacity to provide work and economic sufficiency for refugees. The Albanian government will need to be propped up and the economy improved.

7. Refugees report that a vast number of houses, buildings and infrastructure have been destroyed in Kosovo. Rebuilding will take a long time and care for refugees must be worked out while this take place.

8. Little is known about the refugee situation in Montenegro, but it will undoubtedly add to the overall problem.

9. It is doubtful that Kosovo can ever again be a pat of the Yugoslav federation. It will take a long time to implement workable solution. In time, Albanians will tire of having Kosovo refugees to deal with and infringe upon normal life. Most Kosovo refugees have not documentation, no identity cards, medical histories or necessary records. Even the license plates were ripped from cars as they crossed the border. This, too, will take time to reconstruct.

10. And lastly, let me say a word about the press. Without their coverage as refugees began to pile up, it would have taken even longer to recognize the crisis at hand. The press has done a good job of telling the world what is happening and in mobilizing people to come to the aid of hundreds of thousands of the neediest people. Members of the press should be proud of their work.

STILTSVILLE: A COMMUNITY OF STRUCTURES IN SOUTH FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, a writer in one of our hometown newspapers once said that ''Miami is two parallel universes of life on water and life on land.'' She was describing Stiltsville, a community of structures located approximately 1 mile south of Key Biscayne, Florida, part of the Congressional district that I am proud to represent.

It is difficult to describe in words the picturesque and peaceful view that the homes supported by stilts looming above the water makes against the

Florida skyline. Stiltsville began in the 1940s with the Quarterdeck Club, a beautiful locale featured in Life magazine for its unique architecture and location on the northernmost extreme of pristine Biscayne National Park.

By 1960, at least 25 structures existed which represented distinctive architectural facades with brightly colored wood frame buildings resting on steel foundations. Stiltsville served for many years as the backdrop for many television shows, movies, books, and advertisements, including the long-running television show ''Miami Vice.'' It has been a favorite of movie makers, of boaters, and tourists alike because of its unique features and its frame against the Miami skyline. Unfortunately, due to the hurricanes that often plague our south Florida shores, only seven of the original 25 structures remain intact today.

Stiltsville homes are privately owned and represent no cost at all to the Florida taxpayers. These seven remaining structures have now been equipped with especially engineered features which have been adapted to meet the rigors of a hurricane-prone area.

The remaining seven homes provide not only aesthetic beauty for the landscape but a haven for fish and other sea life that inhabit the area. For boaters and fishermen, Stiltsville is often used as a navigational guide and as a shelter for many during storms.

For Floridians, Stiltsville symbolizes the Miami of yesterday and the Miami of today. In fact, Florida governors since Governor Leroy Collins have spent time at Stiltsville. Many of our local civic and charity groups have used these homes, including the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, the Miami Chamber of Commerce, and the Rotary Club, just to name a few.

For many of our cities across our Nation, there are local historical sites that give our cities character and that make them unique. For south Florida, Stiltsville is one of those places that gives our community flavor and keeps us linked to the history of our great State.

It is unfortunate, however, that in spite of the historical and cultural symbolism that Stiltsville holds for all of Florida, it is looking at the possibility of being demolished by the National Park Service. Its current lease with Biscayne National Park expires on July 1 of this year, and a recent petition for national historic designation was denied even though Stiltsville is regularly a part of the South Florida Historical Association Tours.

The Dade Heritage Trust, which is Miami-Dade County's largest historic preservation society, has worked for almost 30 years to preserve landmarks that enrich the texture of our city's present and future, and the benchmark used by the Dade Heritage Trust for judging structures to be historic is 50 years. Yet an exception has been made for Stiltsville because the members know that the colorful origins of the community itself dating back to the 1930s and 1940s make it a wonderful component of Miami history.

Even the State Historic Preservation Officer of Florida has supported a National Register nomination for Stiltsville. According to noted historian Arva Moore Parks, Stiltsville is a very fragile piece of history worthy of salvage. And certainly many of us in south Florida share that sentiment.

In our district, with the help of dozens of local organizations, such as Save Old Stiltsville, the Florida Department of State, the University of Miami, and the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, we have begun an effort to ensure that Stiltsville will remain a part of Miami's history and that future generations will be able to enjoy the beauty that Stiltsville adds to Biscayne Bay.

□ 1500

Together, we hope to make this dream a very real part of south Florida and our State and our country for years and generations to come.

FORMER SPEAKER GINGRICH VINDICATED—BUT NO ONE KNOWS IT

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I come to correct the record, for a politically motivated injustice. It is titled ''Newt Gingrich Vindicated, But No One Knows It,'' by Brent Bozell. I would like to read and summarize this article for the RECORD on an issue of basic justice.

''The judgement is in. After 3½ years of investigation, the Internal Revenue Service has cleared Newt Gingrich and his allied nonprofit groups of any violation of tax laws in the controversy over his television history course, 'Renewing American Civilization.'

''So after having run countless news reports highlighting the accusations that ultimately forced Newt Gingrich to pay $300,000 in fines,'' did the media correct the record?

I would like to let my colleagues, maybe for the first time, understand and know what Newt Gingrich was about. In our Republican Conference, the then Speaker, Newt Gingrich, and his lawyers met with the entire conference. They said that he would be exonerated 100 percent in this. There was no chance of him being found guilty. But it would take one or more years of court trials and dragging the Republican Party through this event. The Speaker stood up and said, ''I am not going to do this, because we are focusing on a balanced budget, on saving Medicare, on having welfare reform, and having tax relief. And if I go through this court case and don't give the Democrats their pound of flesh by paying this fine, then we will not have a balanced budget or save Medicare or have welfare reform.'' And he agreed to pay that fine. That is the kind of a gentleman Newt Gingrich was.

Do you think that the news media after this was announced did anything or said one word? Let me quote from the article again.

''ABC, CBS and NBC devoted exactly zero seconds to Newt Gingrich's vindication. Only CNN's Brooks Jackson filed a TV report, on the early-evening show 'Inside Politics.'

''He then showed old footage of Democrats David Bonior of Michigan, in which he said, 'Mr. Gingrich engaged in a pattern of tax fraud,' and John Lewis of Georgia, 'We now have a Speaker under investigation for lying to the outside counsel investigating his involvement in a massive tax fraud.'

''Jackson quoted from the IRS decision: 'The (Gingrich ''Renewing American Civilization'') course taught principles from American civilization that could be used by each American in everyday life, whether the person is a welfare recipient, the head of a large corporation or a politician. The course was not biased toward particular politicians or a particular party. The facts show the class was much more than a political platform.' Of course, that was clear to anyone who watched the course.''

And I quote from Mr. Gingrich: I urge my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), ''I urge my colleagues to go back and read their statements and watch how they said them with no facts, based on nothing more than a desire, and I quote, to politically destroy a colleague.''

The article continues. ''But the damage wasn't done simply by devious politicians. It was done by the media itself. National Public Radio reporter Mara Liasson justified the event by saying that he only did what Newt Gingrich did to Jim Wright. 'Bonior learned his lesson from him,' she said.

''To appreciate the media's antagonism—then, now and probably forever—toward Newt Gingrich, compare their treatment of him with their coverage of a real crook, Webster Hubbell. They roasted Newt when he was charged and then ignored him when he was cleared. Hubbell was celebrated when he was cleared of tax evasion charges filed by Ken Starr, but when a Federal court reinstated the charges on appeal, the networks aired no coverage.

''Let's get this straight. Webster Hubbell embezzled half a million dollars from his law firm partners in Arkansas. After he resigned from the Justice Department in disgrace, the President's friends paid him almost another million dollars for, quote, supposed jobs that asked for no work, money he pays next to zero taxes on.''

I would ask my colleagues to take a look at what they said in this well, and I would ask them to apologize publicly and in writing to the Speaker.

THE FOLLY OF COMMITTING GROUND TROOPS TO KOSOVO

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the decision to send ground troops into the war in Kosovo, it is important for us to look at the historical events surrounding that particular area and to then look at the request that is being made, that will probably be made for this Congress to approve in some fashion or other, a request from the administration to commit American troops to this folly.

During the break, I was given an article that I found quite sobering, from an individual in my district. The title of the article is ''Serbia: The lesson of Army Group E.'' It came off of the net, World Net Daily, Friday, March 26. The author, a gentleman by the name of Joel A. Ruth. And I quote from this article because I think it needs to be widely read and widely heard, again, as we approach this potential decision to send American troops in. It says:

Before we engage the Serbs in a limited war over Kosovo, it would be wise to review the experiences of the 22 German divisions that were committed to stamping out Serb resistance between 1941 and 1945. While the Germans also had the help of 200,000 Croatian, Slovenian and Bosnian Moslem volunteer auxiliaries, they still could not do the job, and with a combined army of over 700,000 men willing to commit atrocities that the United States and her allies would never contemplate in this, quote, civilized day and age.

In the end, and without direct Allied help, the Serbs succeeded, through extreme human sacrifice and one of the bloodiest partisan wars ever fought in history, in recapturing over half their country by the time the war had ended on all the other fronts.

Army Group E surrendered to the Serbs and was subsequently force-marched the length and width of Serbia without food until every German soldier had dropped dead by the wayside.

The fate of the Croatian Slovenians and Moslems who had helped the Germans was mass murder; all prisoners were taken, shot and clubbed or tortured to death and dumped in mass graves. Over one half million soldiers and their families were thus exterminated by the Serbs, over 1 million murdered if one counts the victims of the German Army Group E.

After the war the Serbs under Marshal Tito were determined that no outside aggressor would ever enjoy an advantage in occupying any part of Serbia ever again. Therefore, for the next 40 years, a massive system of underground defenses were constructed deep under the mountains, atomic bombproof and capable of maintaining a million-man army underground for several years while guerilla warfare would rage against any future aggressors. These underground facilities contain massive quantities of munitions, field hospitals, food stocks, fuel and consist of thousands of miles of tunnels which can enable a guerilla force to strike and vanish to safety during bombing and artillery strikes.

Believe me, if the Germans who utilized the most brutal tactics could not subdue the Serbs in 5 years when they did not possess such a defensive infrastructure, how much harder is it going to be now that they have spent 50 years in preparing for the next invaders?

The article goes on to claim that any attempt on the part of NATO and this administration to participate in any such venture would be just as full of folly and certainly would be just as bloody. And the idea that we can bomb Milosevic into submission is, of course, if you are taking this at face value, if the information supplied in this particular article is correct, then that theory, that strategy, is idiotic.

For if there is such a system of caverns and caves within Serbia where a million men could be housed and probably are being housed even at the present time, then how can we possibly expect to really cripple him through any amount of bombing that we can possibly do? It will, of course, take armed forces on the ground, and it will, of course, turn into the same sort of bloody situation that preceded us there some 50 years ago.

So I ask my colleagues once again to reconsider, when we are asked to commit American forces to this area, that we consider the lessons of history as it is so often difficult for us to understand. But it is important for us to realize that history does repeat itself, that this is a bad place for us to be with no particular reason for us to be there.

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

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

SCHOOL MODERNIZATION INITIATIVE—KEY COMPONENT OF 1999 DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, one of the priorities of the Clinton administration and congressional Democrats is improving education. Democrats recognize that the future of this country depends upon ensuring that all American children receive a high quality education that prepares them for the jobs of the 21st century. Democrats believe that every public school must be a place where facilities are up to date and in good repair, where classrooms are not overcrowded, where the environment is safe and drug-free, where students have adequate textbooks and computers, and where teachers are well-qualified. This is why Democrats are once again promoting an aggressive, comprehensive agenda to strengthen and improve our Nation's public schools.

This evening, I would like to highlight a key component of the 1999 Democratic education agenda, the school modernization initiative. This initiative will help address the tragic conditions of overcrowded and crumbling American schools. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, thousands of our public school children are trying to learn in schools that are overcrowded and in desperate need of repair. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that our country has the highest number of students in our history and enrollment will continue to grow at a considerable rate for at least the next decade. In order to keep pace with this growth, the Department of Education has estimated that we need to build 6,000 new schools over the next 10 years just to maintain current class size. This crisis is compounded by the fact that in addition to our overcrowded schools, many of our existing schools are in desperate need of repair. According to a 1998 report by the American Society of Civil Engineers, American schools are in worse shape than any other part of our Nation's infrastructure, including our roads, our bridges and our mass transit. Moreover, in 1995, the nonpartisan General Accounting Office, in an in-depth study on the condition of the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools, found that 60 percent of our schools in all regions of the countries are in desperate need of repair. Thirty-eight percent of our urban schools, 30 percent of our rural schools and 29 percent of suburban schools have at least one building in need of a new roof, a new plumbing system, a new floor or a new electrical system. In addition, 58 percent of our Nation's schools face serious environmental problems, such as ventilation, heating, air conditioning and lighting problems, along with environmental hazards such as asbestos, lead in the water and lead-based paint and Radon.

□ 1515

These conditions are dangerous and unacceptable. Leaky roofs, buildings in despair and overcrowded classrooms are not merely annoyances or inconveniences. They are barriers to learning.

This is substantiated by study after study that has produced strong evidence of the link between academic achievement and the condition of our schools. Students who attend class in clean, safe buildings not only do better academically, they also receive a far more positive message about their self worth than students who must attend run-down and overcrowded schools.

That is why President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress have a responsible and realistic blueprint for improving our schools. In order to help States and localities address this critical issue, the President has again included his school modernization initiative in his budget proposal for this year. Democrats in the House and Senate support this much needed proposal

and have included it in their family first agenda.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal creates a Federal tax credit to finance the interest on bonds which States and local school districts can issue for school construction and repair. These bonds would generate $22 billion in funding to build and modernize our public schools while costing the Federal Government only 2 to $3 billion over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, this is not another program leading to federal control over local public schools. Instead under this legislation the Federal Government will be a partner with State and local governments. It will be States and localities that will determine their needs and decide when, where and even if they want to spend Federal funds to modernize their schools, and State and local participation in this program will be totally voluntary.

Most importantly, local school districts around the country are in favor of this proposal.

While it is true that historically States and local districts have shouldered the majority of the responsibility for our schools, this crisis is of such a magnitude, an estimated $12 billion nationally, that States simply cannot solve this problem alone.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national crisis. The education of our children is not only critical to their personal growth, but to our country's ability to compete in the highly technical and global economy of the 21st century. Federal support is essential and in the best interests of our Nation.

In closing I would like to give my colleagues an illustration of the severity of the problem.

This is a picture of Balmont High School in Los Angeles, although it could be anywhere in this Nation. As my colleagues can see, the roof of this gymnasium has multiple leaks, and when it rains, they need to put garbage cans in order to collect the water so that the gym is not completely flooded.

These are pictures of two other schools in Los Angeles, both with extensive water damage which has caused the ceiling tiles to fall off, leaving wiring and piping exposed. It is clearly not a safe environment in which our children can learn.

Mr. Speaker, what message are we sending to our nation's children and their parents if Congress sits idle while our schools continue to fall apart? I urge my colleagues to support the democratic school modernization initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the remainder of my time to my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), a man who is a champion of education and the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Task Force on Education and Training.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Without objection, the gentlewoman's request to give the balance of her time to the gentleman from Texas is agreed to, and the gentleman from Texas is recognized for the balance of the 60 minutes.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to help carry the ball on these issues of such importance to our children's education. The work the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Roybal-ALLARD) is doing on behalf of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus is outstanding, and I congratulate her.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus' Education Task Force, it is my privilege to discuss the caucus' legislative priorities in the area of education for the 106th Congress. Let us start with the unacceptably high hispanic dropout rate.

Simply put, this is an urgent problem that is not getting any better. Over the last 25 years the dropout for both white and African American young adults has declined by almost 40 percent. Hispanic youth, however, have only shared in part of this improvement. Far too many of our students fail to reach their academic potential. Nationwide the percentage of hispanic students dropping out of school is twice the rate of other ethnic groups. Over all, about 38 percent of hispanic young adults have dropped out of high school compared to only 17 percent of African American and only 8½ percent of our white young adults. These figures are simply unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

As we all know, our current economy, unlike 40 years ago, generates few meaningful jobs for people without a high school education. Because of the restructuring of our Nation's economy, not having a high school diploma or its equivalent poses a much stronger burden than it did decades ago when jobs with social and economic mobility were within reach of these with limited educational background and skills. In our present economy even high school graduation is not enough to pave the way to a middle class life. The good jobs are knowledge intensive.

Throughout the past 2 years the Congressional Hispanic Caucus has focused particular attention on the hispanic dropout crisis, but there remains much work to be done. As a Member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I look forward to working with my colleagues in my Committee on Education and the Workforce and on both sides of the aisle of Congress to eradicate this educational crisis.

On the subject of bilingual education I want to give credit where credit is due. I applaud the congressional leaders who are working to improve educational opportunities for hispanic students such as my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) who recently, only 2 weeks ago, presented his ideas regarding excellence in education for limited English proficient students. Congressman REYES has made some excellent points which I agree with and endorse on the complex issue of bilingual education.

The Ysleta Independent School District in El Paso, Texas, is proof that bilingual education works. It is a place where two languages are used without apology and where becoming proficient in both is considered a significant intellectual accomplishment. We need to prepare our limited English proficient students to function, to excel, in a world economy where being bilingual is an asset and a resource. School districts such as Ysleta recognize and understand that bilingualism is an asset, an intellectual accomplishment, and I applaud Congressman REYES and El Paso for their progressive thinking.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the largest elementary and secondary federal aid package targeted at low income and low achieving students. Funding for ESEA currently represents an annual $12 billion investment in our Nation's future. ESEA is a vital program to all of the Nation's children. It includes critical funding for many programs aimed at serving the hispanic student population.

As President Clinton has stated, the 30 percent dropout rate of hispanic high school students is a national economic crisis of great urgency. Expansion of exemplary education programs is needed to increase the education attainment level in the hispanic community as well as school modernization, as well as after school programs, class size reduction in Grades K through 3, teacher training and expansion of gear-up programs at the middle schools. These significant issues must be considered in the reauthorization of the ESEA, and I certainly hope we are going to reauthorize ESEA in this Congress as an entire package, not piecemeal.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my esteemed colleague from the great State of New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, education is my number one priority since I came to Congress. Providing our children with a good education and a bright future is one of our most effective tools for ending gun violence, drug abuse and poverty in our country. I spend so much time in my schools back on Long Island talking with students, teachers, our principals, superintendents and our parents about how we can make the education system work better. In visiting these schools I see students and teachers who are committed to education, and these are visits that have shown show me what there is in grade schools in my district. But these visits have also shown me what our schools and where they need help. Many of the buildings in which our students learn are inadequate, overcrowded and certainly in poor condition.

As my colleagues have pointed out, building new improved schools must be a top priority. That is why I am delighted the administration has made

school construction a top priority. But hand in hand with building more schools is reducing class size.

I was delighted with the administration's initiative to hire a hundred thousand new teachers over the next 7 years to reduce class size in Grades 1 through 3 to a national level of 18 students. I actually would take this down one step further. I happen to believe that we should only have 15 students in every classroom through 1 through 3. We have seen the research that shows 15 in a classroom is where our young students make the most progress. This is simply common sense.

It states that what most parents and teachers already know from experience—smaller class size promotes effective teaching and learning. Smaller class size allows for a smaller manageable work load for the teachers and enable children to receive individual attention. This type of one-on-one attention can solve a lot of the problems before they start.

I am on the the Committee on Education and the Workforce and will be spending most of this year addressing problems like these: teacher training, school construction, reducing class sizes. We reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. With all of this, it is so important to make sure our teachers that are in the classroom now also have continuing education so they can come up to the time that we are talking about as far as being able to use computers so they can teach on the Internet. So, I strongly support continuing education for our teachers.

The act which I refer to is ERISA. It deals with all aspects of K through 12 education.

We all know what it will take to improve our educational system: well-prepared teachers, new buildings, less crowded classrooms. It is time that we show our young people that we are committed to their education and to their future.

□ 1530

I am one of those believers that believes education can help our whole country as a whole. The more we educate our young people, certainly the better job opportunities they will have in the future. The better job opportunities they have in the future will help our businesses across this country, and that certainly will keep our economy strong.

We have to look at this as a whole picture. All we have to do is ask anyone, whether it is from Long Island or New York, whether it is California, whether it is New Mexico, what is the number one issue as far as you are concerned? It is education. It is the key to the future of this country.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield time to my friend, the gentleman from the great territory of Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ).

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how much passion, or more precisely how much hysteria, the issue of language can generate. I use the word ''hysteria'' because concern and fear about the supposed decline of English language usage in the United States bears no relation to reality.

We are 2 months into the 106th Congress and already three bills and one resolution have been introduced in the House of Representatives to make English the official language of the U.S.

The underlying premise of English-only legislation is expressed in H.R. 123, which says, ''Throughout the history of the United States, the common thread binding individuals of different backgrounds has been a common language.''

The problem here is that the premise of English as a national glue is faulty. It ignores and, by default, it trivializes the very thing that has made the United States a beacon to the politically and economically oppressed people of the world. Wave upon wave of immigrants have come to the United States not to speak English, for heaven's sake. They have come because they are desperate for freedom. They are desperate to participate in this great democracy. They are eager to participate in the American dream.

The enduring bond between our culturally diverse population is and always has been a shared commitment to the democratic principles of freedom, justice, liberty and equal opportunity for all.

Most immigrants come to the United States to build a better life, and every immigrant knows that in order to make the American dream a personal reality, English fluency is a must. There are immigrants who literally lose sleep to master English.

The issue is not whether immigrants want to learn English. They have more than demonstrated their determination to speak the language. The question is how best to promote fluency and general learning among young immigrant students, and this brings us to the heated controversy over bilingual education.

I endorse bilingual education and I am anxious to see the development of programs and funding to increase the number of bilingual teachers. Last year as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, I submitted a proposal to create a scholarship program for students who are proficient in English and Spanish and want to be teachers in the Nation's public school system.

The scholarship would be named after Frank Tejeda, the former Representative from the 28th District of Texas, who died in 1997 while serving his third term in Congress. This proposal was passed by the House, but was not included in the higher reauthorization education bill that came out of conference.

Bilingual education programs need to be applied with flexibility and with an eye to their effectiveness. Students learn in a variety of different ways, and it is the difficult job of educators to balance program structure with the flexibility necessary to address individual needs.

Educators must constantly evaluate the effectiveness of existing and proposed bilingual programs because there is something seriously wrong where minority parents have to sue school districts in order to opt out of bilingual programs which in theory have been established to meet their children's English language needs.

Unfortunately, English-only proposals are simplistic and a reactionary response to the challenges of a multicultural society. Worse, they threaten to deprive minorities of their heritage, their culture and the protections guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

If the free speech provision of the First Amendment does not protect language, what does it safeguard? How does one separate speech from the language that frames it? English-only proponents seem to forget that the very purpose of a democracy is to give people a voice. Congress should have no part in silencing those who cannot articulate their needs, their problems or their issues in English. To do so is definitely un-American.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this year we have an opportunity to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I, like many of our Members, we are all concerned in terms of the changes that we foresee and some of the things that might happen. One of the things that I would like to do this afternoon is talk about the importance of bilingual education.

One of the main programs the schools rely on is bilingual education. For many of these youngsters and the students in my district, this is not an option but a necessity. This program allows these individuals an opportunity to be able to learn the core items of the curriculum in their native language so that they will be able to function as quickly as possible in the English language.

This program allows our children to feel included in the learning process. From firsthand experience, I can say that I started in the first grade not knowing English, and it took me 5 to 6 years to comprehend what was occurring in the classroom. Now I have learned that language acquisition requires from 5 to 7 years to be able to learn a second language, and so it is important for us to have a good understanding of what it takes to learn a second language.

Programs like bilingual education will allow our students the opportunity to learn not only English but learn basic subjects in the native tongue that are essential for continued growth and development.

As we move to a global economy, more and more languages will be considered a necessary resource. The highly competitive nature of today's global economy underscores the importance of knowing more than one language. America needs bilingual education to produce educated, well-informed citizens.

The Texas Educational Agency commissioner supports this idea by stating, ''In the future all children should be trilingual: proficient in their native language, proficient in a second language and proficient in computer literacy. The business community understands the value of trained multilingual employees. We must offer a work force that can meet such demands. This is the commissioner from Texas.

By supporting bilingual education, we are supporting our country and also the importance of learning English, at the same time retaining as much of the native language as possible.

It also is important that through bilingual education and various types of options, the two-way developmental bilingual education programs, for example, English speakers and language minority students are in the same classrooms learning all grade level skills at the same time.

Studies show that the most successful programs, models for language for minority students, as well as for native English speaking, bilingual education is a tool that fosters a successful future for these Americans. Bilingual education is an investment that pays off.

If we are to make changes in bilingual education, I hope that it is to improve in terms of assessing the importance of teacher training. We do need teachers to be well trained, to be able to provide that instruction. We also need the ability of the staff to be evaluated and for those programs to be assessed to see how well they are doing. Also important are the initiatives that include parents in the teaching of their children.

These are drastically needed and we hope that as we look forward that these are some of the things that we will be looking at.

Again, I would also just stress that in the bilingual education we will also see dual language instruction that allows both monolingual English-speaking youngsters as well as monolingual Spanish-speaking and other language youngsters be able to work together and learn both languages at the same time.

As we move forward in the global economy, we all recognize the importance of knowing more than one language, and I hope that as we look forward, we move in this direction. I hope that there is no talk of eliminating bilingual education or thinking that Washington, D.C., is a platform for implementing a national 227 initiative. This is not the place. There will never be a time for it to be addressed.

If we do not continue to support bilingual education, we will do a disservice to our children and our Nation. I encourage everyone to support the program. It is a beautiful program.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from the great and progressive State of North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for putting together this special order this afternoon because it is on a topic that is important not just to our Hispanic students and their families; it is important to every American.

Let me take just a moment to speak as a former State superintendent of the State of North Carolina, a State that is seeing tremendous growth in our enrollment of students of Hispanic background.

Let me also thank the gentleman for his leadership on educational issues as a leader in the Hispanic Caucus, and also as a cochair of the House Education Caucus, the Democratic side, and his work there. He understands the needs not only of Hispanic students and Latinos, but of all children in our public schools; and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has a rapidly growing Latino population, as do many of the other States in this country. They come, as my colleagues who have preceded me to this rostrum today have said, for economic opportunity. They come for a variety of reasons; and, yes, they bring their children and want them to have the same educational opportunity as other children.

As a superintendent, I worked hard to serve the educational needs of our Latino community, because they are an important component of the future of this country. If anyone who is watching today does not understand that, all they need do is read our papers and look at the demographics and how our country is changing and the contributions they are making to our society in so many ways today and will continue to in the future.

The biggest barrier to children, the biggest barrier to their learning, is language. We have just heard that. If a child cannot understand the language, then they have a difficult time understanding math or science or history or whatever they are being taught.

In North Carolina, and in most of the school systems in this country, but I will speak specifically about North Carolina and our needs at the national level to do some of these things, implementing English as a second language has served the Latino community better than anything else.

The reason for that is that young children need to understand the language. As I have said, the number of non-English speaking students, not just Latinos but of all languages coming to our shores, have skyrocketed in North Carolina in recent years. It has increased almost 29 percent; 32 percent last year was the increase in just the Latino numbers in our State.

English as a second language works better for youngsters who are in kindergarten to second grade. Let me say why. It takes only 6 to 18 months for those students at a very early age to be proficient and be able to handle it in the classroom, but for high school students it takes 5 to 7 years to bring them up to speed.

Why? Because we do not have the teachers, we do not have the resources and we are not focusing, in my opinion, as we should.

Let me say of an elementary school in my State, happens to be in my district, in Lee County, in Sanford, where they have an outstanding teacher. She taught Spanish for a number of years. She lived in Spain for about 5. She teaches prekindergarten youngsters.

In just 1 year, in just 1 school year, she can bring those students to proficiency. They can acclimate to the classroom and compete with other students and do an outstanding job. That is an indication of immersing students in English, giving them an opportunity in the second language. They spend a number of hours each day in this class, but they also get to go to their regular classes. That is why English as a second language is so important.

There is not enough funding at the Federal level and not enough at the State level to meet the needs of our students. The Hispanic Caucus is providing tremendous leadership on education, as well as this issue of language barriers. It is not isolated to this caucus because they reach across the lines and work with all the other caucuses, because we have a lot of children in our schools who need this help. I think we have an obligation to put our message and our vote where our mouth is.

□ 1545

It is easy for Members to come to this floor and talk about how important education is, and then they fail to realize if a child cannot understand the language, they cannot learn. Today we have a number of students and others in the gallery. I will guarantee the Members, they would tell us the very same thing.

I want to thank the Caucus for their help, not just on the language issues, but the understanding of the needs of children in classrooms that are overcrowded; in putting more teachers in the classroom, and in helping by voting in support of the 100,000 teachers, as the President proposed.

They have also have also been helpful in supporting H.R. 996, a bill that I introduced, the Etheridge School Construction Act, to fit the needs of these communities that are growing so rapidly. The classrooms are overcrowded. Teachers do not have decent places to teach. That is just not acceptable in a day and time when we have the resources to make it happen.

This bill would provide tax credits to finance local construction bonds across

the country in those areas that have great needs. Texas is one of those States. That is one of the second fastest-growing States in America. It will make a difference. I thank them for their help on that. We now have over 100 cosponsors on this bill. I urge the Members of the other body to join us.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank my colleagues from Texas and all those in the Caucus who are working so hard to make education for all children a top priority, but specifically making sure that languages are available for those children who do not understand the English language, to help them to get up to speed so they can become a full player in this economic system of the 21st century, because the future will belong to the educated.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Members are reminded not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. SANCHEZ), the most populous State in the Nation.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today a little bit about school construction, and in particular because my colleague who just spoke, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) spoke a little bit about the school construction bill, and I would like to tell America and my colleagues, so they will sponsor this bill, a little bit about it.

The Expand and Rebuild America's Schools Act is H.R. 415. I know quite a bit about it because I am the author of that bill. We put it in last year and we did not get it passed. This year we hope that we will be able to do it. What does the bill do? The bill addresses one of the most crucial crises facing this Nation; that is, where do we educate our children?

Now, some people would say that at the Federal level we should not be dealing with school construction. I would say that we deal at the Federal level with those issues that do not get answered at the State or local level. One of the major problems that we have with our schools is where do we educate our children, the room in which we educate our children.

I happen to represent a great area, Anaheim, California, Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Irvine, the central portion of Orange County. In the next 5 years, our school population will grow by over 25 percent. That is almost twice as fast the rate of growth as the five fastest growing States with respect to school population across the Nation.

That means not only is California growing faster in the amount of children who are entering public schools, or Texas, for example, or Florida, or New York, or Illinois, but in central Orange County we are growing at twice that rate.

That means that if we take a look at a school district, for example, Anaheim City School District, an elementary school district, kindergarten through 6th graders go there, there are 17,000 children attending that school district. Every year we grow by more than a thousand children.

I know about this school district because I attended it as a child, and the very same school that I attended with about 500 or 600 children today houses almost 1,000 children. Those other schools that are patterned exactly like the elementary school that I attended in the rest of the district have 1,000, 1,100, 1,200 children attending in the space that was made for 600 children.

How do these kids get there? How is it that we are able to put them in the classrooms? We have portable classrooms. We now have double sessions. That means that some children go early in the morning and others come later in the day, so we have a double session going. We now have year-around school. We do not have the traditional 9 months on and 3 months of the summer off. We actually have 4 different tracks of students going to school at any given time.

Now, imagine if you were a mother and you have two or three children, and let us say one of those children is in the middle school or the high school, and they have their own school program going, where they are going 9 months and then 3 months off. And let us say you have two young children also at home, both attending the elementary school. One could be going at 8 in the morning, and the next one would have to be going to school and starting at 10:15.

Now, imagine, you are a mom at home and you have these three children, and you are trying to take them around to soccer and to school and to the doctor's appointments and all, and all three schedules are not the same. So if you are a mother who wants to take three children at the same time to the same school, you cannot do that any longer in the city of Anaheim. It is very difficult to do.

Then, of course, there are the safety issues of sending our kids like that, kids who go out in the morning because they have a 7:30 or 8 a.m. schedule, and kids who come home late because they are on the late schedule and may be walking home in the dark. Think about the problems that we are creating with respect to the school schedules.

Then, of course, there are the portable classrooms that we are now putting onto that school that houses 600 children so we can house more, so we can house the 900 or the 1,000 or the 1,200 children, portables that sit on blacktop and the green grass, where I used to play: less space, double lunches, children going in at 7:30 in the morning so they can have lunch at 9:30. Think about that. We would not do that to ourselves in the business world.

Let us talk about business, because I am a businesswoman. If I were to start a small business today, let us say out of my home, like so many people are doing today, how many telephone lines would I have coming into my office, that extra room in my house set up as my office? At least three, do we not think?

Let us say it was just you working on a consulting basis or doing things like accounting or what have you. You would have at least three lines. One, you would want to be on the Internet. You would want to have your computer set up; two, you would probably like to have a fax; three, you would probably have a line or maybe two lines where someone could be calling in and you could put them on hold while you talk to somebody else.

Well, in these elementary schools in Anaheim, the entire school has only three phone lines to it. Now imagine, you are the principal. You are calling out. There is one phone line. If your PTA was great and was able to raise funds, you would have a fax machine in your office, and you might be faxing some information out to a colleague or somebody else.

Then, of course, kids get sick, so in the morning parents are calling in to say, my kid is not coming to school. If you are a parent and calling in and there is one line dedicated to the fax and one that the principal is calling out to talk to a parent or to somebody else, that means there is one line, one line to call in and say your kid is sick. Imagine if there are 40 children sick that day out of 1,200. That could be a possibility. Imagine the busy signals that you would get or the inability to get through.

Now, imagine if there was a problem at the school and there was a safety hazard or something was going on and you only had three lines, also. You would not start a business in your own home with less than three lines. Why do we allow elementary schools to have 1,200 children, 10 or 15 staff people, 80 teachers, and only three phone lines? That is the state that our schools are in today. That is why room, the fourth R, is so necessary.

That is why at the Federal level we need to be concerned about the rooms in which we teach our children. They should be modern. They should have the technology of the future. They should have the computers and the Internet and the telephone lines, but more importantly, they should be a space that our children could learn in.

The bill that I am offering is not about taxing people more and sending it to Washington, and then deciding what schools we want to be nice to and sending it back to California or Texas. It is about letting people actually keep the money in their area by not sending it to Washington, by giving tax credits.

Schools that qualify would need to have help, they would have to be on a heavy burden list, one like the city of Anaheim, where we need more classrooms, and we can show that we need the growth. Schools would also be required to work public-private partnerships and have businesses working with them, and maybe the businesses would

buy the bonds that the local agency issues.

Third, the responsibility of deciding to issue bonds in order for the interest to be given as a tax credit by the Federal Government would have to be a local decision. That means that on a local level, a community needs to get together and decide that they are willing to pass a bond issue in order to build a school in their area.

Local control, not sending the money to Washington, but giving it back, in a sense, in a tax credit, that is what the Rebuild American Schools Act would do. That is why I hope that when people realize that this is really about putting responsibility on the local level to decide that they are going to do something about it, and the Federal Government stepping in and saying, we are going to help you to do that, we are not going to give it to you, but we are going to help you to solve your problem, that is why this act, this bill, makes a difference and is important.

It is a matter of national security. It is a matter of national security that our children learn in a school environment that is conducive to the 21st century, not in what people have to learn in in Anaheim.

I know because I used to go there as a child. I have seen the closet where the janitor used to push his barrel with his mops and put them away for the night. That closet has been turned into a classroom for six special ed children and their teacher. This is what we are doing to our children, we are putting them in closets so they can learn. How do we expect them to learn? How do we expect people to learn, children to learn, if they do not have the classroom space?

I was talking about portables earlier. The Santa Ana Unified School District, another area that I represent, if we took the portables that sit on its 26 permanent schools and pulled them off and made real permanent schools out of those portable classrooms, there would be 27 new schools built; 26 existing, 27 worth of portable classrooms on those areas.

There is no room to play. There is no room for recess. There is no room for lunch. If it is hot, as it gets in Southern California, there is no shade when you are eating your lunch. If it rains, what do children do? There are even some classes that are taught outside without a classroom.

This is why the Federal Government needs to get involved, and we get involved in a very specific way, with those classrooms that need to be built by the neediest schools all across the Nation, with responsibility at the local level to decide to build them, and with returning money, not sending money to Washington, D.C., but leaving it in the local level to be invested in local communities.

That is why I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 415. I know there are many sponsors already who have spoken today on that bill, and I appreciate the time that they have given me, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from the great State of Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for organizing this special order this afternoon.

It is hard to ignore the fact that our country is one of the greatest in the world, Mr. Speaker, and we have crumbling classrooms and overcrowded classrooms. Research has shown that students do not learn well in overcrowded classrooms and schools.

Some schools have problems with ventilation, heating, air conditioning, lighting, water, along with environmental hazards, such as asbestos. Worst of all, many schools do not have access to the Internet. The advantages of the Internet are unlimited. It is one of the most important educational tools, and provides instant access to a wealth of information.

□ 1600

We need to provide the necessary funding to enable local schools not only to modernize and to rebuild their classrooms, but to make sure each student has access to the Internet.

One of these schools could be preparing the first person to land on Mars, cure cancer or AIDS, or halt global warming. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity this last Friday to have an astronaut from the Johnson Space Center, Dr. Franklin Chang-Diaz, to visit a number of middle schools in my district in Houston, Texas.

He looked out over the 8th graders in each of the rooms and said, ''You are the generation that will be on Mars.'' We need to make sure those eighth graders are prepared to make that step onto Mars.

Also last week, Mr. Speaker, during our break, I had a chance to visit the AAMA Learning Center in my district. AAMA is the Association for Advancement of Mexican Americans. They have a charter school in Houston, Texas. They received E-rate funding for their charter school in the amount of a little over $35,000.

I was happy to see this funding was being used to provide counseling in reading and computer training to these youth in my district, but particularly Hispanic youth.

The AAMA school, the George I. Sanchez High School, was established to take dropouts from our public school system and give them that second chance or that opportunity. When charter schools became in vogue, George I. Sanchez had been around for a number of years. When charter schools became in vogue, the George I. Sanchez School became one of those charter schools and is successful today, Mr. Speaker, because of the success. They are benefiting from the E-rate that will help that charter school help educate these students who are the leadership for tomorrow.

We need to make sure that programs like AAMA's have the necessary funding so that all children have access to quality and innovative education to be competitive in this global economy we have.

In addition, we need to finish the job of hiring the 100,000 new teachers to reduce class sizes in the early grades. My wife is a public school teacher in the Aldine district in Texas. Even in high school we have problems with overcrowding in our math classes. It is tougher to teach 35 children algebra, Mr. Speaker.

In Texas, in 1984, the gentleman from south Texas knows because his former elected position was a State Board of Education member in Texas, Texas law changed it to where we had 22-to-1 pupil/teacher ratio in grades K through 4. That is great. The problem is we could not even keep up, and there are a lot of waivers having to be granted because of the need.

We need that 22-to-1 not only on a State level, but we need it to be 20-to-1 or 18-to-1 on a national level, particularly in elementary school grades, because that is where we set the tone for children to be good students.

Of course, before they get to be high school algebra students or science students or English or math, we need to make sure those class sizes are also small. Because if we are preparing our children to take our place not only as astronauts and physicists and Members of Congress, we need to make sure they have every opportunity.

Let us focus our energy on school modernizing initiatives so our children can learn in a safe and clean environment. Let us create a learning environment in our schools that inspires education and imagination. Let us reduce those class sizes so every child gets the attention and the guidance they need.

Finally, let us provide state-of-the-art technology so that each child is prepared for the challenges and demands of the 21st century. These are measures that will make a difference in the education of our children and that will provide for the best learning environment for our children.

I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) has two very attractive and cute little girls, Mr. Speaker, and I have watched them, not only the 2 years he has served and now his third year, his second term in Congress.

I remember my children went to public schools in Texas, and now a daughter who is starting medical school in Texas and a son who is going to graduate school at Texas A&M, they went to public schools. Public schools educate most of the people in our country.

We cannot say that we are going to fail the public schools simply because

they have a harder job today than they did when I was in public schools in the 1960s. We need to make sure we give them the resources, the technology, the facilities, the smaller class sizes, and also the qualified teachers to be able to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for allowing me to participate with him today.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), my friend and distinguished member of the delegation from my State.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about a different but equally important issue affecting education in America. As we prepare to embark upon the 21st century, all of us know that the Technology Age is upon us.

We live in a time when new ideas and innovations impact the way that we live, the way that we learn, the way that we work, and even the way that we play. Today's children cannot remember a time when fax machines, calculators, computers, or the Internet were not a part of their daily lives.

Their world and the future that they will inherit will require not only an understanding of these innovations, but an ability to fully utilize them and integrate them into their work environment. No matter what occupation our children pursue, every American child must be versed in the technology that is permeating our society today.

Mr. Speaker, a program that is making a tremendous impact is the E-rate program. This program through the Schools and Libraries Corporation is providing discounted telecommunication services and Internet access to schools and libraries across the country.

As a nation, we cannot afford to have only the affluent areas access the benefits of technology. Consequently, through this program, the E-rate program, equal opportunity has been provided to minority and poor areas in urban and rural communities.

The demand for this program and the funding is tremendous, as has been indicated by over 30,000 applications requested in the very first year. Fortunately, we were able to fund the majority of these requests through the E-rate fund with a total of almost $1.66 billion committed around the country.

Even so, however, there were many school districts and libraries that were left out. Nearly 500 million in requests went unfunded this year. This means that not all schools and libraries received the necessary resources that they needed. That, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable.

There is good news and there is bad news. The good news is that there is a round two for the E-rate. The bad news now is that in round two there will be 2,000 more applications than last year. With over 32,000 applications pending, clearly the need for discounted services and internal connections remains very high.

We as a nation have always prided ourselves on giving each and every child the opportunity to receive an education that will benefit them in their future employment. This year as schools and libraries around the country make applications for round two of the E-rate discount, we must make sure that not one child is left out in achieving technical literacy.

I want to encourage every Member of this Congress to stand up for our schools and libraries and encourage that they apply for year two funding. This is just as important as additional teachers, just as important as additional funding and additional pay for teachers, and certainly just as important as school construction and remodeling monies.

Our children's future depends upon the educational tools and skills that we provide them today. We, as a nation, must uphold our commitment to our children. This will determine the solvency and the prosperity of our Nation and secure the future of their children.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important keys to success to Americans is our education. That is why it is one of the top concerns in the Latino community and a high priority in the Unified Democratic Agenda.

We heard our youth requires increased literacy and more education plus enhanced technological skills. My District in southeastern Los Angeles County is absolutely no stranger to high dropout rates, and I discussed this with all of my school districts. These students leave school and are unable to be good, productive citizens in our area.

There are many types of approaches that the people in my district have come up with to fight the dropout rate and improve education. However, this does not mean that we in Congress and the Federal Government do not have a responsibility to work with them.

There are many types of approaches to fight these dropout rates that we hope to be able to, together, fight for. That is why we need to have more teachers, school modernization, funding for alternative programs that help keep our next generations of Americans in school.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important keys to success in America is education. That is why education is one of the top concerns in the Latino community and a high priority in the Unified Democratic Agenda.

To succeed in today's economy, our youth require increased literacy, more education and enhanced technological skills. But our schools are overcrowded and need to be equipped with the latest technology; teachers need better training; and we need to address the unacceptably high Latino drop-out rate.

Thirty percent of Latinos 16 to 24 years old have dropped-out of school. The number for African Americans is 13 percent and for non-Hispanic whites it is 7 percent. Among Latinos with limited English proficiency, about 50 percent have dropped out.

My district, in southeastern Los Angeles County, is unfortunately no stranger to high drop-out rates. Just a few weeks ago, I was discussing this very issue with an administrator at Bell Gardens High School, which serves the East Los Angeles and Montebello communities in my district.

At Bell Gardens High School, they have another problem in addition to the traditional drop-out rate as we know it. They have a very high transiency rate—about 30 percent. These are students who leave school and then come back several months or a year later. Their education is interrupted and they have difficulty readjusting to the educational program, which makes them even more likely to leave school again.

Local teachers and school officials have been tackling the drop-out and transiency problems in multiple approaches. One is to increase parent involvement in their children's education, so that the learning experience at school is reinforced at home.

Another approach is to improve libraries. There seems to be a correlation between the size and quality of libraries and the ability to capture students' interest and keep them engaged in the educational process.

A third approach is the Pathways program, which gears students toward a specific career path. This program has been successful at making high school education more relevant to the lives of students who might otherwise not see the necessity of staying in school. When they can link each of their classes to a future job, school suddenly becomes a much higher priority for them.

For those students who are living adult lives, either because they are parents themselves or they have to work full-time hours to support their parents and siblings, Bell Gardens High School has implemented ''alternative programs.'' These are flexible educational programs designed to fit the schedules and demands of these students' lives.

These are the types of approaches that people in my district have come up with to fight the drop-out rate and improve education. Let us not mislead ourselves into thinking that all the solutions to our schools' problems can be found here in Washington. Excellent ideas are developed in the local schools in our districts.

However, this does not mean that there is no role for Congress and the federal government. It is our responsibility, as servants of the people, to ensure that local schools have the resources they need so that special programs, such as those at Bell Gardens High School, succeed. That is why we need to fight for more teachers, school modernization, and funding for alternative programs that help keep our next generation of Americans in school.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to discuss an important, brand-new education program called ''Gear Up.''

Two weeks ago, I hosted an information workshop in my south Texas congressional district to spread the word to our local teachers, colleges, superintendents and school board members about what a difference the Gear Up program can make in the lives of our junior high school students.

This exciting new initiative is designed to prepare underprivileged students for college. Gear Up is a competitive grant program and supports early college awareness activities at both the local and the State level.

Specifically, this initiative will award multiyear grants to locally designed partnerships between colleges and high-poverty middle schools plus at least two other partners, such as community organizations, businesses, religious groups, State education agencies, parent groups or nonprofit organizations, to increase the number of students going to college among the low-income youth.

Gear Up partnerships will be based on the following proven strategies: working with a whole grade level of students in order to raise the expectations for all students; starting with sixth or seventh grade students and continuing through high school graduation with comprehensive services, including mentoring, tutoring, counseling, and other activities such as after-school programs, summer academic enrichment programs, as well as college visits; promoting rigorous academic coursework based on college entrance requirements; informing students and parents about college options and financial aid, and providing students with a 21st century scholar certificate—an early notification of their eligibility for financial aid.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge and encourage all local educational agencies to get involved in applying for this important grant. It is my firm belief that mentoring programs such as Gear Up can make all the difference in the lives of our middle school students.

A mentor may be the person who makes the difference by providing a role model for positive behaviors, like studying hard and staying away from trouble, by helping with academic work, by encouraging the student to take the right college-preparatory courses, or by providing extra moral support and encouragement.

We have a fantastic opportunity to help our local students—their future success depends on our leadership now. They fail if we fail to live up to our responsibility to ensure them the strongest chances for academic success.

Mr. Speaker, expanding after-school opportunities is a top legislative priority for the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Our President is committed to triple funding for the 21st Century Learning Center Program, which supports the creation and expansion of after-school and summer school programs throughout the country.

Experts agree that school-age children who are unsupervised during the hours after school are far more likely to use alcohol, drugs, and tobacco, commit crimes, receive poor grades, and drop out of school than those who are involved in supervised, constructive activities.

The program increases the supply of after-school care in a cost-effective manner, primarily by funding programs that use public school facilities and existing resources.

In awarding these new funds, the education department will give priority to school districts that are ending social promotion by requiring that students meet academic standards in order to move to the next grade.

The President's budget includes $600 million in fiscal year 2000 to help roughly 1.1 million children each year participate in after-school and summer school programs.

I have visited many of the schools in my congressional district. I have listened to teachers, principals, supt's, and schoolboard members. I have suggested they try converting schools to "After School Community Centers." After school snacks, tutoring, mentoring, homework, organized sports, theatre, number sense.

I strongly support funding for this program and urge all my colleagues to do the same.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

WOMEN IN BUSINESS

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that is near and dear to my heart, women in business, specifically women-owned small businesses.

As the mother of four and a former small business owner myself, I know just how hard it is to balance the full-time job of being a mother and then adding to it the challenges of owning and running your own business.

From women-owned construction firms to women-owned public relation firms to Donna, Jo-Jo, and Angela who own Donna's Hair Design in my own district town of Chappaqua, New York, all of these women deserve all of the support that we here in Congress can give them.

Everyone needs to remember that small business is the most important sector of our economy. Currently, in the United States, there are approximately 8.5 million women-owned businesses. That is 8.5 million women-owned businesses, 36 percent of all businesses in the United States. These 8.5 million businesses employ 23.8 million employees. These businesses have seen their sales increase from $2.3 trillion to $3.1 trillion in just the last 6 months.

My congratulations to all of the hardworking women who are doing more than their share to contribute to the economy of our Nation.

The number of women-owned small businesses have increased by 89 percent in the last decade. During the same period, these businesses have increased their revenue by 209 percent. Women are a force to be reckoned with in today's economy.

□ 1615

During my life, I have had many roles: The mother of four, a public school teacher, a college professor, a rape crisis counselor, a professional patient advocate, a small business owner, and now a United States Congresswoman.

I have learned countless lessons in these roles and have brought them with me to the House of Representatives. Many of these lessons were learned as a small businesswoman. This has given me some insight as to what women need in order to fully compete with their male counterparts, and for this reason I have devoted my energy to working with the Committee on Small Business to enable small businesses to run more efficiently.

I have introduced legislation again this year that expresses the sense of Congress regarding the need to increase the number of procurement contracts that the government awards to women-owned businesses. The Federal Government is America's largest purchaser of goods and services, spending more than $225 billion each year, and women should have more access to these projects.

In 1994 Congress set a 5 percent procurement goal for women-owned businesses. Five years later, however, the rate of procurement for women-owned businesses is 1.9 percent. This percentage is a poor reflection on the access to these jobs when considering the rate of growth of women-owned businesses.

I want to continue to do what I can to improve the procurement process for women in this Congress, and I am happy to say that a few weeks ago the House passed H.R. 774, The Women's Business Center Amendments Act of 1999. This bill authorized appropriations of $11 million for the expansion of this program in fiscal year 2000.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. JIM TALENT), for his work, as well as the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from New York (NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ), and many other people who worked to make this accomplishment here on the floor of the House.

Currently, there are 60 centers now operating in 40 States. These centers assist women in many ways, including helping them to focus their business plans through courses and workshops, providing information on capital, as well as helping the women choose their location. The centers have the freedom to tailor their programs based on the needs of the communities in which they work.

Recently I have been able to meet with many women business owners and some of the women who run these centers and heard firsthand the challenges and the successes of these businesses. These are just a few of the issues that

women business owners face. There are many others, like tax and regulatory issues, ensuring fair access to capital, that we all need to stay involved with.

I know my colleagues here share my concerns. Let me close by congratulating all of the women businesses in our Nation. I know all too well how difficult their jobs are. They are an important part of our Nation's economy, and I will continue to do what I can to ensure that they are not forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in discussing the need for this Congress to help America's working women. I am proud to be a part of the Women's Caucus and I am proud that this caucus is committed to raising and addressing important issues concerning women.

Today, more than ever, working women are no longer the exception, they are the rule. America's working women are redefining the workplace as we know it. They are learning how to balance their dual responsibilities of work and family. In today's business world, women own about 6.5 million companies. That is one-third of all the businesses in America. Today, women are creating businesses at twice the rate of men. In fact, it is estimated that by the year 2000 women will own 40 percent of American companies.

These facts make it vitally important this Congress address the issues and the interests of this growing segment of our economy. Yes, it is becoming increasingly clear that women's issues are economic issues. Jobs, taxes and economic growth are the top issues for today's women.

Since women are creating more jobs than men, they are disproportionately affected by burdensome taxes, rules and regulations, and too often it is too difficult for women-owned businesses to get started. Once started, it is often difficult for women-owned businesses to stay afloat.

According to a 1995 survey of women-owned businesses, 84 percent of women entrepreneurs used their own personal savings to start their businesses. And once underway, women business owners often find themselves dipping into their savings to stay in business.

Mr. Speaker, as a small business owner myself, I have made it a commitment to stand up and speak out and stay focused on the issues that face women-owned businesses. Female entrepreneurs are here to stay, and while it is true that Washington cannot create wealth, it is no less true that we have an obligation to make the business environment as conducive as possible for women.

I believe that excessive government taxation, regulation and litigation hold back our working women by holding up production costs. Government taxes prevent female employers and employees from keeping more of their hard-earned money, and it has often been noted that today taxes consume more of the family income than families spend on food, education and shelter, or anything else. We need to make our tax system flatter and fairer so that our women will not have to work almost half the year to foot government costs. Working women need to be able to keep more of their hard-earned money.

We also need to review our regulations as well. Each year over 100,000 pages of new rules and regulations are produced in Washington, and many of these guidelines overlap and they are repetitive.

Moreover, it has been estimated that regulations cost businesses over $700 billion each year. These regulations impact every single business owned by women. And since businesses often have to raise prices to afford these new regulations, it is estimated that each American family pays an extra $700 per household to cover the cost of regulations.

It has also been estimated that regulations add as much as a third to the cost of building an airplane engine and almost double the price of a new vaccine. Mr. Speaker, we need to be working on ways to increase, not decrease, the number of women in business, and adding cost is not the way to do that.

Moreover, government rules and litigation often subject our small businesswomen to years of legal battles and legal costs. Let us let our working women spend more time in the board room and less time in the courtroom. Only then can we truly create a conducive business environment for women.

Mr. Speaker, today's working women are the pioneers of tomorrow. As they struggle to create more jobs, growth and opportunity, let us make our government work for our women, not against them; stand by their sides, not ride on their backs.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget that working women have yet another job waiting for them when they get home at night. In our efforts to enhance and encourage the careers of women, I am afraid we sometimes lose sight of the fact that many of our working women are also working mothers. These working mothers need the opportunity to balance their schedules between work and home. After all, meetings with our children are more important than meetings with our staffs.

I was a working mother of three, and I understand there is no price tag put on the time we spend away from our families. That is why when I became Mayor of Fort Worth several years ago, I took an active interest in ensuring our employees had the kind of schedules necessary to take care of their jobs and also take care of their families.

One of the tools we used to help create a family-friendly city hall was comp time. This program allowed workers to choose time off instead of overtime pay. It is extraordinarily popular in the public sector, but it is still not available in the private sector. Let us help our working women by giving workers in the private sector the same choice.

Mr. Speaker, the working women of America are essential to ensuring that our Nation continues on a path of economic growth and personal responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support measures which promote and protect the dual role of American women as leaders in the office and leaders at home.

I want to thank the Women's Caucus for raising awareness about the importance of women's issues.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, for bringing attention to these important issues that affect women and for drawing attention to the contributions that women business owners have made.

It is true that women business owners now employ more people than the Fortune 500 companies combined in the United States. They have made great strides, but we know that women in the work force still face discrimination in many, many forms, both as business owners and as employees.

Women in the work force today, as we enter into the 21st century, still earn only 74 cents for every dollar that men earn at the very same jobs. This persistent wage gap forces families into poverty and deprives them of the benefits that women would earn if only they were men; that is, if only they were men making more money at the very same jobs.

This discrimination follows women into their retirement. Because they make less money through their working years, they have fewer private pensions and they get fewer Social Security benefits. Often they have less health care coverage during their working years, and so they bring into their retirement years more disease. They are less well.

I want to focus for a minute on the issue of Medicare because now this Congress is engaged in a great debate on what we are going to do about Medicare. And I would say that while it is important for Congress to ensure Medicare solvency in the future, any proposal must protect women who receive Medicare.

Of course, Medicare is a program that serves both men and women, but women comprise most of the beneficiaries. Elderly women aged 65 outnumber elderly men three to two. There are 20 million elderly women on Medicare and another 2 million women who are on Medicare because they receive Social Security disability benefits. In fact, 58 percent of all elderly beneficiaries are women.

Seventy-one percent of the beneficiaries aged 85 or older are women. That is, of course, because women live longer than men do. Women aged 65

years and older are more than twice as likely as older men to live within 125 percent of the poverty line. That is to say that they are twice as likely as men to have to live on $10,000 a year or less, and we know how hard that is.

Recently, older women were projected to spend over $200 a year more on out-of-pocket health care costs than men. And we know today that the elderly are spending a greater percentage of their income on health care out-of-pocket than they did when Medicare was enacted in 1965. This is a particular burden for women.

One of the proposals that has been on the table that frightens me the most and should frighten older women the most is that of raising the eligibility age for Medicare from 65 to 67. To underscore how dangerous that would be, currently there are a million people between the ages of 62 and 64 without insurance, and three out of five of those are women. So currently the numbers of uninsured people in the older age groups are mostly women already.

Many women are uninsured because they are younger than their already retired husbands who are on Medicare and they do not have employer-based insurance themselves. Raising the eligibility would deny people access to health care during their early 60s and would expand their need for more complicated and expensive treatment in later years.

There are many problems with some of the proposals that are on the table, but the reality of raising the age of eligibility for Medicare is that it would accomplish one thing, and that is, it would increase the numbers of uninsured people. Because employers are not looking for women aged 65 to 67 to hire and to provide health care benefits to, it would dramatically increase the numbers of people who are uninsured, and most of those people would be women.

So I would say if we care about elderly women in the United States, then we want to make sure that we do not agree to any proposal that increases the age of eligibility.

□ 1630

I thank my colleague from New York for allowing me this time to speak on this important issue.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute our Nation's women business owners and to join my colleagues in the Congressional Women's Caucus in bringing to the forefront the impressive contributions women business owners are making to the strength and vitality of our economy.

Over the past 2 decades, women-owned businesses have been amongst the fastest growing areas of our economy. In 1973, when I started my home-based law practice, women owned less than 5 percent of all businesses in the United States. By 1997, that figure jumped to 36 percent. Over the last decade, the number of women-owned firms increased by 89 percent nationwide. Employment nearly tripled and sales nearly doubled.

Who are today's women business owners and how can we help ensure that they are free to grow and prosper? There are more than 8.5 million women-owned businesses in the United States, employing nearly 24 million people. That is more than all of the Fortune 500 companies combined.

Where do we do business? Everywhere. Today, women own businesses in all sectors of the economy, not just in the service sector or the so-called traditional women-owned business areas. In fact, the top growth industries for women-owned businesses in recent years has been in construction, wholesale trade, transportation, communications, agribusiness, and manufacturing.

What is it that motivates women to start their own businesses? The National Foundation for Women Business Owners surveyed women across the country and found that nearly half stated one of two reasons. A great idea for a product or service, or the realization that they could do for themselves what they had previously done for an employer. Frustrations with the corporate environment, including feeling unchallenged and experiencing a glass ceiling were also cited as motivation for women to become entrepreneurs.

The foundation also asked women why they stay in business. Not surprisingly, the greatest reward of business ownership for women is gaining control over their own fate, and the greatest challenge of business ownership for women is being taken seriously.

In my home State of Illinois, the largest and most comprehensive women's business assistance center has thrived for 14 years. The Women's Business Development Center has served over 30,000 women through counseling, training, financial assistance, and new marketing opportunities. Thanks in part to the help of the center, in Illinois there are now over 336,000 women-owned businesses employing 23 percent of all Illinois workers and generating 15 percent of the State's business sales.

But despite the explosive growth in women's business ownership in the United States, we still generate only 18 percent of all business revenues. So there is still much work to be done, and Congress can help accelerate the growth and success of women-owned businesses.

Women need new and more access to market opportunities and to contracts at all levels of government. Women need access to technical assistance to develop and grow their businesses.

Most importantly, like all businesses in the United States, women-owned businesses must be free from excessive regulation and taxation, and they must have access to markets for their products and services abroad.

I thank my colleague for allowing me to participate today on this important issue.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague and friend from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, and particularly my friend from New York, who put this together tonight and for all who have spoken so eloquently in honor of women and Women's History Month.

I come to the floor of the House today to salute the mothers of Women's History Month, the National Women's History Project, known as ''The Project.'' The Project is from the Sixth Congressional District in California, the district that I am so very proud to represent.

Almost 1 year ago, I traveled to Seneca Falls, New York, with a group of my colleagues to celebrate our Nation's women, the 150th anniversary of the Women's Rights Movement. This was truly a special occasion because Sonoma County, which is where I live, is the birthplace of the National Women's History Project, the organization responsible for the establishment of Women's History Month and a leader in the 150th anniversary of the women's rights celebration.

The Project is a nonprofit educational organization founded in 1980. They are committed to providing educational resources, recognizing and celebrating women's diverse lives and historic contributions to society. Today, The Project is repeatedly cited by educators, by publishers and journalists as the national resource for information on U.S. women's history.

Thanks to The Project's efforts every March, boys and girls across the country recognize and learn about women's struggles and contributions in science, literature, business, politics, and many, many other fields.

As recently as the 1970s, women's history was virtually unknown, left out of schoolbooks and classroom curriculum. In 1978, as chairwoman of the Sonoma County Commission on the Status of Women, I was astounded by the lack of focus on women in our education system. Later, The Project petitioned Congress to expand the national celebration to the entire month of March. Due to their efforts, Congress issued a resolution declaring the month of March to be Women's History Month.

Each year since then, nationwide programs and activities on women's history in schools, in workplaces, and communities have been developed and shared.

Under the leadership of Mary Ruthsdotter and through the hard work of these wonderful women, the celebration of International Women's Day was expanded and declared by Congress to be National Women's History Week.

Together, the women of the Project succeeded in nationalizing the awareness for women's history. I want to acknowledge Molly MacGregor for her

thoughtful leadership and Lisl Christy, Cindy Burnham, Jennifer Josephine Moser, Suanne Otteman, Donna Kuhn, Sunny Bristol, Denise Dawe, Kathryn Rankin, and Sheree Fisk Williams. They are the women that are at the Project presently. All of these women serve as leaders in the effort to educate Americans of all ages about the contributions of women in our society.

I also want to pay tribute to the ''first lady'' of Marin County, California, just across the bridge from San Francisco, part of my district. This woman's name is Vera Schultz. Vera was the first woman on the Mill Valley, California, City Council and the first woman on the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

Vera's career in Marin County during the late 1940's and early 1950's was a pivotal era in Marin's social and political history. As the area grew in population with the opening of the Golden Gate Bridge, Vera had an important vision and dedicated herself to the changing face of Marin County. Vera faced great opposition to reforming an unfair tax structure that would have taxed newcomers at a higher rate, and she also fought hard so that Marin County could have the very best possible civic center.

Vera knew that Marin deserved the best, so she got the best. Due to her persistent prodding, in 1959, Frank Lloyd Wright submitted his plan for the Marin County Civic Center, and in 1960 construction began. Marin County now has another precious treasure to share with our country because of Vera Schultz.

As I pay tribute to Women's History Month, I am truly grateful to Vera Schultz and to all the devoted women at the Project because of their continued commitment and for making an indelible mark on our country. We now understand the importance of women in our history.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for organizing and leading us in this wonderful opportunity to speak here on the floor regarding issues which we can give our attention to, which really do affect women across this country.

It is a real pleasure to hear the wide range of emphases that have been mentioned already today, and we have more coming. But whether it is women in their own businesses, and as they own and participate in business, whether it is the way Social Security affects women and Medicare affects women in all of these areas, there is much to speak about pertaining to women in this recognition of Women's History Month.

I want to rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of a most important piece of legislation which is among us and at our table in Congress today, and that is the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act.

Just 2 weeks ago, I joined the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) in introducing this bipartisan bill, which will help to treat low-income women who have been diagnosed with cancer.

In 1990, Congress took a very important first step to fight breast cancer and cervical cancer by authorizing a screening program for low-income, uninsured, or underinsured women through the Centers for Disease Control; and they called this program the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, and now it is in place over this past decade in virtually every part of our country.

Now, the problem is that while the program covers screening services, it does not cover treatment for women who are found to be positive and in need of services through this screening program. Thus, these vulnerable, poor women are left to an ad hoc patchwork of providers, volunteers, and charity care programs, making their treatment unpredictable, delayed, and in so many cases incomplete and resulting in really disastrous results for themselves and their families.

Approximately 3,600 women per year are diagnosed through the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program. And now that they are diagnosed, they need services. All the screening in the world will not help if women who are diagnosed with the disease do not have access to quality treatment for their condition.

And so, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act, which is before us now, gives States the opportunity and the option to provide Medicaid coverage to uninsured or underinsured women who have been diagnosed through the early detection program but cannot afford treatment.

I was very heartened a couple of weeks ago to notice in our first hearing in the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Committee on Commerce that the hearing that we held on this particular issue that there was unanimous, it seemed, and very bipartisan support for enacting this legislation.

And I was pleased that one of my constituents, Dr. John Cox, the Director of Student Services at the University of California at Santa Barbara, was one of the expert witnesses; and the various people who presented were lauded by both sides of the aisle for their recognition that this early detection program is working well. But what it is uncovering is the need for services for these very women.

With that enthusiasm that we felt in the room that day, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and I and some other members of the committee have set aside Mother's Day as our goal for obtaining 218 cosponsors on the bill to bring it to the floor for a vote. What better way to honor mothers across the Nation this year than by providing this life-saving treatment?

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, I pledge my commitment to working in a bipartisan manner, and I know my colleagues today will be joining that effort, toward passing the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act.

This bill is widely supported by women's health groups and is a top priority for the breast cancer community, including the National Breast Cancer Coalition and the California Breast Cancer Coalition.

Over 100 Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, men and women, have already signed on to be original cosponsors. I urge my other colleagues to sign on as well.

I cannot think of a better Mother's Day gift for women across the Nation than to pass this legislation.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for letting us share this particular special order with America. I do not think there is any week with any more importance or month as significant as Women's History Week. The contributions of women in this country are so outstanding until if every woman in Washington were to be here today, they could not say enough about what women have done. On both the local, State and national level, women have made significant contributions to our society and they will continue to do so. Our role in government is increasing. Our role in the health medical sciences is increasing. Our role in science is increasing. Our role in every facet of American culture is increasing. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, women now are sort of the bedrock of the family. We seek to be the glue to hold it together. Regardless of what phase of life that we participate in, we still feel that we have the family as our most significant contribution. We give, we yield, we culture, we nurture our children and we do our best to have them grow into outstanding individuals.

I came today to talk about a health problem that is so devastating to young women. Many of my colleagues may not have ever heard of this disease. It is called lupus. It kills women in their childbearing years. It cripples them. It maims them. It makes them feel as if they have no life-style at all. When you hear the word again, you will say, that is a devastating disease that is pretty much outstanding in significance and incidence among young women. It is serious, it is inflammatory, and for the past 6 years I have tried to get this bill authorized in the Congress so that the National Institutes of Health would receive at least 20 to $50 million a year for research into lupus. If you could see some of the young women that become seriously impaired by lupus, you would say to the health subcommittee of Labor-HHS, that is a disease that needs to be

stopped. The immune system becomes so overreactive that it goes out of control. The antibodies in the woman's body attack her other tissues. This causes inflammation, causes redness, swelling, and it affects women nine times more than it does men. Between 1.4 to 2 million Americans have been diagnosed with this disease. There are so many cases that go undiagnosed and that doctors cannot many times diagnose lupus. Many times the diagnosis for lupus is worse than the treatment, and doctors are not very adept at finding out whether or not a woman has lupus or not. Our body's immune system is known for protecting the body, but if a woman has lupus, the immune system just goes haywire, it loses its ability to tell the difference. It is not infectious, it is not rare, it is not cancerous, but it is not well known. It is more prevalent than AIDS, Mr. Speaker, sickle cell anemia, cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis and cystic fibrosis combined. So you can see what a devastating disease it is and its impact on women. It is so important that during Women's History Month that I call America's attention to this devastating disease and how much it is leading to the impairment of women.

I can relate to lupus firsthand. I had a sister to die from it. There are so many people here in this Congress who have had relatives. I have had several hearings on lupus. We are losing our children, Mr. Speaker, we are losing our sisters, our mothers, grandmothers and friends. We need to really do something about this deadly disease. We need to say to NIH, look, more research is supposed to be done on this disease. There has to be a cure. American women are at high risk for this deadly and debilitating disease. There is a need for more professional awareness. That is why I am glad that my wonderful colleague gave me this opportunity to come to the floor and speak about lupus because of its significance to women and during Women's History Week. We must fight those diseases that cause morbidity and mortality among the ranks of women.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) the cochairwoman of the House Women's Caucus.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for organizing this special order and for her fine leadership in this body this year and other years in support of women's issues and family issues. I was elected in 1992, the so-called Year of the Woman, when many Americans voted for women candidates not as a slogan but as a force to be reckoned with. We came to Congress. There were 48 of us. Our presence did make a difference in doubling moneys for health care for women and access to clinics, in child care, in education, in many, many areas. And we have made progress since then in the number of women that are elected.

In 1999 there are 89 women who hold statewide offices across this country, and there are other positive signs. There are now three women governors, 58 women in the House, and nine women Senators. In fact, the First Lady might even choose to run for the Senate in New York State. We have women in posts that never have been held before. We have the first woman to ever serve as Secretary of State, Attorney General, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, head of the National Science Foundation, and many, many more.

But I am still concerned that women did not receive the vote until 1920, a right that we should have been born with. In fact, my mother was born without the right to vote. We all owe a great debt to the many women who came before us, on whose shoulders we stand, who worked for and fought for women's rights, Alice Paul, Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, Carrie Chapman Catt and many, many others, because the vote is so important. The vote is what enables women to be not only at the kitchen table but the peace table, the economic development table, the congressional table. It is important that we as Members of Congress support other women in other countries as they work for and gain the right to vote.

Earlier today, a resolution passed this House authored by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the chairman of the International Relations Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN). It was supported by every Member of this body. It congratulated Qatar on the first ever election to be held where men and women could vote and where women could stand for that right.

The gentlewoman from New York and I traveled all the way to the tip of the Gulf to be part of this historic and important event. It was held on March 8, International Woman's Day. What better way to celebrate the progress and advancement of women and girls throughout the world than by giving women the right to vote and stand for office in an emerging democracy in the Gulf. The Gulf Cooperation Council, which is in the area, this is the first such election to take place, and we hope it will encourage the movement forward in other countries.

In comparison, Kuwait has an elected parliament which exercises limited legislative and oversight powers, but women are not allowed to vote. In Oman they have an elected consultive council; however, only selected male and female citizens are enfranchised, and the Sultan retains the final say over who is part of that council. Bahrain had an elected parliament which was dissolved by the Emir in 1975, and the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia have no elected institutions. So we hope this historic election in Qatar will be a banner, a leadership step for the region.

We live now in a world economy and we must recognize that democracies help us in our shared world with stable environments and really improved rights for individuals. It was very exciting for the gentlewoman from New York and myself to meet the six women who were running for office. One almost won. She lost by 24 votes, but next time we hope that she will win. It looked very much like an American election, with banners and rallies and meetings, just good plain campaigning.

Any democracy is a journey. It is one that begins with many steps. This was the first step towards a full parliamentary election. It was for an advisory council. But it is an important first step. Seeing the faces of the individuals reminded me very much of the faces that I saw on television of our brothers and sisters in South Africa when they first received the right to vote. It was exciting, it was historic and it was wonderful to be there. But as we work here in Congress, we are working every day to help women and families and children.

Just this week, along with the gentlewoman from New York, we introduced a very important bill that will provide screening and protection for breast cancer and prostate cancer. Roughly 1,500 cancer-related deaths per day take place in our country. Early detection of cancer through screening can extend a patient's life, reduce treatment time and cost, and improve a person's quality of life. The first step we need to take to reduce the number of cancer-related deaths is to increase access to screening exams in the private sector.

In 1997, Congress, through the Balanced Budget Amendment, included a bill that Barbara Vucanovich and I had authored in 1992. Barbara was a survivor of breast cancer. It called for the coverage of annual mammograms for women in Medicare. It was very important that this bill passed and was part of the Balanced Budget Amendment. It will save hundreds of thousands of lives.

The bill we introduced will extend these same benefits to Americans under the age of 65 if they are at risk and if the patient and their doctor know that such a test is needed. Most insurance companies provide coverage for some cancer screening, but that coverage is inconsistent and often does not provide coverage for the appropriate type of screening test given a person's risk level. My office has received comments from not only colleagues and constituents but doctors who talk about plans that do not cover tests that are needed to save lives and to prevent cancer from growing. If it is caught in the beginning, it is a very minor procedure. Yet if it continues to a more life-threatening stage, it is not only costly in terms of suffering but also in terms of medical dollars.

□ 1700

This bill assures that all individuals with health insurance are guaranteed coverage for important cancer screening tests such as mammograms and

prostate cancer screening. Science has proven that these screening exams work. If a doctor and patient have decided together that the patient would benefit from a screening exam, insurance companies should not have the right to deny coverage of a potentially lifesaving exam. This bill will save lives and lower the cost of treating cancer by increasing the rates of early detection.

We have worked together on a number of bills, not only in health care, but in child care, in helping women-owned businesses and strengthening educational opportunities for our young people and our people who are displaced from work, and I look very, very much forward to working with my colleagues in the Women's Caucus, especially the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) who has been an outstanding leader in so many issues, particularly those that help women in business, women, children and families.

I want to note that the Women's Caucus has probably been the most successful caucus in a bipartisan way of actually passing and enacting legislation. It was my privilege to work with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) last year when we really enacted into law many important measures to help women, children and families, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) on the other side of the aisle.

So I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), for organizing this special order for women's history. We have to realize that we are making history every day as we work here to strengthen the rights that so many women gave their lives for as they worked to gain the right to vote for women in this country. I thank her for going to Qatar with us and being part of that exciting election, and I thank all my colleagues for going on record and voting in support of the elections and the right for women to stand for office in Qatar.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I especially thank her for her initiative in organizing this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I am a former Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, have spent much of my life working on women's issues. Many of them are discrimination issues, many of them are not, and if you would ask the average woman which of the literally hundreds of women's issues are more important, you would have a hard time coming up with a single answer. But I think you would probably find more women saying that pay today is important than any other issue, and that is because women are out here and have to be out here working.

Senator TOM HARKIN and I simultaneously introduced the Fair Pay Act just before recess because Equal Pay Day, when we would have introduced it, occurred when Congress was out of session. Equal Pay Day is a day that women in the year, usually four months, earn about what men earn during the entire prior year.

Thereafter we had a meeting at the White House with the Chief of Staff, John Podesta. At that meeting I asked that the President use Equal Pay Day to do an event to raise the profile of pay issues because they already high with the people of the United States, and to his credit the President and the First Lady had an event attended by several hundred women leaders on April 7 where, interestingly, they did not lecture us but invited in women, four women, to tell their own pay stories.

Why does pay carry so much weight today? Even women who live in two-parent families, two-thirds of them work. In year-round wages you have women up to somewhere in the 70s. It has bounced between 70 and 75 percent during this decade. The source of the progress we have made in the last 20 years has been largely a thin slice of women at the highly-trained level, and sadly, because of the decline in mens' wages, women are catching up.

There are a number of bills, and I support them all, but I wanted to say just a word about the Fair Pay Act, because if you want to meet the problem of the average woman today who works, it will not even be an equal pay, as much as we still have to do in that. It will be an equivalent pay for equivalent jobs in traditional women's occupations. It is the mainstream women's occupations that are undervalued.

Regardless of their education, the women now get more bachelors degrees, and women finish high school more often than men, women cannot catch up, and it is largely because even when they have working jobs where they have the same skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions as men, they are not paid the same so that if a woman is an emergency services operator and a man is a fire dispatcher, he is going to earn more money even though they both may have 2 years of community college.

The Fair Pay Act therefore says that discrimination in jobs that are equivalent in skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions should be paid the same, and it would add that to the law. Equivalent pay for equivalent jobs is going to be the issue of the next decade, just as the issue of the 1960's when we got the Equal Pay Act was equal pay for equal jobs. The Fair Pay Act does not tamper with the market system because the woman has to show that the reason for the disparity is not market factors but discrimination.

I would like to go through and talk about the women who appeared at the White House on April 7, but in deference to the woman who still may want to speak during this special order, I would like to conclude by saying that I think we are off to a good start and we ought to keep before the House this entire term the importance of women's issues.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) who organized this special order, and I congratulate her strong partner, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for her work in a bipartisan manner with the gentlewoman from her own home state.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make sure that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) had completed her sharing with us over the pay equity, which is so important for the full House to understand, so I want to, if I may, yield additional time as she may want to conclude that statement. She was so gracious.

Ms. NORTON. That is very kind of the gentlewoman and very typical of her.

Unless the gentlewoman from New York needs that time, I do think it would greatly illustrate my point to have some examples.

Mrs. KELLY. If the gentlewoman will just manage to fit it in, I think like in 2½ minutes, it is fine. I personally would like to hear the examples, Mr. Speaker, and I would be delighted to have her take that time if she would like to have it.

Ms. NORTON. I very much appreciate it. It will take just a couple of minutes.

These are the women that came. One my colleagues may have read about, a woman from Massachusetts Institute of Technology who is a molecular biologist who is at the top, who never dreamed of herself as a victim of discrimination, at the top at MIT of a tenured professor, the top of the scale. Then she found out that she was making 20 percent less than men who had come at the same time, had done the same amount of work, and she talked to other women, found 14 other tenured women had precisely the same circumstance. To MIT's credit, instead of becoming defensive, MIT said, ''Let us do a study. We're scientists, let us study,'' and have been decided to bring up the women's pay. That is the example, it seems to me, that we want to put forward.

Sanya Tyler who is the head women's coach, basketball coach, at Howard University sued Howard University. She now compliments Howard University because our university has now moved forward to rectify a situation where the only team that was winning was the girls' basketball team, and yet they had disparities in everything from facilities to her own pay. Her pay was brought up, and again the employer has moved forward instead of becoming defensive.

Patricia Higgins, a nurse from Cleveland, Ohio, who testified that her daughter wanted to be a nurse, but the fact is she is a pharmacist. People who are not doing the same job, had no

more training, did not work in the high-pressured nursing and high-skilled nursing that she did and yet earned more money, and she expects that she is now in a union organizing drive, and she thinks that AFSCME is simply going to be able to negotiate up the salaries of the nurses so that they are equivalent to the salaries of the pharmacists.

These were three of the most salient examples, and I think when America hears those examples, America wants to do something about it.

I very much thank the gentlewoman from New York, and I particularly thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON); however I would like to retain 1 minute for myself.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I really wanted to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) as well as the gentlewoman who is also from New York, our colleague (Mrs. MALONEY), in holding this special order and allowing me to participate and to thank them for raising issues that are important to women in our communities and in our Nation. I particularly am interested in supporting the effort of encouraging women to take leadership roles in emerging countries. I was pleased to be voting on the bill that allowed that to happen.

I encourage also the whole enterprise effort of women who are now becoming the growing percentage of small business people, so those issues that would allow our families not only to be viable, but also to be businesswomen and to be striving as businesswomen, not just existing.

I just want to bring up one issue, and I will conclude. That is the issue of child care. If we are going to talk about ability for mothers to go out to work, they have to be concerned about child care.

I am introducing a bill where we will provide tax credit not only for child care, but also for the training of child care workers to make sure that we can assure quality child care for mothers who need that so desperately. So issues about income, issues about leadership and issues about our children and child care are very much issues about families, and I want to support that and urge my colleagues also to be ready to support those initiatives that come in.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will take all of the remaining time, but I want to note that many women have spoken here this afternoon, and, as you can see, women's interests in Congress cover a vast array of legislation. One of the positive things about the House Women's Caucus is our ability to recognize that we, working together, can affect the course of legislation in the United States Congress and hopefully, therefore, make life better for all of the families, women and children in the United States.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the Women's Caucus for having this Special Order tonight and for allowing me the opportunity to speak. I would like to focus on the issue of Domestic Violence against women. The dynamics of domestic violence can be as subtle as verbal attacks or as overt as murder. Nationwide, one out of every four women of all women has been battered at some point in their lives.

Violence against women destroys families, takes the lives of women and their children, and it traumatizes the young people who witness it. It is a well documented fact that children who witness violence in the home grow up to repeat the same patterns as adults.

The tragedy of violence against women is not just a personal problem, it is a community crisis. It is up to the community to get involved to address this issue.

Domstic violence affects women of all races and socio-economic backgrounds. A high percentage of these victims are women of color. African-American women account for 16% of the women who have been physically abused by a husband or partner in the last five years.

According to the Houston Area Women's Center, over 1100 women in Houston called for counseling services in 1997 for family violence. This counseling included services for women with children and teenagers who have also survived violence.

This figure only accounts for the women who have sought help. There are others who continue to suffer in silence. There were also 102 women in Houston who were killed by their partners in 1997.

We all have heard the stories of women who have suffered abuse. In my district I have heard the personal stories of domestic abuse survivors and I have also heard the tragic accounts of women who lost their lives at the hands of their partners.

One of my staff members recounted for me a story from her days at Legal Aid. A young woman with three children came in for assistance to get permanent custody of her three small children. She had suffered from years of abuse from her husband and she had finally decided to leave him.

Although her husband continued to harass and threaten her, this brave young women came to seek help in defiance of his threats. She declared that she was better off poor and alone than dead. This woman's story is inspiring because she made the decision to speak out about her situation. This means that we must continue our efforts to get domestic violence out in the open.

I hope that domestic violence will continue to be viewed as a serious public health issue that deserves our attention. We must encourage women to speak out and to seek help. As a community, we must provide support, encouragement and compassion.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my Colleague from New York—SUE KELLY for her leadership—and the other Members of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues in the special order. As the senior woman in the House, by virtue of seniority, I have been laboring in these vineyards for many years. I am always pleased to have fresh recruits. So I welcome all the Congresswomen to this special order today.

ALL ISSUES ARE WOMEN'S ISSUES

When I first ran for Congress, my experience was that every interview with every reporter started off with the same set of question: "What is your position on the 'women's issues?"

And my response was alway the same: all issues are women's issues. And I still believe that.

But I have to tell you, when I got to Washington, I found that some of the "women's issues—the "family issues"—weren't being addressed by the men in power. Things like child support enforcement and women's health issues and family safety issues. It wasn't that the men were opposed to these issues—they just didn't get it. They were not sufficiently aware of them.

So I realized, in many important areas—if we women in government don't take action, no one else will.

NEED MORE WOMEN

That's why we need more women in Congress.

That's why we need more women State legislators.

That's why we need more women Governors.

That's why we need more women in the County Courthouses, the Township Municipal buildings and the City Halls.

Of course, there are countless issues that have been thrust into the national spotlight due in large part to the efforts of women in Congress—health care, equal pay, family and medical leave, education to name just a few.

I would like to take a moment to examine one issue upon which women lead.

Child support enforcement

The first issue stems from the national epidemic of child support neglect. This epidemic of shame affects over 20 million families where parents ignore both the financial and psychological needs of their children

I have a long history of standing up for child support enforcement, having been a pioneer on child support reforms and having served on the U.S. Commission for Inter-State Child Support Enforcement. It's a national disgrace that our child support enforcement system continues to allow so many parents who can afford to provide for their children's support—both financially and psychologically—to shirk these obligations.

Among those due support, about 50% received the full amount, about a 25% received partial payment and about 25% received NOTHING. In 1991, of the total $17.7 billion owed for child support, $5.8 billion was not paid! This figure is unconscionable!!

Through the years, Congress has taken many concrete steps to crack down on child support deadbeats. The most recent major reform was contained in the landmark welfare reform legislation we passed in 1996—beacuse after all, child support enforcement reform is welfare prevention.

Now we have another opportunity to strengthen the child support enforcement network.

One of the major unfinished items of business from the last Congress is bankruptcy reform. Indeed the Leadership has indicate that bankruptcy reform will considered in the House in the next few weeks.

I am very pleased that the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1999, H.R. 833, introduced by Representative GEKAS, strengthens child support enforcement in a bankruptcy proceeding. H.R. 833 does the following: (1) Makes child support payments number one when determining which debts are paid first in a bankruptcy case (2) confirmation and discharge of Chapter 13 plans are made conditional upon

the Debtor's complete payment of child support (3) provides that the automatic stay DOES NOT apply to a state child support collection agency trying to recover child support payments.

I will be working with Chairman GEKAS and Representative CLAY SHAW to further refine and improve the language that will eventually be included in the final bill.

It is important to remember that failure to pay child support is not a victimless crime. The children are the first and most important victims. We must ensure that these children are taken care of and I will continue my relentless effort in this pursuit.

Remember, All issues are women's issues'', nevertheless, women and children are sometimes victims because of indifference or lack of sensitivity. We pledge here today to give them the sensitivity they need.

Ms. SANCHEZ. What a century this has been for the advancement of women's rights in America. Women vote, we own businesses, we explore outer space. We fight in our nation's armed services, we represent our fellow citizens in our legislature, courts and state houses, and we have a greater role in U.S. public policy than ever before. But first and foremost among these accomplishments is the ability to control our own economic destinies.

I am here tonight to salute women business owners who have helped this remarkable change grow. And in particular, I praise the Women's Economic Summit, one of the first gatherings of its kind. It is planting the seeds for even greater future successes, and I am proud to be a part of that progress.

Women everywhere build their success on that of the women who have gone before them. Tonight I salute women business owners for their work in making the American dream available to our friends and daughters.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. MURRAY, be the conferees on the part of the Senate to the bill (H. Con. Res. 68) ''A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009.''

OVERWHELMING NEGLECT: THE ARITHMETIC OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clearly label my discussion this evening with a topic. I want to call it ''Overwhelming Neglect: The Arithmetic of Federal Aid to Education.''

Overwhelming Neglect: The Arithmetic of Federal Aid to Education, and I am pleased that this special order has fallen in a period when there may be large numbers of school-going youngsters, students in high school and elementary school and junior high school, awake, and maybe a few will be listening.

□ 1715

I want to address a large part of my remarks to those students, and I assure them that what I have to say will not be complicated. I am not going to talk in terms of complex and abstract ideas. I am going to talk about the simple arithmetic of Federal aid to education, no higher mathematics, no logarithms, no differential equations and calculus, nothing complicated, just simple arithmetic.

I want the students of America out there attending school to join me in trying to educate my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and in the whole Washington decision-making arena. There is something wrong with decision-making in Washington at this point about education, something radically wrong.

I think we need the children, the students, younger minds, to come to the aid of the decision-making circles here. We have some decision-making circles with closed minds. We are hemmed in and smothered by some conventional thinking and we need a breakthrough, and I am going to call on the children of America to help us make this breakthrough.

There is some simple arithmetic we should start with. The arithmetic begins with an allocation of priorities here in terms of time and attention and money based on the priorities that are established by the American people. In other words, we live and die by opinion polls here in Washington. Public opinion polls are very important to the Republicans, they are important to the Democrats, they are important to the White House. Everybody is concerned about what the public thinks and we spend a lot of time and energy discussing public opinion polls.

There are a large amount of resources committed to finding out what is it that the public thinks. The impact of public opinion polls, of course, can be tremendous on public policy. We saw the impact of public opinion on the impeachment proceedings which the Republican Party insisted on going ahead with despite the fact that common sense, as reflected by public opinion, the common sense of the American people dictated that it was a wasteful venture, kind of a silly venture and that is what it turned out to be. So public opinion can sometimes be ignored by powerful forces here that refuse to listen.

Right now we have a war in Kosovo which public opinion, I think, will play a great role in determining what else do we do, where do we go in terms of United States policy.

For good or ill, sometimes public opinion is not so desirable in terms of the results that I think we need. I did not agree with public opinion when we had a dictator, self-imposed Army dictator, in Haiti for 3 years. They got rid of the lawful government and they sat there and they would not move, and negotiations went on and on and on.

I wanted to go in and restore the rightful president of Haiti, elected leader of Haiti, and if it took troops to do that, armed intervention, then I was in favor of that. Two-thirds of the American people said no. Two-thirds of the Congress said no. I am glad that the President did not listen to public opinion in that case. I am glad that he went ahead and took some decisive action and it all worked out in the interest of not only the people of Haiti but in the interest of democracy in this hemisphere.

I am glad that Abraham Lincoln did not listen to the opinion of his cabinet when he signed the Emancipation Proclamation. All the votes were against the Emancipation Proclamation which set the slaves free, but he went ahead and signed it anyhow.

So there are times when public opinion, I admit, I may not agree with it but we do listen to it. We do listen to it.

I want to call upon the decision-makers in this Congress and in the whole Washington arena to listen to public opinion on the issue of education. Public opinion has been speaking not sporadically but consistently over a long period of time about the priority it assigns to education.

The great majority of the American people say that government assistance to education ranks highest on their list of priorities, and it has been among the top priorities in the last 5 years.

Education consistently, the American people say, needs help. We need government at every level to do more for education and certainly we need the Federal Government to do more because the Federal Government really does very little in terms of dollar value. The Federal Government is responsible for less than 8 percent of the total budget for education in general. That includes college education, where most of the money goes. So the Federal Government should do more. The public keeps saying that.

Just to refresh everyone's memory, let me cite the polls generally. Whether taken by Republicans or Democrats, they are saying that education ranks number one. Seventy-four percent of the American people consider education as a number one priority. We might think it is Social Security because we hear more talk about saving Social Security. Among the elected officials and political leaders of both parties, Social Security is on everybody's lips. So Social Security is important. However, it is the second highest concern. Seventy-one percent rank Social Security as the highest priority.

Crime reduction is the third. Health care reform is the fourth. Eliminating poverty is the fifth. Tax cuts are the sixth. Jobs, number seven; getting rid of the national debt, number eight;

campaign finance reform, number nine. Here is a list of priorities with education at the very top.

By the way, I have not mentioned defense. Defense expenditures and increases in government aid for defense does not even score. It is not on the chart. It is not on the chart. It is not ranked. So one would think that the priorities that we set here in Washington would have some relationship to the priorities which public opinion has set. One would think that there would be a correlation between what the American people say they want government to do and what we are actually proceeding to do here in Washington, in the Congress and in the White House.

Is there a priority? Is there a correlation? Well, on the surface, it may seem so because on the surface we have a lot of talk about education. Both Republicans and Democrats have all seized the issue in terms of public relations and spin, in terms of getting out press releases, in terms of posturing. Everybody wants to make it appear that they are concerned with education.

However, when we look at the budget, when we look at the arithmetic, we find that there is a very shallow commitment. When we look at the arithmetic, we will find that education is not a priority. The arithmetic of the budget, the allocation of resources, of dollars, it places education way down on the list of priorities. Defense, which is not even in the top ten, defense is the highest priority for both Democrats and Republicans, if we measure priorities according to the amount of money they are willing to appropriate.

Now, defense we often say is the business of the national government; the Federal Government is defense, so it is natural that defense should be the very highest priority. But why a big increase in defense at a time like this? Why do we have to have a tremendous increase proposed for defense before the arms intervention in Kosovo?

We have to pay separately for that. Most people do not know it, but the defense budget is for something else besides fighting wars. When we went into the Gulf War, we had to have a special appropriation for that. Any special armed intervention, any deployment of our forces in large measure, we have special appropriations. So we are going to have to have a special appropriation for Kosovo. We are already in Yugoslavia, to the tune of $8 billion. Our armed forces are in Yugoslavia, in Bosnia, and part of Croatia and carrying out a peace plan. So we have spent up to $8 billion already. All of that money is appropriated on top of the defense budget.

So let us leave out Kosovo for a moment, although I think that Kosovo is certainly important to what I have to say today, and I am going to mention Kosovo because I think Kosovo is an example of how the military strength of the United States is very important in the present world.

We are the last superpower and Kosovo certainly would not be possible if it were not for the participation of this American superpower in that intervention.

What do I think of that intervention? I think it is very important that the American people support the intervention into Kosovo, just as I thought it was important to intervene in Haiti and to follow up a long list of various efforts that were made to resolve the problem peacefully. We negotiated and we negotiated and we negotiated but the predators in Haiti, the vicious, savage people who were killing people every day and killed nearly 5,000 of their own people, they were not about to back down just via negotiations.

Slobodan Milosevic in Yugoslavia, Serbia, is the same breed of character. He is a sovereign predator. He and his gang are in control of the tanks. They have control of the machine guns. They have control of the arms might of the Nation and they are not about to stop the genocidal destruction of Kosovo. They are not about to stop it via peaceful negotiations.

I want to pause and comment on Kosovo because a strong nation must be strong across the board, and our military strength is very important for now and for the future. Even our military strength is weakened and jeopardized by the fact that we are blind to the need for a greater investment in education. We are blind to the need to make the investment now in order to guarantee that we will not have shortages in the future anywhere, shortages in our military personnel who are capable of running a high tech military operation or shortages in the civilian sector, in any area of the civilian sector, information technology, teachers.

We have a lot of shortages that have been projected as a result of the fact that not enough people are being educated in this country. Not enough people are in the colleges now in various fields that are threatened with great numbers of vacancies. To be specific about the military, the aircraft carrier that we launched recently, the super aircraft carrier like none other in the world, was short of personnel. Almost 300 staff members that they needed for that aircraft carrier, they could not find them. They were short of personnel. They could not fully staff the last great aircraft carrier that was launched by the United States Navy.

Why could they not staff it? We have a Nation of almost 260 million people. In a nation of 260 million people, we cannot find enough people to staff an aircraft carrier? It is because we are not talking about simple bodies. We do not need just a physical body, a man or a woman to stand there and staff the aircraft carrier. We need people who have some orientation, some orientation toward a computerized world and can be trained to run a high tech aircraft carrier. They need a certain kind of people. They still need certain kinds of people.

There are other shortages. Already I mentioned in Kosovo, we have got shortages of fuel tank pilots, tanker pilots. One might have picked that up if they were listening to the news, because it came out in the regular news. One does not have to listen to C–SPAN to get serious things like that. I think I heard it twice. I think I heard it again on C–SPAN, but certainly I heard it on the regular news. Tanker pilots in shortage. They are going to find other shortages soon. In a high tech world where we cannot just take a body, an individual and throw them into an activity and expect them to perform, we need educated people.

So it does not matter where we look. Economic security or military security, whatever, it is threatened by the fact that we are not measuring up to the economic challenge.

□ 1730

Now, back to Kosovo, do I think we should be in Kosovo? Do I think that should be a challenge that the American superpower should take on, the so-called, what I like to call, in agreement with President Clinton, the indispensable Nation?

We are the indispensable Nation in terms of certain kinds of activities in the world. In this particular instance, I do not think we would be in Kosovo if this indispensable Nation did not play an indispensable role.

I was going to make a statement on the Floor earlier, but did not get a chance today, so I am going to make my statement on Kosovo right here, because I do think it relates to education. It relates to the need for the indispensable Nation to have the most educated population, not only military, but we need more diplomats, we need more people who are able to deal with the details. We need all kinds of specialists to take care of the various kinds of problems of the world which require people who have a great deal of technical competence.

On Kosovo, I call Kosovo a campaign of compassion. It is a campaign of compassion, and this Nation should be proud of the fact that it has provided a leadership role in this campaign of compassion. The U.S.-NATO military intervention in Kosovo is not driven by any vested interests, any financial interests, or any strategic hidden agenda. That is not the case.

There are some cynics who say, well, we would not be over there if it was not for something. Tell me, I would like to know. Are we in Kosovo because we are afraid that the price of oil or gasoline will go up? They used to say that about the Gulf War, that we had to protect our supply of oil, and we had a vested interest. But Kosovo does not have any oil. Yugoslavia does not have any oil or minerals of any great importance to us.

Somebody said in a joke the other day that we are in Yugoslavia to lessen the competition to Ford and General Motors for the building of autos. They

were making fun of the Yugoslavian automobile industry. The Yugoslavian automobiles have not caught on in the world.

We have to search very hard to find some vested interest we could pinpoint of the United States in Yugoslavia. We would have to search pretty hard to find a vested interest we could pinpoint with respect to most of the NATO countries. We are not in this by ourselves. It is the NATO countries, including Great Britain and France. France has provided a great deal of moral leadership. I understand the people of France are clearly articulating the reason why they think this is an important intervention.

The NATO nations, the United States and the other nations, are motivated by great moral interests and high standards which require that civilized people never again should tolerate any rationalization for genocide.

I would like to repeat, these NATO nations and the United States are motivated by great moral interests and high standards which require that civilized people never again should tolerate any rationalization for genocide.

Our Nation's generous commitment of resources and the large-scale risks of American lives, and they are already being risked, those pilots are risking their lives. With people over there in the fervor of just getting ready, just loading material and so forth, many people can die by accident in that kind of atmosphere. But certainly people who fly those missions are risking their lives. Even before we move to the level of ground troops, large numbers of lives are being risked. We are doing that already.

The large-scale risk of American lives, not in the pursuit of the usual narrow vital interests, but to protect the sacred lives of human beings that we will never know personally, this action represents a laudable and noble national action.

The Roman empire only dispatched its legions to achieve greater conquest. This American indispensable Nation has deployed its armies in an unprecedented campaign of compassion. This is a campaign of compassion.

Adolph Hitler, Josef Stalin, Saddam Hussein, Idi Amin, the Hutu generals of Rwanda, Slobodan Milosevic, we can call the roll of sovereign predators who have used murderous ethnic scapegoating to seize, to hold, and to expand their powers.

The oldest trick in the world is to scapegoat. Scapegoating even existed where there were no ethnic groups involved. Scapegoating, in fact, the whole description of it is an actual goat. The dead and dried carcass of a goat was used in some villages when there were plagues or hunger and famine, and people were so downtrodden and angry and bitter and hopeless that they would pull together the dead carcass of a goat and they would heap all of their rubbish and stuff, and the symbolism would be that all the evil and all the disease and everything in the town and in the village would be heaped on this thing, and it would be driven out of town or dragged out of town. Scapegoating was done even without having another ethnic group.

But in the history of humankind, scapegoating has become a very convenient vehicle for demagogues. Demagogues throughout time find it easy to come to power. The easiest way to power is to brand somebody as the enemy, and to set yourself up as the savior of your group against that enemy. It has been done repeatedly, and any group that happens to find itself in a minority is likely to be victimized.

It is not because the minority has something wrong with it. African Americans have often absorbed a whole lot of self-hate, and they think that there was something wrong with them, that they allowed themselves to be enslaved for so long, and that it is because of some curse in the Bible, it is because of some genetic inferiority. They believe the white folks who say that African-Americans are inferior. They have taken in a whole lot of guilt and inferiority feelings, and they said, this is the reason why we are persecuted.

No, there have been minorities in history who have been superior, who have been acknowledged as being superior. It does not matter whether you are accused of being inferior or of being superior, but when they are ready, the demagogues are ready to take advantage of a situation and they need scapegoats, they will seize upon and utilize the weakest element of the population. Just being the minority guarantees that you are going to be in the line of victimization.

The Jews in Germany, they were too rich, they were too educated, they were too accomplished in the arts, too accomplished in the sciences, they were despised because they had achieved too much. It did not matter, if it had been just the opposite they would use another kind of excuse. This is the process that demagogues use to come to power.

The most recent demagogue, of course, that we are dealing with is Slobodan Milosevic. People say, well, they have been fighting in the Baltic for years and we cannot do anything about that, because they are going to do that. It is ancient hatreds.

Well, there was a period of several decades where Kosovo was given its autonomy, and the Serbs and the ethnic Albanians lived together in peace. In fact, all of Yugoslavia has been falling apart for the last 15 years, but all of Yugoslavia was united under one banner for several decades.

The answer to that, they say is Tito. Tito was a Communist. He made them do it. I do not pretend to know how it all happened. I am not a historian. I am not a sociologist. I think there ought to be a study made of how did they hold it all together. Even under communism, there are no magic formulas.

But nevertheless, these people, they say, cannot live together in the Balkans. They are always going to fight each other. But they did live together. In Kosovo there was a solution. Slobodan Milosevic wrecked the solution. He took away the autonomy. He started the problem.

We have been negotiating with him for 8 years. How long do you negotiate before you realize that there is no profit to this so-called peaceful negotiation? Slobodan Milosevic is a sovereign predator. He is in the vein of Hitler, Stalin, the Hutu generals, Hutu leaders of Rwanda who massacred the Tutsis. They needed to come to power fast, and they just used the hatred of people to scapegoat and come to power.

From ancient Egypt to Kosovo, the demagogues repeatedly have used the same methods and found a willing mass of supporters. The United States-led resistence to genocide in Kosovo shows that finally we have not only learned a vital lesson in history, but now that knowledge has also provided us with an imperative for painful but effective action.

We are not just looking back at what happened when Hitler killed 6 million Jews and the world stood by and did nothing. We are not just regretting that that happened, but in this particular instance we have been forced to come to grips with a decision.

As a Nation, I am proud of the fact that public opinion in this case is behind the President, who has made a very difficult political decision and moved forward on this venture that becomes more complex and violent every day.

The U.S.-led resistance to genocide in Kosovo shows that finally we have not only learned a vital lesson of history, but now that knowledge also provides an imperative for painful but effective action.

Slobodan Milosevic should have been declared a war criminal 8 years ago. Diplomatic patience has been cleverly manipulated by this sovereign predator. Better late than never, however. We must now declare Slobodan Milosevic a war criminal, and send a clear message to all of his confused civilian followers, now mobilizing in their neighborhoods under misplaced banners of nationalism and patriotism.

For more than 8 years the citizens of Serbia and Yugoslavia have failed to marshal internal sovereign resistance to the genocidal policies of their dictator. Their popular will, majority complicity with evil, is the true cause of the present conflagration in the Balkans. It is not the designs of NATO, it is not the vested interests of the United States, it is not some kind of outside desire to humiliate the people of Yugoslavia and Serbia. It is the majority complicity with evil that has allowed Slobodan Milosevic to stay in power that has led to this conflagration in the Balkans at present.

War is hell, and we extend our prayers to innocent victims on all sides. War is hell. We need to pray for all those people who have been caught up in this.

Most people are innocent, because only a handful control the power, the tanks, the machine guns. But the refusal to watch the repeat of Hitler's death pageant is our duty. It is our duty to refuse to watch a repeat of Hitler's death pageant.

There are some who say that because we cannot stop genocide everywhere, we should refuse to stand against genocide anywhere. People are saying, well, you are not doing anything about Tibet, you were not doing anything about genocide against the Kurds in Iraq, you did not do anything to help the Tutsis in Rwanda, so why are you in Kosovo? Because we cannot stop genocide everywhere, we should refuse to stand against genocide anywhere. That is the logic they have.

We reject that logic. We cannot save them all. We could not save the Tutsis in Rwanda. We cannot save the Kurds in Iraq at this point, the Tibetans in China. But the world can take united action now in Kosovo.

In this clear and present instance, a portion of the civilized world has both the capability and the will to stop genocide. I am certain that the angels in heaven are applauding these bold and brave actions. Since the civilian electorate of Serb-Yugoslavia has not been willing or not been able to save itself from totalitarian disease, and because a minority of military monsters with tanks and machine guns can hold the majority of a Nation hostage, outside intervention is sometimes the only antidote to a spreading poison.

Decades of autonomy was the peaceful solution that Milosevic eradicated. Let the Kosovo campaign of compassion send a message to sovereign predators everywhere. Sovereign predators will not be allowed to savagely devour human rights. Diplomatic condemnation of genocide will always be a certainty, and sometimes military confrontation will also be possible.

I appeal to progressive thinkers everywhere to lay aside their fuzzy-minded analyses and remember the Hitler syndrome. Remember the Hitler syndrome. ''Never again'' must not be an abstract slogan. Each one of us has a duty to take a forceful position.

We should all be proud of the fact that this indispensable Nation has both the will and the power to reinforce the foundation of a compassionate civilization.

I make this statement in the midst of my discussion of education because I think that, as the indispensable Nation, the last remaining superpower assuming great responsibilities in the world, our citizenry, the people out there, including the students who are still awake and attending high school and grammar school and listening, they certainly ought to understand and know or be stimulated by my remarks to go and do more research, if you wish.

We need to move on all fronts. We need a peace academy in this country that is as big as West Point. We have a peace academy, by the way. Look it up on the Internet, or do some research on the peace academy. We have a budget for a peace academy, a very tiny budget. I know, because it was under the jurisdiction of one of the subcommittees that I served on at one time.

The peace academy is very important, and understanding how to make peace, how to negotiate. What shall we do about the world court at the Hague, which is responsible for trying war criminals, or how significant should that be? It should be given a greater role in the present situation and in our present modern day society.

As we go toward the future, we need to have as much energy and effort put into studying how to make peace as we have in the process of making war.

□ 1745

Education. The Peace Academy would have a big education budget, not as big as West Point maybe, but it needs a big education budget.

So back to my major topic, overwhelming neglect, the arithmetic of federal aid for education. What I am trying to say tonight is we are on the verge of making a great mistake in America. We can act with great nobility and great bravery and courage in emergency situations, and we have done that.

In the case of Kosovo, it is an emergency which the machinery of our government, starting at the White House with the leadership of President Clinton, the machinery of our government has gone into motion to provide support for the foundations of a compassionate civilization. This is a great compassionate crusade to stop genocide in Kosovo.

So while I am applauding the expression of the American people, which is what such an action is, I would also like to caution us and warn our Nation at this point. The way we are responding to the education crisis, there is a crisis, we are not educating the kinds of people, the numbers that we need for the future. We are not educating at a quality level to deal with a complex future.

I think we are going toward a cyber civilization, a cyber civilization, which is very complex. We need not fear it because it has already created miracles. It will continue to create miracles.

There is a future out there which is possible where some of the most difficult problems and burdens that mankind faces will be able to be resolved because of the nature of this cyber civilization that we are going into.

So, as we prepare for that, we have to understand that an investment in education is the one thing we must do. We do not know all of the pitfalls. We cannot project and predict everything that is going to happen. But one thing is clear, we need the most educated population possible, and we need more people educated. We need better education.

Right now we are failing to do that, to respond to the need for that kind of investment. We are failing to respond to the clear clarion call of our own people.

The common sense of America is amazing sometimes, the common sense of American people. They sense, they understand, they feel that education is very important. Across this country, most people have never graduated from college.

But in this Congress, 99 percent of the people have graduated from college. In Washington, all of the decision makers and the bureaucracies, the White House, everyone, they are all graduates from college. They have all benefited from our great education system. Yet they are blind, they are blind to the need to follow the lead of the American people and make education our number one priority.

There are some of my colleagues listening to me who would say, what are we talking about? It is our number one priority. We talked about it in the Democratic Caucus all the time. We talk about it in the Republican Caucus all the time. We have made great statements to our party about how important education is.

It is all a bit strange when this talk adds up to peanuts in the budget. The arithmetic of the budget does not show that we understand that education is important.

Let me give my colleagues a little of that arithmetic. As I said before, it does not take a genius to figure these figures out. The billions and the millions might confuse us sometimes, but this is simple arithmetic.

Defense is not on the list of the American priorities. Highways and transportation are not on the list of American priorities. Remember that as I talk.

Right now the budget for public schools, elementary and secondary schools in America, this Federal Government is giving $22.6 billion in assistance. This is probably less than 5 percent of the total budget for elementary and secondary education assistance because the States and the localities provide most of the money for the education.

The Constitution does not require the Federal Government to assume the responsibility for education. People are always repeating that. Since the Constitution does not require the federal government to assume the responsibility for education, why should we make a great investment at the Federal level in education?

Well, the Constitution does not require the Federal Government to assume responsibility for highways and roads. That really has always been traditionally a State and local function. But we are spending $22.6 billion for public schools, elementary and secondary education, $22.6 billion right

now. The budget for highways and transportation, most of which is highways, is $51.3 billion.

Where did we take on the responsibility of roads and highways from the local and State governments? Somewhere down the line, because it was important. I think it is important.

Last year we passed a bill which authorized $218 billion over a 6-year period for highways and transportation, mostly highways again, $218 billion in 6 years. What we are proposing in terms of school construction, however, is $3.7 billion over 5 years.

Listen. Make the comparisons. $22.6 billion is our total education contribution from the Federal Government at this point. But $51.3 billion, more than twice the amount, goes for highways and transportation across the country. Why are we investing more in highways? I have no problem. Let us invest in highways. Let us understand how minuscule our investment is in education.

The President, who is in the leadership on education, and I applaud the White House leadership on education, the White House has proposed to increase the education budget by $697 million this year. The annual increase is $697 million, which is more than the Republicans are proposing. They are proposing $500 million this year although both parties say that they are very concerned about education.

The increases in the case of the Democrats or the President's budget is 5.1 percent. The increase in the case of the Republicans is 3.7 percent. The increase for the highway budget was 12 percent. The increase for the defense budget is staggering. They are proposing $110 billion at the White House, $110 billion or $112 billion, I forget, $120 billion, but no less than the $110 billion, it has sort of been fluctuating, $110 billion for defense when the American people did not say we need anything in terms of increase for defense. Remember, we have got to pay for Kosovo and any emergencies on the side with additional funding anyhow.

Let us take a look at what we are getting per student. The number of enrolled public school students in America is 54.4 million students, 54.4 million students. That means that the Federal expenditure per enrolled student at this point is $415 in annual yearly expenditure for each student enrolled in public school across America is merely $415.

If we take a look at the proposed increase this year on a per-student basis, the President has proposed to increase the budget by $12.80 per student. The Republicans are proposing to increase the budget by $9.20 per student.

When one looks at the number of students we have in the schools out there and one looks at the amount of money being appropriated, one wonders where is the response to the American public opinion polls which said that education is a priority. Think about it.

I have proposed an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Assistance Act, title XI, I have proposed to increase the education budget just for construction, school construction, including modernization, repairs, and basic technology, wiring of the schools for the Internet, et cetera. I am proposing increasing it by $22 billion a year over the next 5 years. I want to get close to the defense budget, $110 billion over 5 years.

Twenty-two billion dollars a year would be an appropriate response to the fact that education is in great need of Federal assistance. It would be an appropriate response to do it in construction because that is the simplest way for the Federal Government to help education.

It would be an appropriate need because that is where we have a need for larger amounts of capital expenditures. It would be an appropriate place for the President and the Federal Government to intervene because it does not involve the Federal Government getting involved in running the schools on an operational basis.

We do not have to get involved in determining what the curriculum should be. We do not have to interfere with the internal workings of the school that is basically the responsibility of the State and the local government.

So to appropriate, and I do not propose doing it in any way except straight appropriation, a straight appropriation of $22 billion a year for the next 5 years would not bring schools equal to highways. Remember, I just said highways get $218 billion over 6 years. So school construction would not come anywhere near the capital outlays for highways.

If we divide the 54.4 million students into the amount of money I propose to spend per year per student, we are talking about school construction expenditures by the Federal Government would be $416 per student.

If there are young people listening, they are going to go to school tomorrow. Talk to your teacher about why is it that the Federal Government cannot spend $416 for each student going to elementary and secondary education schools. Why can we not spend $416 per student?

Why do we say we care about education, that the federal government wants to help, while the Republicans are out peddling their education agenda, saying that they are all for education and want to do something great for education, while the Democrats out there are pushing hard, the President is certainly stressing education in his program, why do they do so little?

The President is out way ahead of the Republicans. He is proposing $3.7 billion for construction. He is not proposing to do it the way I want to do it, that is a direct appropriation, put it in the budget and appropriate it, he is proposing to do it via a tax credit. The Committee on Ways and Means has to approve a tax credit for school construction.

Over a 5-year period, he proposes to make $25 billion available; that is, he allows the States and the local governments to borrow $25 billion. They have to borrow that. In New York, we have to have a bond issue on the ballot. Voters would have to vote to borrow some money in order to qualify for that Federal program because it only provides the interest on the $25 billion. Over a 5-year period, he proposes to pay the interest on $25 billion worth of bonds that local governments and State governments would borrow.

That comes out to $3.7 billion over 5 years, roughly, depending on what the interest rate is. And $3.7 billion over 5 years is the only commitment we have to the school construction, but we have $110 billion over 5 years committed to defense in increases I am talking about, increases.

The defense budget is already $280 billion. We are going to increase it over a 5-year period by an additional $110 billion.

Highways are going to be spending, over a 6-year period, $218 billion. Yet, we propose to spend only $3.7 billion for school construction over a 5-year period.

So take out a pencil and paper and do the addition and the subtraction and the comparison. I am not really going to leave here with my colleagues believing that the President is not trying. He assumes this is all he can pass. I say we need to, from the White House, state the case more clearly and call for what is needed.

The Republican proposed budget for school construction is zero. Zero. Nothing. They do not propose anything for school construction whatsoever over a 1-year period, over a 5-year period, nothing.

If we look at the President's construction budget, the only one on the agenda, the only one on the table, nobody else has it, we must praise him for having a proposal on the table for school construction, but if we look at it closely and we divide the number of students in elementary, secondary education institutions, in schools, the President is proposing $68.50 over a 5-year period for school construction per student, $68.50 per student.

The Republican construction per student of course is zero because if we start with zero, we end up with zero. I am sorry, that is per year, $68.50 per year, per student. My proposal is of course, as I said before, $415 per student, $416 per student when we look at all the students.

My colleagues might say how are we going to evaluate those costs? Is that a lot of money, $416 per student times 54 million students, which comes to about $22 billion a year. Is that a lot of money?

□ 1800

Well, $416 per student, compare that with the cost of one combat rifle. One modern rifle used in our Army costs how much? $835. Twice as much as we are willing to spend, as I propose to spend, per year per student on construction. I mean look at it closely.

Look at this figure, also. The average annual cost per prison inmate in the United States. For each person we put in prison we are spending $24,000. The average is around $24,000 to keep a person in prison, and yet we cannot spend $416 per student for school construction.

The average annual cost of a student in school, in terms of operating cost, is probably somewhere between $8,000 and $10,000. The annual cost per student in our schools, operating costs, ongoing costs, the average, when we take the rich and the poor districts, is between $8,000 and $10,000.

I ask my colleagues to do the arithmetic and take a look at it. Is it in harmony with what we hear being said about the importance of education?

The governors say education is very important. They have all kinds of nickel and dime experiments ongoing that they parade at conferences, and parade around about what they are doing about education, but they are not willing to spend the money. The governor of New York had a $2 billion surplus but he would not spend any money for school construction. The Mayor of New York had a $2 million surplus last year and he would not spend any money for construction in New York City, although New York City has a very serious situation.

In New York City they have large numbers of schools that are overcrowded, where students have to eat lunch at 10 o'clock in the morning because they have three shifts of lunchroom sittings, but also it has 250 schools that are burning coal in their furnaces still, jeopardizing the immediate health of students with pollution, and yet they would not move. Why are all these people talking about education?

One of the programs we hear a lot about is the 21st Century Learning Centers. Now, that is a worthy program. It is an after-school center program, and already we have $200 million committed to that and we are going to raise that over the next 5 years to $600 million. When we have it funded at $600 million, we will serve about 1.2 million students. 1.2 million students will be served by this program.

It is a great program because it deals with the fact that we want to end social promotion and have students move on through school but we will not dump them. We will give them some kind of after-school help, tutorial programs, some summer help. Well, $600 million will only provide help for 1.2 million students at best.

There are 54 million children in elementary and secondary education institutions. About a quarter of them, at least one-fourth of them need help in this area. How will we provide help for one-fourth of the students if all we are willing to appropriate is $600 million?

It is a great program, but it is a very minuscule program. If we did 10 percent, one-tenth of the total students, the 54 million, can we help that many? Even one-tenth? I think my colleagues can understand the dilemma we are facing.

We need to understand that we are the richest country in the history of the world, and at this moment in history we are probably more rich than we have ever been. The country is richer than it has ever been. The government itself has a surplus. The surplus can be used partially to invest in education. We do not have to submit to the stampede to put it all into Social Security.

Again, they are playing the American intellect and the American common sense cheap. They are trying to take advantage of people's concern about Social Security, to whip us all into a frenzy and say that every penny we get in the surplus should go into Social Security.

Well, the President proposed that we use 60 percent of the money we have in surplus for Social Security. That sounds reasonable to me. He proposed to use another part of it for Medicare. That sounds reasonable to me, because Medicare is health security for elderly people. But then we have some left over. We still have a percentage that they are proposing no use for at this point, but we know that most of it will go into defense expenditures if we do not say that we ought to have some for education.

Education is the key to our future's defense. Our national security is all bound up in the educated populace we produce. Education is the key to Social Security. How? Because we want a populace that is working. We want young people who are working, and they must be able to qualify for the high-tech jobs being created every day more and more.

And if we do not have workers, young people who can qualify for those jobs, they will not come out and take the jobs. What we will do is contract with overseas corporations. We will send the work overseas and companies will do the work overseas who do not pay into the Social Security System. The best way to rob the Social Security System is to deny the work force the opportunity to earn the money and pay into the Social Security fund.

There are some other ways we can save Social Security, too, but the present time-honored way we fund Social Security is through the wages of working people. If we have fewer people working, and they have already projected that, we cannot avoid the demographics, we are going to have fewer people working. But how few? Can we avoid wiping out the whole work force because they cannot qualify for high-tech jobs? So many will not be able to qualify for high-tech jobs. We have a real dilemma here.

The kind of greatness and the kind of vision and courage being shown in Kosovo by our national leaders now we need to apply in the sector of education, looking down the road. If we do not do it, we will have a great deficit in major areas. This great indispensable Nation is going to stumble and fall if we do not have as many people educated as possible. Every person that can be educated must be educated.

It is likely that our posterity will pity us. They may even spit on us in the future as they evaluate and analyze our great lack of vision at this critical moment when we have maximum opportunity to go forward in the revision of our education system. We are in danger of becoming the victim of midget minds and tiny spirits. Too much of the planning at the Department of Education is being undertaken by midget minds and tiny spirits.

Too many tiny spirits are guiding our caucuses, both the Republican and the Democratic Caucus. We are not willing to take hold of where we are in modern America and deal with education the way we dealt with the GI bill after World War II. We understood the implications of the need for a more educated population and we had a massive education program in the GI bill.

A Congressman named Morrill, many years ago in the 1800s, around the time of the Civil War, had the vision to see that every State in America needed a land grant university. We dealt with it. A big mind and a big spirit seized the problem.

Thomas Jefferson, who created the first State university, the University of Virginia, had a vision. The model he established inspired Morrill to go on to create land grant colleges and universities all across the country.

The vision of a transcontinental railroad, the Federal Government financed the transcontinental railroad. We had the people in Congress who had the vision to take hold and to do things in a big way.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BUD SHUSTER) is my hero here in Congress. He is a Republican, but he had the vision to take hold of the highway problem, the transportation infrastructure problem, and with a lot of criticism. He was called a big spender, and still called a big spender, but he had the initiative and he used the available power that he had to pass a highway transportation infrastructure bill that is meaningful. We need it. We need it. We need it far more than we need some of the weapon systems that are being proposed. We need it far more than we need some of the other wasteful expenditures taking place presently.

We are in danger of becoming, as I said before, the victims of midget minds and tiny spirits. We seem to possess the cerebral alertness, the statistical understanding that a crisis looms ahead if we do not meet the education emergency at the moment. We understand the trends, the projections, the inevitability of continued inadequacy in our school systems. We comprehend with our heads, but we seem incapable of engaging with our backbones and moving forward with our decision-making feet. In the education arena we need giant minds and great spirits. We

need to end the overwhelming neglect of education.

In the minds of our citizens, the concerns related to national defense do not compete with the overwhelming mandate to improve our schools. Nothing in the minds of our citizens, the American electorate, the people who have common sense out there, nothing in their minds competes with education. It is number one. ''It is education, stupid.'' It is education.

Look at the polls, but do not look at the polls and let your eyes blink. Here in Washington, in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, we need to act on appropriating and vesting real dollars in an education system which will take us into a cyber civilization in the future where everybody needs to be educated.

The dollars that we are willing to appropriate in response to the American people's stated concern about education are minuscule. We are throwing pennies at a problem which requires billions of dollars. We must change our minds.

If the American people are listening, they might help open the eyes and the ears of their own Congressman or Congresswoman. Have them make a survey. Even in the richest districts there are often schools that need help.

I challenge every Member of Congress to make a survey and select a few schools in their districts and go take a look at what they need. There are some places where they need money for wiring for the Internet; there are other places where they need money to fix the roof; there are some places where they need money to tear down old buildings and construct new schools. All over New York City we have schools that need money to put in a new furnace and get rid of the pollution and the asthma-generating coal-burning furnaces.

We need to address these issues in our Education Task Force and the Democratic Caucus, as well as the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce were on the floor before, and I want to applaud what they had to say. They understand the problem, but I do not think that the solutions that are being proposed have yet come to grips with the magnitude of the need.

We need to spend many billions on school construction. School construction is just at the center of the problem, but that is a place to start. If we do not meet the need for adequate buildings, safe buildings, across America, the Congressional Budget Office says we need about $147 billion to just stay even, if we do not meet that need or begin to step forward to move toward meeting that need, then everything else we propose to do in Washington at any level is fraudulent, everything else we propose to do about education.

We are feeding the people a spin on the problem without coming to grips with the reality and the substance. We must go forward and invest in education in order to prepare our education system to take us forward into a new cyber civilization.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. DAN MILLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Laura Griffin, staff member of the Honorable DAN MILLER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 8, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, 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 received a subpoena for documents and testimony issued by the Circuit Court of the Twelfth Judicial Circuit of Florida In and For Manatee County, Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined to comply with the subpoena to the extent that it is consistent with Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

LAURA GRIFFIN,
Case Manager.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House at this hour to discuss primarily the issue of illegal narcotics and its effects on our young people and our country, but I could not help but hear some of the words of my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), who just spoke here and talked about education.

I want to say to my colleagues and to the American people that I too support education. I support anything this Congress can do, anything our Nation can do to enhance educational opportunities for each and every American. However, I do have some differences with the previous speaker.

The previous speaker represents 40 years of trying to get more education power, more education decisions, more education regulation in Washington, D.C.

□ 1815

And I think I represent a new wave of thinking that has come here in the last few years that education decisions, education of our children, and decisions about education policy are best decided at the local level with parents, with local school boards, and through local initiatives.

Then I think we also heard the argument that we are spending money on military defense and others, and this money could be converted into education. I might remind my colleagues in the House that the number one reason that we came together as a Nation to allow us to live a free life in a free society is in fact the principal reason for the formation of the United States, and that is the question of national security.

Without national security, without the ability to defend ourselves, without the ability to have a defense of this Nation, all other things are impossible. And under the Constitution, if we care to look at that document, that is our prime responsibility and all things flow from that level.

So we cannot discard our military, particularly with an administration and folks what want to send our troops to every corner of the Earth and every conflict, at great expense, stretching our limited Federal dollars, and also spend additional funds or take away funds from education. So we cannot have both, but we try to do our best in meeting our Federal obligation.

I might say, and I did not really want to get into this too much tonight, but I just had the opportunity to meet with a couple from Florida, and they were here and heard some of the debate about education in the Congress, and one of these individuals, the wife, was a teacher and she was delighted to hear the philosophy of the new majority relating to education, that the power and the ability to teach and the funds go to the classroom, to the teacher and the student, not to the education bureaucracy in Washington, Atlanta, and is forced at different layers of the education bureaucracy even within the State and in particular in my State of Florida.

Our discussion was quite interesting because we did not identify the problems the way the previous speaker did; we identified the problems I think the way parents do, the way teachers do and local citizens who examine education. And we do not need a Harvard Education Ph.D. to look at American education today and see that teachers are not allowed to teach.

We asked the simple question in our conversation a few minutes ago off the floor with this couple from Florida, ''How can you teach, how can you have order in a classroom when you cannot have discipline in a classroom?'' And the same well-intended liberal policies from the other side of the aisle have amassed laws and regulations, which, combined with liberal judicial decisions, have handcuffed our teachers so that it is almost impossible to have discipline in the classroom through this maze of Federal regulations, mandates, and court orders. So we have said we want the teacher to have the ability to teach in the classroom.

Now, we also have a unique approach to education because we do not think that the money needs to be in Washington and again the power and the regulations all coming from Washington, but we think that those resources, that those abilities, should be at the local level with the teacher, with the parent, with the local school

board, again reversing this trend where everything has come to Washington at a very heavy expense.

Now, let us also for a minute, before I get into this drug discussion, talk about funding of education. My friends and my colleagues, the Federal Government only provides between 4 and 5 cents of every dollar on education, 4 and 5 cents. Now, of course we can provide more. The problem is we provide about 90 percent of the Federal regulations in education. So we provide very little money, but all of the constraints and mandates and regulations that cause teachers instead of teaching, not allowing them to teach, to be filling out papers, to be complying with Federal regulations, and to report to a maze of bureaucracy that now starts at the local level, goes to the State level, goes to the regional level, and ends up at the Federal level.

I was chairman during the past 4 years of the Subcommittee on Civil Service. One thing I learned as chairman of that Subcommittee on Civil Service is where the bodies in the Federal bureaucracy are buried. The first 5,000, if my colleagues ever care to go down to the Department of Education, now imagine, there are 3,000 of 5,000 Federal education employees in the Department of Education here in Washington D.C., or in the close environs, 3,000 people.

Now, we also got into the discussion of changes in education. And we have, as a new majority in the Congress, tried to shift again this responsibility from Washington, the authority, the regulation, and do away with some of the bureaucracy. We started out with some 760 to 780 Federal education programs, all well-intended, but each with its own administrative level, 760 to 780 of those. We have got it pared down to 700.

Quite frankly, we have only begun the paring process. But every one of these programs has turned into lobbying organizations, into special interest activities; and they justify their existence by lobbying the Congress, by telling what a good job they have done. And what, in fact, we have again are 3,000 bureaucrats in Washington D.C., most of them making between $70,000 and $100,000 if we look at the pay schedules.

Now, I am not saying that we should abolish the Department of Education, but I think we could do it with 10 to 20 percent of the personnel that we have just by consolidating the programs.

In fact, there are proposals and there will be proposals before this Congress very shortly to go to a Super EdFlex, where we take the amount of money, we divide it by the student population and other criteria and we send it to the States. This Congress, under this new Republican majority, has tried to reverse the trend in that 80 to 90 percent of the Federal dollars do not get into the classroom, do not get to the teacher. Now, is that what people want with their Federal money, that 80 to 90 percent of this Federal money does not get to the classroom, to the teacher?

Again, we have to allow the teacher to teach and discipline in the classroom, authority, the responsibility, the ability to teach in the classroom. We have to give that first. And secondly, we have to give the Federal money to the student and to the teacher, a unique approach, not to the 700-plus Federal programs, not to the 700-plus administrators.

If we have only three administrators for each program at the Federal level, there are 2,100 that help account for the 3,000 just in Washington, D.C., in the Federal Department of Education. So we have to ask ourselves where we want our dollars to go? Into the classroom? To the teacher?

This Congress, this new Republican majority, said we want those funds to go to the classroom and to the teacher. Then what are we teaching? Again, in my discussion with this couple from Florida, the wife again taught school. My wife was an elementary school teacher. I have a degree in education, although I have never taught other than my school required certification internship.

But we have to ask the question, what is a teacher doing in the classroom? Does she have authority to control the classroom, first of all? Does she have the funds, Federal funds and other funds, coming to the classroom? Then the next question is, what is the teacher teaching?

The answer is, today Federal money goes on everything but basic education. Now, show me a student that has basic education, is able to read, is able to write, is able to conduct basic mathematics, and I will show my colleagues a successful student. But almost all of our Federal education programs go for everything except those basic education fundamental programs.

And what is interesting is that the individuals who suffer the most from this deficit in a Federal approach to education that again has been adopted and culled and now culminates in this bureaucracy from Washington and this sad approach to education as the ones who suffer the most are our most disadvantaged students.

So our disadvantaged students are not learning the basic skills. Those disadvantaged students, because they do not have these opportunities to learn basic educational skills, I will tell my colleagues what has happened. They are our first problem in the classroom. Ask any teacher. They are our discipline problem. And the teacher does not have the right to discipline or have control of her classroom because of the Federal regulations and the bureaucracy that has been created to make certain that a teacher does not have control of the classroom.

So here we have the most disadvantaged, not able to learn the most basic skills that are necessary. They become discipline problems. Then next they become dropout problems. After they are dropout problems, they become societal problems. They do not have a job. Sometimes they get into drugs and into other illegal activities. Just look at the statistics for unemployment among our minority youth. Look at the statistics about dropouts among our minority youth.

So if we really care about education, if we really care about those disadvantaged children, if we really care about getting dollars into the classroom for our students, for our teachers, for basic education, why not adopt a different approach? And that is the EdFlex approach that we have talked about. And we may want to look at Super EdFlex.

As chairman of an oversight subcommittee on education, I intend to conduct hearings in the future on this subject and see why we cannot get more Federal dollars into the classroom, to students, to teachers, to do away with the mass of bureaucracy.

It is interesting now this concept of charter schools. And what does a charter school do? A charter school basically lets a teacher teach, go back to basic education without the mass of regulations, whether they are locally imposed, State imposed, or federally imposed.

So I did not intend to get off on this subject of education, but when I hear those who have helped develop a system that has helped ruin public education, and I am a strong advocate of public education. Again, my wife taught in public schools; I was educated to teach in public schools.

The public schools helped make this country great. The greatest minds of this country, some of them were taught in a one-room public school, and I think we can still achieve greatness in our public schools. And public education has helped make America great, and our public teachers deserve practically a little award of merit, the survivors, those who have managed to survive the mass of bureaucracy passed down from Washington, the mass of regulations that do not allow them to do what they went to an education university or college for, and that is to teach students in a disciplined atmosphere basic and fundamental education and to help develop that policy of working with parents and working with local school board members rather than edicts from some bureaucrat at some level who causes them to do everything but what their original mission was.

So I take great exception when I hear those who have helped create the disaster talk about criticism about this approach to get back to the basics that made American education and public education so great in this Nation. And again, I commend our public teachers, those survivors of this mass of bureaucracy we sent them from Washington and regulations that they must try to deal with every day.

My purpose tonight also is to talk about another issue, an issue that is not on the front page like Kosovo and

is not an issue like Iraq. It is an issue that I feel is one of the most critical social issues facing this Congress, this Nation, our young people, and every American in every walk of life now.

□ 1830

It is a social problem that for many years was limited to folks who were the unfortunate victims of illicit narcotics, illicit drugs, sometimes lived in urban areas and became drug junkies or drug addicts and were the castasides of our society. But, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, there exists in our Nation tonight and today a drug problem that is of serious dimensions and proportions. Last year, over 14,000 Americans lost their lives because of drug-related problems, drug-related deaths; 14,000. Since President Clinton has taken office in 1993, 100,000 Americans have lost their lives. In many instances young people, some of those in the prime of their life, have become victims to illegal narcotics.

Now, this problem is so serious that I want to try to bring it into some understanding to those individuals who represent various locales here in the Congress. But if we took Hattiesburg, Mississippi and we wiped it off the map and its population of approximately 100,000, that would be equal to the number of individuals who have died because of drug-related deaths. If we destroyed Gadsden, Alabama, again close to 100,000 people would vanish from the face of the planet. Iowa City, Iowa would be wiped out, 100,000 died. If we had everyone die now in Iowa City, everyone would be alarmed. In Elmira, New York, again a population approaching 100,000, 95,000 Americans have died, more than 95,000, because of illegal narcotics in this country during this administration. Bangor, Maine would be wiped out. Pine Bluff, Arkansas, the population of that city would be wiped from the face of this country. Cheyenne, Wyoming. I could give a long list of others that are equal in population to those individuals who have lost their lives in this social problem of illegal narcotics, in this criminal enterprise now that is affecting every corner of America.

The cost of illegal narcotics in this country is approaching a quarter of a trillion dollars. In addition to lives that I mentioned, 100,000 over 6 or 7 years, we had 14,000-plus last year, we have a cost to this country estimated at over a quarter of a trillion dollars.

This Congress in our budget debate is debating a number of measures to deal with illegal narcotics just in this next fiscal year. The estimate is somewhere around $18 billion will be expended. We now have in the United States of America 13.9 million Americans who are users of illegal narcotics. Drug use by 12 to 17-year-olds in this period since President Clinton has taken office to now has doubled, has doubled since 1992, drug use by our teenage population. More than 6 percent of Americans have used illegal narcotics in the past 30 days.

What is another dimension of the illegal narcotics problem in this country is the change in the pattern of usage. When I came to Congress, crack and cocaine were the big problem. Today, heroin is a major, major problem, not only in our urban areas but in suburban areas across this land, including my own area, central Florida, from Orlando to Daytona Beach, one of the highest income, highest educated, one of the most prosperous areas in America, and we have experienced an incredible heroin epidemic and particularly again among our young people.

In the United States of America, first-time heroin use surged 875 percent from 1991 to 1996, again under the charge of this administration. Heroin-related emergency room admissions increased from 1989 to 1995 some 80 percent. In Florida, I want to talk about the problem that we have been experiencing again with heroin. Recently, a number of our newspapers featured headlines that said that heroin deaths increased 51 percent in the State of Florida from 1997 to 1998, a 51 percent increase in heroin deaths. Two hundred six deaths in Florida in 1997. Fortunately no Americans have been killed in Kosovo, no Americans have lost their life in the current Iraq crises. Even in the Gulf War, we had fewer than that number of casualties. But just in the State of Florida, we had 206 heroin deaths in 1997, a 51 percent increase from 1997 to 1998.

In Orlando and again central Florida, a very prosperous area that I represent part of, we had 36 deaths, heroin deaths, and we had the highest death rate, we had 3.6 per 100,000 population die from heroin overdoses or heroin-related deaths. Additionally, our cocaine problem still is with us in Florida. We had 1,128 cocaine deaths in Florida in 1998, up from 1,039 in 1997. So we are seeing an incredible epidemic of heroin deaths, particularly among our young people, and even an increase in cocaine deaths.

Now, you might say, how did we get into this situation? Let me review, if I may, for the Congress and for the American people the history of how this administration got us in this situation with these statistics, with an epidemic of heroin, with the continued problems with cocaine, with methamphetamine and designer drugs at epidemic levels in other parts of our Nation.

The first thing this President and this Congress did when it was under the control of the Democrat Party, and I do not mean to say this in a partisan way, it is a matter of fact, but their policy was to eliminate much of the war on drugs. Their policy was to try to just deal with treatment of those who had drug abuse or illegal narcotics problems and put our resources in that area. The first thing this President did as President was to cut the positions in the drug czar's office, and they were slashed dramatically, practically closed down the drug czar's office. This was the very first action, as we may recall.

The second action was to appoint a surgeon general who really said ''just say maybe'' to the use of illegal narcotics. Now, if you do not think that the chief health officer of the United States, who gives a mixed message to our young population, does not influence that young population in that important position, if you do not think the President of the United States, if he would say that ''I didn't inhale'' or ''if I had it to do over again I would,'' if you do not think that influences young people, then I think you have another thought coming, particularly when you see the statistics of the dramatic increase in illegal narcotic use from 1993 to today.

Additionally, when the Democrats and the Democratic majority controlled the other body, the Senate, the House of Representatives and the White House, some of their first actions in the Congress in 1993 and 1994 when they controlled the entire governmental operation was to start to slash the efforts of stopping drugs at their source. These are source country programs. We know where 100 percent of the cocaine is coming from in the world. Every bit of it is coming into the United States, or was coming from and comes from today Bolivia, Peru and Colombia. That is it. There are no other locales. We knew where heroin was coming from, and this administration with this majority on the other side slashed the eradication programs, slashed the interdiction.

Now, the most cost-effective way to stop illegal narcotics is at its source, where they are grown, where the supply comes from. The next line of defense is interdiction. What did the administration and this majority in Congress, this past majority in Congress, do? They cut interdiction. They slashed the programs for source countries, to stop drugs at their source cost effectively. Then they stopped interdiction programs. They also stopped the use of the military. They stopped, at least temporarily, the sharing of information with some of the countries in shoot-down policies. Only after a great ruckus in Congress were we able to reinstitute the information sharing policy that allowed us to give assistance and aid to other countries that had shoot-down policies, these principal producing countries, so that they could take action to stop those illegal narcotics from leaving their borders.

So we have seen what this administration has done as far as the military, interdiction, eradication. Another thing that folks do not realize is that the Coast Guard is a great line of defense, particularly for Florida, around Puerto Rico. The Coast Guard has been the first line of defense around Puerto Rico. It stopped under the Bush and Reagan administration most of the illegal narcotics coming into the United States. Puerto Rico is part of the United States and once you get into

Puerto Rico, you are into the United States, and the Coast Guard provided that shield.

This Congress under the previous Democrat majority and under the Clinton administration slashed dramatically the budgets of the Coast Guard and particularly the defenses and ability to interdict drugs around Puerto Rico were eliminated.

So this is what this administration had done. We know what the other administration had done. The Bush administration, the previous Reagan administration had put into place programs that cost effectively stopped drugs from coming into our borders, stopped our young people from using drugs, and we actually saw decreases in use of illegal narcotics and drugs coming into our Nation.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on how this administration lost the War on Drugs and how under the control of the previous majority this country lost the effort to interdict drugs cost-effectively at its source. In fact, under this administration and under the previous Democratic majority, they slashed stopping these efforts by funding a percentage that went from 33 percent of all the funds we expended in the drug war down to 12 percent. So basically what they did was gutted by two-thirds the programs to stop drugs at their source. Again, their emphasis was solely on those wounded in battle, treatment of those victims of illegal narcotics.

This administration also decided to have the Department of Defense rank counter-narcotics efforts at the bottom of its priority list. If we look at a priority list developed by this administration in its priorities, previously under again the Reagan and Bush administrations this was a high priority. With DOD, the Department of Defense, it is now a low priority. The President, not learning from experiences of the past, proposed to this Congress through the Office of Drug Control Policy and the Drug Czar a budget to the Congress that is $100 million less this year than last year, and again in the areas that are most important to stop drugs cost effectively at their source, the President also failed to provide adequate proposals for funding of these programs, including again the Coast Guard which plays such a vital role, including the source country interdiction programs, including the use of the military.

In fact, if my colleagues want to look at the budget, in addition to being $100 million less, there is $73 million that is being currently used to relocate our forward drug interdiction efforts in Central and South America. We have previously been stationed at Howard Air Force Base for these efforts, the advanced surveillance activities in our illegal narcotics efforts over the South American region, again where these drugs come from, again the source of production, the source of transshipment of these drugs. Our eyes and ears and our frontline defense in the War on Drugs is located in Panama at Howard Air Force Base, and $73 million in this budget is to move our operations to locations that will not under any circumstances be as good because this administration, and it is not widely publicized, but basically they blew the negotiating with the Panamanians, and the United States of America is being kicked out lock, stock and barrel from Panama as I speak here.

We have lost $10 billion in assets, lost every one of them. They negotiated without success. We have lost every asset. There we have lost 5,000 buildings, over 5,000 buildings, and we will not be conducting one advanced forward drug surveillance operation there. In fact, we will be paying $73 million out of this budget that has been proposed by the President to make up for the failed negotiations which got us totally kicked out of Panama and giving these assets to the Panamanians is a disastrous consequences, I predict, not to mention that the Panamanians, through a corrupt tender, have given one of the ports to a Chinese group that basically is run by the Chinese Army. So the Chinese will control one of the ports through a corrupt tender, and this is the situation we find ourselves in, and again part of this President's budget is being expended. Even though he has $100 million less than we proposed last year and appropriated last year, additional funds will be paid to correct mistakes by this administration.

So this is the situation we find ourselves in today. We have a very serious drug problem, and I want to, if I may, to put this chart up here and show the drug problem that we have in the United States, and again, as a result of the inactions or lack of proper actions by this administration in the 1990's we see this new pattern of illegal narcotics coming from South America. Again, production of cocaine through Columbia, Peru and Bolivia, and that was the pattern we saw at the beginning, it is the pattern we still see, but we see the drugs now coming through Mexico, and we see them coming from Columbia into the United States, some through Puerto Rico into the northeast United States and other routes, but the two major sources of illegal narcotics coming into the United States are Columbia and Mexico.

Now let us examine, if we can for the record, how we got into the situation where again Peru and Bolivia were the primary producers of cocaine. I could not possibly believe this would be true if someone told me it 5 years ago, but this administration managed to make Columbia the biggest cocaine producer in the world, and they have done that because in the past 5 or 6 years of this administration they have fought every effort by Congress, they have fought every request of Members of Congress, they have fought requests of the Drug Task Force of Congress to get resources to Columbia to stop the production, to stop the trafficking of illegal narcotics from Columbia. This administration has done everything possible to make sure that those resources did not go to Columbia. They stopped helicopters, they stopped ammunition, they stopped resources. Now we have Columbia as the number one producer. It has outstripped Peru and Bolivia and is the number one producer of cocaine.

What is even more incredible is 5 years ago Columbia produced almost no heroin, almost no heroin. Today Columbia is the source of most of the heroin coming into the United States of America.

While this administration blocked equipment and supplies, resources, military and police aid going in to stop the production and transiting, when they blocked this, what happened? The drug dealers began producing, and of course we heard cocaine. Now they are the major producers, but in Columbia they are also now producing heroin, and it is not like the heroin of the 1980's. This is tough stuff. This is high purity, not 10, 12, 15 percent pure; this is 70, 80 percent. This is the heroin that is killing our young people on the streets of Florida and across this Nation.

So again, through the inaction or improper actions or inadequate steps that this administration failed to take, Columbia is now the biggest drug producer on the globe. It is my hope, it is my prayer, it is the intent of almost everyone in the Congress who serves on the subcommittees of jurisdiction, that this administration now will allow helicopters, equipment, resources to get to Columbia.

I met several times with the President of Columbia, President Pastrana. He is committed to the war on drugs. He has a very difficult civil war on his hands. Thousands and thousands of police and military have lost their lives at the hands of drug dealers and narco terrorists and Marxist terrorists in Columbia. We have a very difficult situation, but hopefully now this administration, with the urging again of Congress, will get the resources to stop drugs at their source, which the source is Columbia.

Now the other major source area and problem that we have today is Mexico. Mexico has become the primary source of hard narcotics and marijuana coming into the United States of America. It is the primary source. Some of this is heroin and cocaine being produced in Columbia, but now in concert with the drug dealers in Mexico, and with the cooperation and with the consent in many instances of almost every level of government, corrupt government in Mexico, we see the drugs coming through Mexico into the United States. They are coming into the United States through the largess of this Congress which voted NAFTA, which voted almost an open commercial border between Mexico and the United States of

America through again a policy that allowed us to give trade benefits.

Now we have to stop and think. This Congress gave great trade benefits. They are not really an equal trading partner, not when they pay people 25, 35 cents, even $1 an hour. These are not equal trading partners as we did with Canada, which is a very equal trading partner. We gave them a great trade advantage. And what did they give us in return? An unprecedented supply of illegal narcotics transiting across our border. This is a fact; this is incontrovertible.

The DEA administrator, who testified before my subcommittee and on the other side of the Congress, said the corruption among Mexican anti-drug authorities was, and let me quote him, ''unparalleled with anything I have seen in 39 years of police work.'' This is one of the most professional, most dedicated capable administrators we have ever had. He does not buy the administration line even though he is a member of this administration, and he tells it like it is. He has said that the level of corruption in Mexico is absolutely unparalleled.

Now this administration has certified Mexico. Under Federal law we have a certification law that says that every year the President must certify whether countries who deal in illegal narcotics or are the source of illegal narcotics coming into the United States, that the State Department and the President must certify under this Federal law that they are fully cooperating with eliminating both the production and trafficking of drugs under this 1986 law. And this administration has the past several years certified that Mexico is fully cooperating and did so just a few weeks ago.

How can an administration certify that Mexico is cooperating when even this Congress asked 2 years ago, this House of Representatives, simple steps for the Mexicans to take? First, to extradite those who are convicted of illegal narcotics trafficking, and to date I believe they extradited one individual, and that is only under the pressure of decertification, only under the pressure of so many people, from the Minority Leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), by a bipartisan majority saying that Mexico must take some steps to show that they are cooperating. But they fail to extradite major drug traffickers, they fail to install radar in the south, they fail to allow our DEA agents to arm themselves, they fail to raise the level, the number of DEA agents in their country that would be adequate to deal with the severe problem that they have, and they fail to enforce laws that they put on the books and have made a mockery of those laws, including the most egregious incident I have ever seen a country take, which was last year in an operation called ''Casablanca'' in which our Custom officials identified millions and millions, hundreds of millions, of illegal drug dollars going through Mexican banks and some into the United States, and when it was uncovered, the Mexican officials threatened to indict the United States Customs officials rather than cooperate with our officials. What we got in return was a threat against our agents, and only again until we came to the issue of possibly decertifying them through a step of Congress, the House of Representatives and the other body, not this administration who certified them.

The President went a few months ago down and met with President Zedillo, and he met there in the Yucatan Peninsula, this little point here.

□ 1900

We are told by our DEA officials and others in hearings that I conducted that the entire Yucatan Peninsula is corrupt, that it is run by drug lords. It is corrupt from the officer on the street to the governor.

In fact, we knew it was corrupt. We are told the entire Baja Peninsula is corrupt. We are told that entire other regions and states in Mexico are corrupt from the bottom to the top.

We had testimony at a recent hearing, which I conducted as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, that in fact this corruption may go even to the highest offices in Mexico. There were indications that there was as much as a billion dollars that one Mexican official was trying to place from his proceeds of dealing in illegal narcotics.

Now, President Clinton went with President Zedillo and met in the Yucatan Peninsula, one of the, again, centers of corruption, one of the centers of illegal narcotics. We knew that the governor of this state was corrupt. We knew that he was involved in narcotics, but they have a quirk in Mexican law that is interesting, that when you are in office you cannot be charged.

So they were waiting until a few weeks ago when this Mexican governor, we were told, would leave office so they could indict him. That is what we were told.

Then what happened? Under investigation, this is The Washington Post, April 1, April Fool's Day, this would almost be funny if it was not the truth, but this Mexican governor of the Yucatan Peninsula, Quintana Roo is the name of the area, under investigation the headline says, ''Mexican disappears; governor may have fled to avoid expected arrest.''

Now, that should tickle the conscience of everyone in the Congress to see that the Mexican official that we were told was going to be arrested when he left office fled.

Now, to really rub salt in the wound, this is the Miami Herald story of just a few days ago, missing governor fled to Cuba, paper reports. So here is where the President of the United States, the President of Mexico met. Here is where we were told it was corrupt from the bottom to the top, and now we are told that that official, who was supposed to be arrested, has fled the country and possibly may be in Cuba.

Do they think the Members of Congress are going to ignore this? Do they think the American people are going to be fooled by the actions of this government to fail to take actions against one of the most corrupt officials? Do they believe, in fact, that this Congress will certify that Mexico is fully cooperating when they turn a blind eye on the escape of one of the major drug traffickers and one of the major officials in the Mexican Government?

So this is where we are today. This is the history of the supposed war on drugs by this administration; again, an administration that has almost dissolved the Drug Czar's office; again, an administration that appointed a Surgeon General that sent a mixed message to our children; again, an administration, and the previous majority, the Democrat majority that slashed the programs that stopped drugs cost effectively at their source.

These are, again, the results that we see when we certify that a country is fully cooperating and they make a mockery of the entire process of cooperation, a country that we help with trade, a country that we help with financial assistance. When it was going down the tubes, the United States Government held back the financial instability, that we still back through the International Monetary Fund, through world financial organizations and through the corporations of America.

So I ask tonight, where is the outrage? There is outrage about Kosovo. There is outrage about Saddam Hussein in Iraq. But these folks from Mexico, these corrupt individuals, these illegal narcotics dealers, have killed 100,000 Americans in the last 6 or 7 years of this administration; 14,000 young people, young adults and Americans who lost their lives, a cost of a quarter of a trillion dollars to the American people. Where is the outrage?

If it takes every week, if it takes every night, I will be here on the floor. If it takes 100 more committee meetings to bring this to the attention of the Congress that we need to make certain that we get this effort back on track, we need to make certain that we seek the cooperation and that we seek working with our allies, such as Mexico, to see that the flow of illegal narcotics, the production of illegal narcotics, hard drugs like heroin, cocaine, methamphetamine, that are killing our young people are stopped at their source before they ever reach our border, before they ever imprison our young people and destroy the lives of so many Americans and destroy the lives of their families. So whatever it takes, I will be here.

I see my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), on the floor. The Speaker has appointed myself, the

gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) from Ohio, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) is in charge of working on the demand side and has done a tremendous job in trying to put together community programs which, again, this administration has not adequately funded, to educate our young people, to work in our communities, to work with local organizations. He has done an outstanding job.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the Speaker has appointed him another cochair with me to the Speaker's Working Task Force on the Drug Problem for the House of Representatives.

Both have done an excellent job. I commend them. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) chairs the Subcommittee on Crime and works on criminal justice legislation.

So with those comments, I am pleased to conclude my remarks tonight, but I will be back as many times as it takes, as many hearings as it takes, and as much attention as we must give this problem that, again, I believe is the most important social problem facing our Nation, our Congress and the future of all Americans.

VICTIMS OF TORNADOS IN OHIO GET SUPPORT FROM NEIGHBORS AND OTHERS

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the previous speaker for being willing to offer me some time, as well as our next speaker, and also to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), who just gave an explanation of some of the tremendous problems we face fighting drugs in this country and in our hemisphere, for his hard work on this effort.

He chairs the subcommittee and committee that deals with this issue, not only in terms of reducing the supply of drugs into our country but also the demand, which is, as he said, where I focus more. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) has taken a strong and balanced approach on this that is going to lead, over time, I think, to a much more effective policy to save our young people from the scourge of drugs.

I want to thank him for what he does every day. He could be out enjoying dinner tonight, maybe be with his family. Instead, he is here on the floor, as he is so many evenings, talking about this issue as he does in his committee constantly.

Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about something else. It has to do with a natural disaster. Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, a tornado ripped through the very heart of my district near where I live, near where my office is. The cities of Blue Ash, Ohio, Montgomery, Ohio, Loveland, Ohio, Symmes and Sycamore Townships were some of the communities hardest hit in Hamilton County where I live; also Deerfield Township and several other townships, Hamilton, Salem and others in Warren County, Addysten in Western Hamilton County, were hit by these high winds and devastating storm.

The damage is extensive. I have spent the last few days visiting the area and meeting with victims and local officials trying to help out. Four people were killed, many injured. It is a miracle that more were not killed when one looks at the devastation.

Hundreds of southwest Ohio residents are tonight without homes. In some areas, entire neighborhoods were virtually wiped out. In other areas, individual houses have been destroyed and then the house right next to it stands unscathed.

Although the damage estimates are still under way, we know that there are about 900 homes that have been damaged by the storm; 200 of them have been so severely damaged that they probably will not be able to be rebuilt or they have been totally destroyed. Another couple of hundred have sustained very extensive damage. Dozens of businesses were damaged or destroyed.

Tonight our hearts go out to those families who are trying to put their lives back together. There are some people who lost everything. We have seen from other natural disasters in our area, particularly the flooding in 1997, how difficult it can be for a community to rebuild after a natural disaster; and our thoughts and prayers are with everyone in these hard-hit communities.

The good news is that the response to this storm has been decisive and quick. Truly, I have been overwhelmed by it. Victims are getting help. Neighbors are helping, friends are helping, total strangers are pitching in, all to get people back on their feet.

I spent the last few days working with local, State and Federal officials, working alongside Red Cross and so many other volunteers, police, fire fighters from every neighborhood in our region. It has been truly heartwarming to see people throughout southwest Ohio rally around these communities.

I had occasion on Saturday to tour some of the areas with the Federal Small Business Administration personnel who were sent in to evaluate the damage, and I asked them after some of our visits what they thought about this disaster and how they would compare it to the many others that they have seen around the country, earthquakes, floods, fires and so on.

They said, well, the big difference we see here is the fact that your community, Congressman, really has pulled together and people are helping in every way they possibly can, businesses, individuals and so on. That, again, was heartwarming for me to hear that in the area where I live, folks have come together in a way that is so effective at helping their fellow persons.

There are too many people to thank, so many people have done this, the police and fire departments in Blue Ash, Montgomery, Loveland; Sycamore and Symmes Townships, Deerfield Township, all the affected areas have been fantastic. I think they have done an outstanding job. The sheriffs' departments in Hamilton and Warren Counties provided rapid response. Emergency management throughout southwest Ohio were well prepared and well organized. Our Governor, Bob Taft, came down to the area immediately. His emergency management agency officials have been excellent, and I want to thank the Governor personally for his interest and personal concern for our area.

The Hamilton County Urban Search and Rescue Task Force, so-called USAR team, has been great. They have been working along with elements of FEMA's Ohio Task Force One and they have really been a Godsend to the communities. They searched about 70 homes the morning of the tornado to make sure there was indeed an accurate count of those damaged and injured and those killed.

They also searched numerous businesses to look for survivors, and they have helped since then to be sure that as the clean-up is proceeding, people are entering these homes and businesses in a safe way. Dozens of other agencies throughout the area have lent their mutual support and assistance to these devastated communities.

The Red Cross, of course, and the Salvation Army have been on the scene since the start, offering help to victims and their families; and all of us owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to untold hundreds of volunteers, people who have come out to these communities, some neighbors again, some friends, some total strangers who have taken time and energy to help these folks who are in distress.

□ 1915

Our prayers go out to the families, and our thanks and appreciation go to all the hardworking volunteers and emergency management personnel and local officials who I think have done an outstanding job at a difficult time.

This clean-up process is going to be long and hard. There is still more we need to do to help families get back on their feet. One area where we have made some progress is getting relief from the April 15th tax filing deadline for tornado victims. Victims have much too much to worry about on their minds right now to worry about whether or not they get their taxes in and to worry about the IRS.

We have worked with the IRS here 2 days before the April 15 deadline to get some relief, to get extensions. The IRS has had officials at my office on Montgomery Road to answer questions and help tornado victims right through April 15. People can stop by my office in Kenwood, or call us at 791–0381 to get filing extension information, to get expedited refund checks from the IRS, or

to expedite the process of their tax returns.

We have forms to be able to help people extend their tax filings and also to get expedited refunds. The IRS has also agreed to set up a special phone number for tornado-related problems in Cincinnati. That number is 241–2929, and after hours you can call the IRS Helpline at 1–800–829–1040.

We are making some progress, but we still need a lot more help. The Federal Small Business Administration had a disaster relief team again I joined in the district last week. FEMA officials arrived at the disaster scene to conduct a disaster assessment.

I understand from local and State and Federal officials that the area is likely to meet the threshold to be declared a Federal disaster area, and I urge President Clinton to give prompt consideration to a request that may come from Ohio Governor Bob Taft shortly.

I would also like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, many of whom have come up to me to express their condolences and support as the area I represent recovers from this devastating storm. Now it is time for all of us to do all we can do to help these victims pull their lives back together.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Rules, I am submitting a copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary adopted February 4, 1999.

RULES OF PROCEDURE, 106TH CONGRESS, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 4, 1999

Rule I. The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary and its subcommittees with the following specific additions thereto.

RULE II. COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee on the Judiciary for the conduct of its business shall be on Tuesday of each week while the House is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) At least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session) before each scheduled Committee or subcommittee meeting, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be furnished a list of the bill(s) and subject(s) to be considered and/or acted upon at the meeting. Bills or subjects not listed shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee.

(d) The Chairman, with such notice to the ranking Minority Member as is practicable, may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(e) Committee and subcommittee meetings for the transaction of business, i.e. meetings other than those held for the purpose of taking testimony, shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(f) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon demand of any Member, and a copy made available to each Member present.

(g) For purposes of taking any action at a meeting of the full Committee or any subcommittee thereof, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of not less than one-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee, except that a full majority of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of reporting a measure or recommendation from the Committee or subcommittee, closing a meeting to the public, or authorizing the issuance of a subpoena.

RULE III. HEARINGS

(a) The Committee Chairman or any subcommittee chairman shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by it on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman or subcommittee chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(c) For purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence before the Committee or any subcommittee, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of two Members.

(d) In the course of any hearing each Member shall be allowed five minutes for the interrogation of a witness until such times as each Member who so desires has an opportunity to question the witness.

RULE IV. BROADCASTING

Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio and still photography except when the hearing or meeting is closed pursuant to the Committee Rules of Procedure.

RULE V. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The full Committee shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: antitrust law, tort liability, including medical malpractice and product liability, legal reform generally, and such other matters as determined by the Chairman.

(b) There shall be five standing subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, with jurisdictions as follows:

(1) Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property: copyright, patent and trademark law, administration of U.S. courts, Federal Rules of Evidence, Civil and Appellate Procedure, judicial ethics, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(2) Subcommittee on the Constitution: constitutional amendments, constitutional rights, federal civil rights laws, ethics in government, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(3) Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law: bankruptcy and commercial law, bankruptcy judgeships, administrative law, independent counsel, state taxation affecting interstate commerce, interstate compacts, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(4) Subcommittee on Crime: Federal Criminal Code, drug enforcement, sentencing, parole and pardons, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, prisons, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(5) Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims: immigration and naturalization, admission of refugees, treaties, conventions and international agreements, claims against the United States, federal charters of incorporation, private immigration and claims bills, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and ranking Minority Member thereof shall be ex officio Members, but not voting Members, of each subcommittee which such Chairman or ranking Minority Member has not been assigned by resolution of the Committee. Ex officio Members shall not be counted as present for purposes of constituting a quorum at any hearing or meeting of such subcommittee.

RULE VI. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

RULE VII. NON-LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

No report of the Committee or subcommittee which does not accompany a measure or matter for consideration by the House shall be published unless all Members of the Committee or subcommittee issuing the report shall have been apprised of such report and given the opportunity to give notice of intention to file supplemental, additional, or dissenting views as part of the report. In no case shall the time in which to file such views be less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session).

RULE VIII. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use according to the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the ranking Minority Member of any decision to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

KOSOVO AND THE INVOLVEMENT OF U.S. TROOPS

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the entire hour, but I do want to continue a discussion that I started last evening, a discussion regarding the situation in Kosovo and the involvement of our troops in the air campaign, as well as the potential involvement of our troops in a ground campaign.

I thought it was especially important to continue this this evening, Mr. Speaker, because, as we both know, there are a number of our colleagues who are this evening sitting in their offices signing mail and responding to constituent concerns and at the same time keeping one eye and perhaps one ear on the discussions taking place here.

I think it is important that we look at all the parameters associated with the status of our military today as we hear increased discussions in the city about committing significantly larger amounts of American troops to Kosovo, and committing a significant amount of American resources to the situation and the ultimate defeat of Milosevic.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, I focused on the need to bring Russia in and to basically have Russia, which is on an ongoing basis a significant beneficiary of American tax dollars, to play a vital and direct role in helping to bring Milosevic to the table and to agree to negotiated terms to settle the ethnic unrest that has occurred in Serbia, especially with the Kosovars.

As I said last night, we spend between $6 hundred million and $1 billion of taxpayer money on programs to assist Russia. From economic development to stabilization of their nuclear programs to assistance with environmental issues, we are actively engaged in Russia, and I am in the middle of many of those issues as the chairman of the Interparliamentary Commission with the Russian Duma.

Now is the time for us, Mr. Speaker, to let Russia know that we expect, for the assistance that we give them, that they play a significant and vital role in bringing Milosevic, an ally and close confidante of the Russian government and certain Russian leaders, to the table to help us resolve this conflict peacefully.

As I said last evening, I have had discussions with Russian Duma deputies and with leaders in Russia who want to pursue such a course. Make no mistake about it, I think these negotiations should be on our terms, not Russia's. We should set the policy based on the negotiations that we have had with the Contact Group in the past, but Russia has to be part of the process.

I think in the 3 weeks or so that we have been bombing Serbia it is evident that we have not seen Milosevic move, in terms of coming our way in acquiring a peaceful settlement. What we can in fact do is, in continuing to apply pressure on the government there for the NATO alliance, is bring Russia in and give Russia a more prominent role, and basically allow Russia to play I think the kind of middle position they should be playing in bringing Milosevic and his people to somber discussions about how to resolve this situation peacefully.

I encourage the administration to do that. I am heartened that some feedback I have gotten today is that the administration in fact is looking at these options. I think that is critically important for Republicans and Democrats to continue to press the administration and our allies to look at ways that we can solve this problem to our satisfaction, to the satisfaction of NATO, to the satisfaction of the stability of the Kosovars and Kosovo as a Nation, where people can live freely without ethnic intimidation, but we should do that also without having to resort to inserting ground troops and potentially involving ourselves in a major conflict that could involve the world's two major superpowers as opponents.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to use this opportunity to talk about some other factors that Members must consider as we prepare to either support or not support the administration's policy on moving additional troops and operations and personnel and platforms into Kosovo and the surrounding theater.

Before I do that, however, I want to reiterate two important points that I made last evening. The first is that Milosevic understand in no uncertain terms that all of us in this body are united with the President in demanding that he end his reign of terror on the Kosovars, and that he stop and be held accountable for the atrocities that are now unfolding in Kosovo and Serbia, and that we as Americans will follow through in holding him accountable personally. Let there be no mistake about that.

The second key point I want to make and reemphasize from last evening is that we are solidly behind our military; that we in the Congress are doing everything in our power to give them the tools and the resources they need to allow them to continue the operations that have been outlined for them by the Commander in Chief.

But let me get into the meat of what I would like to discuss this evening, Mr. Speaker. That deals with the need for Members of this body and the other body to understand that deploying our troops in Kosovo, sending our pilots in to conduct aerial campaigns, sending our helicopters, our Apaches in to provide safe ways, is not the same as sending inanimate robots into an area.

These are human beings, and these human beings have need, they have wants. We have not been as supportive as a Nation in providing the backup and financial resources to protect the quality of life and stability of these troops as we should be.

This is an appropriate time for us to outline these concerns, and to use this as part of our discussions as we decide whether or not to move into a phase where ground troops are entered into Kosovo.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people in America have been convinced that for some reason we are spending so much more money today on our military than at any point in time in the past. The facts just do not bear that out.

When I talk to my constituents back in Pennsylvania, I use a simple analogy. I do not compare what we are spending on defense to Ronald Reagan, as some would perhaps do. Rather, I go back to the time of John Kennedy.

When John Kennedy was president in the sixties, Mr. Speaker, we were spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar coming into Washington on the military. Yet, it was a time of peace. It was after Korea and before Vietnam. Fifty-two cents of every tax dollar was spent on the military. Nine percent of our gross national product was spent on defense back then.

In today's budget, we are spending 15 cents of the Federal tax dollar on defense. We are spending 2.6 percent of our gross national product on the military. The numbers have dropped dramatically. In fact, by any accounting standard, we are spending a significantly smaller portion of our Federal allocation that is available on defense and security than we were back when John Kennedy was the President, even though I would argue that was a more stable time and a time of peace throughout the world.

But some other factors have changed. Back when John Kennedy was president we had the draft. Young people were brought into the military. They served a period of 2 years or more. Then they went on with their lives. They were paid next to nothing.

Today we have an all volunteer force. They are well educated. Many are married, they have children, so we have added health care costs, housing costs, travel costs, so a much larger portion of our smaller defense budget is being spent on the quality of life to get those troops, to get those people, to serve in the military and to keep those troops involved and to stay on beyond one tour of duty.

In fact, quality of life is the overriding driving factor of our defense budget process today, to make sure our troops are happy, that they have the best possible quality of life to raise their families and to continue to serve America.

That was not the case back in the sixties. With the draft, we paid the troops a meager amount of money. Most were not married. We did not have all the associated costs with housing, education, health care, and so forth.

Some other things have changed. Back in John Kennedy's era when we were spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar on the military, we were not spending a significant portion of our defense budget on environmental mitigation. In this year's defense budget, $11 billion of the defense budget will go for what we call environmental mitigation. That is money that is not going to provide support for our troops. That is money that is not going to buy new equipment or to replace old equipment, or to repair equipment.

Now $11 billion out of today's budget for defense environmental mitigation, and zero dollars spent during John Kennedy's era for the similar type of situation, a further change from the nineties as compared to the sixties.

But there is even a more fundamental difference that gets at the heart of our problem in sustaining the readiness of our troops today. That is the issue that I also talked about last evening. This issue, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to drive home to Americans and to our colleagues on a daily basis.

During the time from World War II's ending until 1990 and 1991, under the administration of all the presidents that served during that period, starting with Harry Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower and Richard Nixon and going on through John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, and going on through Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford, and even including Ronald Reagan and George Bush, during all of that time the total amount of deployments by those Commander in Chiefs was 10, 10 deployments in 40 years.

Our troops were only inserted into hostile environments as a measure of last resort by our Republican and Democrat Commander in Chief.

Let us look at the past 8 years, Mr. Speaker. Since 1991, 1990 and 1991, we have had 33 deployments. I had to cross them out, because Kosovo is now the 33rd. There have been 33 deployments of our troops into hostile situations. Each of these 33 deployments, 33 in 8 years, versus 10 in 40 years, each of these deployments cost hundreds of millions or billions of dollars. None of these 33 deployments were budgeted for, not one. None of these deployments were paid for with an up or down vote on the Congress in advance of the deployment of the troops.

The payment of the costs associated with these deployments was made by taking dollars out of an already decreasing defense budget, out of programs of modernizing our aircraft, modernizing our naval fleet, modernizing our platforms, and giving the soldiers, sailors, marines, and corpsmen the kinds of quality of life that they deserve in an era where we have all volunteers.

In fact, the Comptroller of the Pentagon has given us a figure that these 33 deployments cost us $19 billion of unanticipated expenditures. Many of them were paid with supplementals to provide the funding to pay for these operations.

In fact, the irony of these 33 deployments, Mr. Speaker, is that we in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, joining together each year for the past 4 years, plussed up more money to try to replenish some of these funds that were being eaten away for this rapidly increasing deployment rate.

In fact, 4 years ago we gave the Pentagon $10 billion more than what the President asked for. Three years ago we gave the Pentagon $6 billion more than what the Pentagon asked for. Two years ago we gave the Pentagon $3 billion more than what the President asked for.

In each of those years, as we in the Congress tried to replenish the funds to replace money that was being used for these deployments, the President and the administration criticized the Congress for giving the Pentagon more money than they asked for.

□ 1930

Finally this year, the Pentagon leaders have spoken up and said, ''We can take this no longer. The funding problem is so severe in the Pentagon that we have to tell you candidly that we need more money in next year's budget.''

The service chiefs came in and testified before the House committees and the Senate committees and said, at a minimum, they need $19 billion more than what President Clinton asked for in the fiscal year 2000 budget.

The President said he would make $11 billion of new funding available. It was a great speech. But when we cut away all of the rhetoric, the actual new money put in by the President in his budget for the next fiscal year is $3 billion. In fact, one of the gimmicks they used was to take $3 billion out of R&D for defense, shift it into acquisition, and call that a $3 billion plus-up in defense spending.

The problem we have today is that the readiness of our troops, the capability to perform in Kosovo, is directly dependent on how much we support our troops. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have undermined the capability of our military.

Because of the rapidly increasing level of deploying our troops around the world and because of the rapidly decreasing defense budget, we have unfortunately encountered a mismatch that is affecting the quality of life for our troops, that is affecting the ability for our troops to serve this Nation well in Kosovo, let alone the possibility of asking ground troops to go in to fight what could be a massive war.

Mr. Speaker, let me give my colleagues some examples that are very specific. One of our national defense technical media outlets is running a series of stories that, to me, are embarrassing. They have documents, one of which I will enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These are internal memos of the Army where the Army is discussing the need to replace the survival radio gear that we provide the pilots and crew members on aircraft flying over hostile environments.

This gear and equipment is essential because, if a plane is downed, as we saw with the F–117A, those pilots and those crew members have got to have a way to get a signal back so that we can go in and rescue them.

These documents refer to those systems. Unfortunately in the internal memos of the Army, in discussing the availability of these devices to provide for our planes that are flying, not just over Kosovo, but also over Iraq in the peacekeeping role there and protecting the no-fly zone, this is what the Army is saying to those who are asking for these devices to put on these planes to protect our pilots, and I quote: ''We do not have any radios available to fill shortages.'' We do not have any radios available to fill shortages, referring to these devices that are so critically important for pilots that may be downed in either Iraq or in Kosovo from enemy fire.

They go on to discuss the fact that we need to have some kind of protection for the pilots. So further on in the same memo, these are internal Army memos that I have been given by the medial outlets running these stories, this is a directive that has been issued by the Army, ''The pilot in command'' of the aircraft ''will continue to ensure that not less than one fully operational survival radio is on board the aircraft. This does not preclude crew members from carrying additional radios on board the aircraft as assets become available. In addition, the'' pilot in charge ''will ensure that crew members without radios have other means of signaling'', now listen to this, Mr. Speaker, either a ''foliage penetration flare kit and/or a signal mirror.''

Can we imagine, Mr. Speaker, that we are sending pilots and crew members into a hostile environment, whether it is over Iraq or Kosovo, and we are telling them, because we do not have enough equipment, that they should make sure that they have a signal mirror; that that is the method they are going to use to tell our rescue crews that they have been downed.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there was another story that ran a week or so ago where one of our Maryland units, I believe it is the 104th Air Reserve Squadron out of neighboring Maryland who is currently flying the missions over Iraq at this very moment, that the commanding officer has been quoted as saying that that unit had to go to local Radio Shack stores and buy GPS devices to give their pilots to carry on board these planes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not some pie-in-the-sky make-believe threatening scenario. This is what is happening today with our military. How can we as the world's most powerful Nation there to provide security and leadership for NATO allow our pilots and their crews

to fly combat missions without the appropriate equipment to guarantee the safety of their lives?

Is it no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the retention rate for our pilots in the Navy and the Air Force is the lowest rate today since World War II? The retention rate for Air Force and Navy pilots flying planes today over Kosovo and Iraq is below 20 percent. In one case, it is 15 percent.

We wonder why these young pilots who we have invested so much money to train do not want to stay in. It is because we are not giving them the equipment they need. It is because their morale is suffering and because they are sick and tired of going from one deployment to the next.

Instead of having time to come back to visit with our families, to visit with our children, they are being dispatched to Haiti, from Haiti to Somalia, from Somalia to Macedonia, from Macedonia to Bosnia, from Bosnia to Kosovo.

The morale is suffering in a dramatic way, and we are seeing the result of that in a level of retention for pilots that we have not seen in the last 50 years. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing it in the ability to recruit new young people in the services.

The Secretary of the Army just 1 month ago, because of shortages in the Army's ability to bring the new recruits, has proposed that we lower the standard of acceptance, that we now take young people in the Army who do not have high school diplomas.

Here is the irony of that, Mr. Speaker, the Army's number one priority right now, which I fully support, is the digitized battlefield, to give the Army warrior of the 21st century an information technology capability second to none, a computer in the backpack so they have visual imaging, a GPS capability so in their goggles they can see what the pilots in our helicopters and our planes and our radar surveillance planes are seeing.

At a time when we are making our soldiers digitized, able to be operating computers, we are having to lower the standard of acceptance in the Army to well below a high school diploma because we cannot fill the billets, because the morale in the services are suffering unlike any time, including 1970s, since World War II.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have ships going out to sea, aircraft carriers short of 600 to 700 sailors from what the required rate of deployment and billets should be for a mission, 600 to 700 sailors short because we cannot provide the number of sailors to man the ships to do the functions that they are required to do in hostile environments.

Mr. Speaker, these are facts. These are not ideas. These are not maybes. These are dependables. These things are happening today. We have a severe problem with our military. We are stretching it to the bone.

Our military was not designed to become the world's police department where every time a conflict occurs, we send in the American troops. These are not robots. These are human beings with families, with loved ones. They deserve to be treated with dignity and respect.

I appreciate President Clinton today or yesterday going down and speaking to the pilots who are flying our B–52s, real heroes for America and real heroes for the world that we are trying to protect. But I wish the President would have addressed one other thing when he spoke to them.

I wish he would have told those pilots what we all know, that those B–52 bombers are going to be 75 years old before we can retire them, 75 years old and flying because we have undermined the base of financial support to provide new aircraft.

That is what is critical to those pilots in those B–52s and those crews. It is not just enough to say they are American heroes. It also requires us to give them the new equipment, the training, the repairs, the kinds of support they need to do the job they are being asked to do.

We are not doing that, Mr. Speaker. We are not modernizing the military because, over the past 6 years, we have cut program after program to put the money in to paying for these deployments because we do not have the dollars necessary to fund these deployments up front.

This means that marines flying in the CH–46 workhorse helicopter that was built during the Vietnam War will be flying those helicopters when they are 55 years old. Those helicopters were designed to be flown for 20 to 25 years.

The marines will have to fly the 46 when it is 55 years old because we have not replaced the 46 with the aircraft that is designed to take it out of service, because we have taken the money from that program and used it to fund these escapades around the world; and that is what they are, escapades.

Critics would say to me, ''Well, wait a minute, Congressman Weldon, you are being critical of this President and this administration for all of these deployments. What about President Bush? Wasn't it President Bush back in 1991 in this 33 deployment rate who sent our troops to Desert Storm, a very large conflict?''

The answer is, yes, it was President Bush who sent our troops into Desert Storm. We did have a full and open debate in this body and the other body before those troops were committed to combat.

We did one other thing, Mr. Speaker, or I should not say ''we did''. The President did. President Bush felt so strongly about the allied commitment in Desert Storm that he personally went to the major world leaders around the world, and he said something very simple to them. ''If you cannot send troops, then you must support this operation financially. But if you can send troops, we want your troops involved.''

Desert Storm was the largest multinational force that we have seen certainly in this decade. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Desert Storm cost the American taxpayer $51 billion, a huge sum of money. But, Mr. Speaker, President Bush got our allies to reimburse us $52 billion. There was no net cost to our defense budget.

Each of these deployments, the reverse has occurred. Not only are the allies not reimbursing us for our costs, in places like Haiti, we are subsidizing the cost of other nations sending their troops in along with us. In fact, we are using American defense dollars to fund the support, the housing, the food, and the subsidization of other nations to bring their militaries into these deployments that we have become involved with.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is getting grave. We on the Committee on Armed Services are getting ready to mark up our defense authorization bill. We have very serious problems. The Joint Chiefs have said publicly they need $19 billion more than what the President has in fact allocated.

That does not include a pay raise for all the service personnel. That does not include service-wide adjustments to the retirement system that are needed. That does not include missile defenses, which are one of the fastest growing threats that we see emerging in the 21st Century.

The estimate we have come up with is that we are short approximately $25 billion in the next fiscal year just to take care of our ongoing commitments. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because Kosovo has already cost us $2 billion. Where did that money come from? It came out of an already decreasing defense budget. Every major operation in the country has had to put dollars on the table to help fund the Kosovo deployment.

We are going to have to pass a massive supplemental. I saw the report today where the long-term projected cost of Kosovo could exceed $10 billion to $15 billion alone. Mr. Speaker, I ask the question of our colleagues, where is that money going to come from? Where are we going to find that additional $10 billion to $15 billion when we cannot even fund the $19 billion to $25 billion shortfall that has been identified before Kosovo became an issue.

□ 1945

We are in a massive crisis. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as I have spoken around the country, I have made the statement that this period of time, the 1990s, will go down in history as the worst decade in undermining our national security because of our increasing rate of deployment and our massive decreases in defense allocations. The two run in a diametrically opposite way, and we are feeling the crunch today.

With all of these deployments, the Navy is being asked to do more and more assignments around the world. We are now dispatching another carrier over to the Kosovo theater; to the

Balkan theater. The Navy at one time had 585 ships. If we listen to our Navy experts today, we are having trouble keeping our Navy at 300 ships, in spite of these massive increases in deployments around the world.

Our fighter squadrons. We have fighter squadrons today, Mr. Speaker, where up to one-third of the planes are grounded because we are using them as spare parts to keep the other two-thirds in the air flying.

Mr. Speaker, how long can this go on before the American people sense that something is terribly wrong? Is it going to take a massive loss of life? Are we going to have to see another case where soldiers are killed, as we saw 28 young Americans killed in 1991 when that low-complexity SCUD missile hit the barracks in Saudi Arabia that we could not defend against and we brought them home in body bags?

It is a real fact, Mr. Speaker, that 8 years after that attack on our soldiers in Saudi Arabia with that SCUD missile that we have no highly effective system today to deal with the medium-range missiles that Iran and Iraq both now have, that North Korea has now deployed that threatens our troops in South Korea and threatens our troops in Japan. The growth of missile proliferation is providing threats to our troops that we do not have the money to build systems to defend against.

The threat of weapons of mass destruction has caused the President to ask for billions of dollars of additional money to deal with the threats of the potential use of chemical, biological and small nuclear weapons, and I agree with his assessment of the threat. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not have the money.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest threat, the threat of cyber terrorism, the use by a rogue nation or rogue group with high-performance computers to compromise our smart weapons and our civilian information systems, is requiring a massive increase in new dollars to deal with information warfare, and we do not have the money to put into that process.

Mr. Speaker, I recite these facts because as we, my colleagues and I, are being asked to assess whether or not our troops should be deployed, both our helicopters which are already there and the troops that support them that are already there, and the potential follow-on of a larger group of troops going into Kosovo, we had better consider one very important thing: We had better be prepared to provide every ounce of support for those men and women that they need.

That is going to require a significant new investment of money. That is going to require an effort that breaks the budget caps. It is going to require us to significantly increase the support to replace the Tomahawk cruise missiles, the guns and ammunition, the fuel, the lodging costs, and all those other associated costs that currently are in excess of $2 billion for the Kosovo deployment.

Mr. Speaker, we better be prepared for one other debate as well. If we cannot sustain the level of our troop strength that we need, if we cannot reverse the decline in the retention of our pilots, especially Navy and Air Force pilots, if we cannot turn around the Army's problem of recruitment, the Navy's problem of filling its billets, if we cannot solve those problems, Mr. Speaker, I believe all my colleagues know what that means we will have to debate. That means we have to debate whether or not to consider reinstating the draft. Boy, all of a sudden does that raise eyebrows across the country.

It is easy to say put the troops in. It is easy to say put American kids in harm's way. It is easy to say send planes over. But, Mr. Speaker, we need men and women to fly those planes, to fly those helicopters, to feed those troops. And if morale becomes such a problem because of our lack of support financially for our troops, what then do we do?

If we cannot convince young people to voluntarily serve their country, and that is where we are heading, then, unfortunately, if we are going to see the administration keep this level of deployment up, we have got to find a way to get young people to fill those billets, to sail those ships, to man those helicopters, to fly those B–52s, to fly those F–117As. And if we cannot do that voluntarily, Mr. Speaker, that means we have to force people to serve our Nation to complete these operations that our commander-in-chief has gotten us into.

These are not easy decisions. These are not easy circumstances where we can, sitting in our armchair, decide to send more robots into a theater and risk their lives. We have a problem with our military because we have not funded readiness, we have not funded modernization, we are not even giving the pilots the remote sensing gear they need if they are shot down.

And if we cannot provide the support to keep those volunteers serving our country, then those Members of Congress who are standing before the national media, who are talking about putting our troops in harm's way, who are talking about sending tens of thousands of new troops into Kosovo, they better be prepared to address the issue of where do these young people come from. Because if we cannot provide the bodies, then we have to force young Americans to do what they did prior to the Vietnam War, and that is serve their country as a part of a national conscription effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to do that. I do not think we should be thinking about restoring the draft, but I also understand the reality of the situation we are in. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot deploy our troops 33 times, we cannot keep young people in Haiti, Macedonia, Somalia, the Balkans, in Bosnia, and put them in Kosovo, and have them handle floods and tornadoes and earthquakes and unrest in Central America, and rebuilding in Central America, and at the same time not have the bodies to fill those slots. It does not work that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have never heard this President deal with these issues. He has not talked about the need to provide additional support for our troops. He does not want to break the budget caps. He does not want to put the kind of money in that the Joint Chiefs have said publicly they need this year. And he is not willing to talk about the morale problems in the military. These are issues that we in the Congress cannot run away from.

Defense is not a partisan issue. I am the first to admit publicly, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats in this body have been as supportive of defense as have Republicans, and some of our leading supporters of the military are Members of the Democrat party. An overwhelming number of our Republicans are strong supporters of our military.

I want to speak to those other Members of the Congress who want to put our troops in harm's way but who want to cut the defense budget even further than what it is now. Mr. Speaker, we cannot let that happen. Every one of those Members of Congress who goes on national TV, who stands in the well of this body and talks about committing our troops, talks about humanitarian efforts, talks about saving lives and taking people out of wheelbarrows to give them homes, they better be prepared to vote for the money and the support to deal with the morale problems, the readiness problems, the modernization problems that we have in the military today. Because that is what this debate needs to focus on. This is not about undermining the leadership of our country. This is about giving those men and women asked to go into harm's way the tools they need to do their job.

We need to have this debate across America, and I hope, as we get closer to a decision on how to proceed with Kosovo, we continue to understand that every day we are there is costing us, by one estimate I saw, $30 million an hour. Thirty million dollars an hour of U.S. tax money that we do not know where it is coming from. Thirty million dollars an hour that the U.S. is putting up, that we are shouldering the bulk of the responsibility for.

These costs have to come from someplace, and this body needs to find a way to provide the additional resources to pay for those operational costs and not rob other accounts that force us to fly aircraft well beyond their life expectancy, that forces morale to continue to drop, that forces our pilots to want to get out and make money in the private sector, and that forces those people flying those bombing missions and those security missions over Iraq and Kosovo at this very hour to not have the necessary equipment so that if they are shot down they can alert our rescue crews to come in and know where they are to get them out quickly and safely.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges before us are great. This country needs to understand all the dimensions of the Kosovo deployment. This country needs to understand that we cannot afford to be fair weather friends of the brave men and women who serve this country. It is not just enough to stand up and wave the flag and say ''I am behind the troops.'' We must be prepared to take care of all the extra costs that are associated with these 33 deployments, many of which our troops are still involved with around the world today.

I ask my colleagues to consider these facts as we move further into a very nasty and dangerous situation far away from the homes and the towns where these brave Americans live.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0018

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. KASICH submitted the following conference report and statement on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106–91)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68), establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, do pass with the following, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the resolution and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2009 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.
Sec. 104. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the Senate.
Sec. 105. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the House of Representatives.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Safe deposit box for social security surpluses.
Sec. 202. Reserve fund for retirement security.
Sec. 203. Reserve fund for medicare.
Sec. 204. Reserve fund for agriculture.
Sec. 205. Tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate.
Sec. 206. Emergency designation point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 207. Pay-as-you-go point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 208. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 209. Establishment of levels for fiscal year 1999.
Sec. 210. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to foster the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities in the Senate.
Sec. 211. Reserve fund for fiscal year 2000 surplus.
Sec. 212. Reserve fund for education in the Senate.
Sec. 213. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Sense of Congress Provisions

Sec. 301. Sense of Congress on the protection of the social security surpluses.
Sec. 302. Sense of Congress on providing additional dollars to the classroom.
Sec. 303. Sense of Congress on asset-building for the working poor.
Sec. 304. Sense of Congress on child nutrition.
Sec. 305. Sense of Congress concerning funding for special education.

Subtitle B—Sense of the House Provisions

Sec. 311. Sense of the House on the Commission on International Religious Freedom.
Sec. 312. Sense of the House on assessment of welfare-to-work programs.

Subtitle C—Sense of the Senate Provisions

Sec. 321. Sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not invest the social security trust funds in private financial markets.
Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the medicare program.
Sec. 323. Sense of the Senate on education.
Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to Americans by returning the non-social security surplus to taxpayers.
Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate on access to medicare services.
Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate on law enforcement.
Sec. 327. Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplomatic missions.
Sec. 328. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.
Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.
Sec. 330. Sense of the Senate on TEA–21 funding and the States.
Sec. 331. Sense of the Senate that the one hundred sixth Congress, first session should reauthorize funds for the farmland protection program.
Sec. 332. Sense of the Senate on the importance of social security for individuals who become disabled.
Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate on reporting of on-budget trust fund levels.
Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate regarding South Korea's international trade practices on pork and beef.
Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate on funding for natural disasters.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 2000 through 2009:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,434,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,454,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,531,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,584,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,648,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,681,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,735,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,805,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,868,515,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$7,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$53,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$31,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$49,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$62,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$109,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$135,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$150,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$177,195,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,455,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,486,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,559,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,612,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,666,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,698,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,753,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,814,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,874,778,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,434,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,454,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,531,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,583,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,639,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,667,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,717,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,781,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,841,858,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS OR SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits or surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $0.
Fiscal year 2002: $0.
Fiscal year 2003: $0.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $8,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $13,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $18,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $23,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $26,657,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,628,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,708,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,793,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,877,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,956,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $6,024,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $6,084,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $6,136,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $6,173,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $6,203,400,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $468,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $487,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $506,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $527,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $549,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $576,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $601,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $628,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $654,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $681,313,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $327,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $339,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $350,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $362,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $375,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $389,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $404,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $420,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $438,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $459,496,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $288,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $308,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $318,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $327,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $328,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $329,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $330,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $332,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $333,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $318,040,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $14,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $14,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,560,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $49,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$84,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,067,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $23,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $23,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $23,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $23,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,238,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $11,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $10,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $10,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $10,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,145,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $10,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $10,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,223,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $9,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $12,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $12,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $12,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $13,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,824,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $51,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $50,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $52,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $52,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $52,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $52,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $52,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $52,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,082,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $6,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $3,851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $3,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $3,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $3,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $3,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,483,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $66,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $66,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $66,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $70,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $73,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $74,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $74,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $75,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $76,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $76,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,688,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $156,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $164,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $173,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $173,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $184,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $197,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $212,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $228,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $246,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $245,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $265,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $285,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,941,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $208,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $208,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $222,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $230,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $250,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $268,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $295,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $306,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $306,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $337,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $365,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $394,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,249,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $244,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $250,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $262,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $276,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $286,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $298,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $304,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $310,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $311,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $323,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $334,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,604,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $18,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $21,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,215,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $45,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $44,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $45,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $46,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $48,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $47,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $47,805,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $48,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $49,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,671,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,657,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $26,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $26,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,368,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $12,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $12,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $12,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $12,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,931,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $275,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $271,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $267,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $265,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $263,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $261,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $258,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $257,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $255,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $252,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,968,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$12,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$19,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,889,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,102,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,039,000,000.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

Not later than July 23, 1999, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $142,315,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $777,868,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Not later than July 16, 1999, the Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House of Representatives a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $142,315,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $777,868,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. SAFE DEPOSIT BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2000, the social security surplus will exceed $137 billion;

(5) for the first time, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(B) in setting forth the deficit level pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, that level shall not include any adjustments in aggregates that would be made pursuant to any reserve fund that provides for adjustments in allocations and aggregates for legislation that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform.

(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if the deficit for a fiscal year results solely from legislation enacted pursuant to section 202.

(4) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose;

(2) in the Senate, adjust the levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 207; and

(3) reduce the revenue aggregates by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for that purpose.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that implements structural medicare reform and significantly extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may change committee allocations and spending aggregates if such legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—The adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a) may be made to address the cost of the prescription drug benefit.

SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Agriculture of the House or the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides risk management or income assistance for agriculture producers that complies with paragraph (2), the appropriate Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it does not cause a net increase in budget authority or outlays for fiscal year 2000 and does not cause a net increase in budget authority that is greater than $2,000,000,000 for any of fiscal years 2001 through 2004.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed—

(1) $6,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; and

(2) $6,000,000,000 in budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 205. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may reduce the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise committee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if such legislation will not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 206. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are whether it is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure and if the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—A provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this subsection may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE SPENDING.—Subsection (b) shall not apply against an emergency designation for a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category.

(h) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on the adoption of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 207. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

(1) ensure continued compliance with the balanced budget plan set forth in this resolution; and

(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection the term ''applicable time period'' means any one of the three following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(B) The period of the first five fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(C) The period of the five fiscal years following the first five fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term ''direct-spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''direct-spending legislation'' and ''revenue legislation'' do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, then it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A).

(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 202 of House Concurrent Resolution 67 (104th Congress) is repealed.

(g) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 2002.

SEC. 208. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this resolution, sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply to fiscal year 2000 and the total for fiscal year 2000 and the 4 ensuing fiscal years.

SEC. 209. ESTABLISHMENT OF LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.

The levels submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5 of the 106th Congress or S. Res. 312 of the 105th Congress, and any revisions authorized by such resolutions, shall be considered to be the levels and revisions of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and

allocations may be revised for legislation that finances disability programs designed to allow individuals with disabilities to become employed and remain independent if, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section.

SEC. 211. RESERVE FUND FOR A FISCAL YEAR 2000 SURPLUS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its economic and budget forecast for fiscal year 2000 by July 1, 1999.

(b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000, the appropriate Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The appropriate Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the following adjustments in an amount equal to the on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 as estimated in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by that amount for fiscal year 2000;

(2) increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 207; and

(3) adjust the instruction in sections 104 and 105 of this resolution to—

(A) reduce revenues by that amount for fiscal year 2000; and

(B) increase the reduction in revenues for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 by that amount.

SEC. 212. RESERVE FUND FOR EDUCATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, upon reporting of a bill, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon that allows local educational agencies to use appropriated funds to carry out activities under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act that complies with subsection (b), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may—

(1) increase the outlay aggregate and allocation for fiscal year 2000 by not more than $360,000,000; and

(2) adjust the levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 207.

(b) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this subsection if it does not cause a net increase in budget authority or outlays for the periods of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 213. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Sense of Congress Provisions

SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE PROTECTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Congress and the President should balance the budget excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds;

(2) reducing the Federal debt held by the public is a top national priority, strongly supported on a bipartisan basis, as evidenced by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's comment that debt reduction ''is a very important element in sustaining economic growth'', as well as President Clinton's comments that it ''is very, very important that we get the Government debt down'' when referencing his own plans to use the budget surplus to reduce Federal debt held by the public;

(3) according to the Congressional Budget Office, balancing the budget excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds will reduce debt held by the public by a total of $1,723,000,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 2009, $417,000,000,000, or 32 percent, more than it would be reduced under the President's fiscal year 2000 budget submission;

(4) further, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that the President's budget would actually spend $40,000,000,000 of the social security surpluses in fiscal year 2000 on new spending programs, and spend $158,000,000,000 of the social security surpluses on new spending programs from fiscal year 2000 through 2004; and

(5) social security surpluses should be used for social security reform, retirement security, or to reduce the debt held by the public and should not be used for other purposes.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Congress shall pass legislation which—

(1) reaffirms the provisions of section 13301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 that provides that the receipts and disbursements of the social security trust funds shall not be counted for the purposes of the budget submitted by the President, the congressional budget, or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and provides for a point of order within the Senate against any concurrent resolution on the budget, an amendment thereto, or a conference report thereon that violates that section;

(2) mandates that the social security surpluses are used only for the payment of social security benefits, retirement security, social security reform, or to reduce the Federal debt held by the public and such mandate shall be implemented by establishing a supermajority point of order in the Senate against limits established on the level of debt held by the public;

(3) provides for a Senate super-majority point of order against any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that would use social security surpluses on anything other than the payment of social security benefits, social security reform, retirement security, or the reduction of the Federal debt held by the public;

(4) ensures that all social security benefits are paid on time; and

(5) accommodates social security reform legislation.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) working with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) education initiatives should boost academic achievement for all students; and excellence in American classrooms means having high expectations for all students, teachers, and administrators, and holding schools accountable to the children and parents served by such schools;

(5) successful schools and school systems are characterized by parental involvement in the education of their children, local control, emphasis on basic academics, emphasis on fundamental skills and exceptional teachers in the classroom;

(6) the one-size-fits-all approach to education often creates barriers to innovation and reform initiatives at the local level; America's rural schools face challenges quite different from their urban counterparts; and parents, teachers and State and local officials should have the freedom to tailor their education plans and reforms according to the unique educational needs of their children;

(7) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(8) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that would consolidate thirty-one Federal K–12 education programs;

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms;

(3) increased funding for elementary and secondary education should be directed to States and local school districts; and

(4) decision making authority should be placed in the hands of States, localities, and families to implement innovative solutions to local educational challenges and to increase the performance of all students, unencumbered by unnecessary Federal rules and regulations.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have no or negative financial assets.

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children.

(3) In order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established.

(4) Across the Nation, numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building incentives, including individual development accounts, are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers.

(5) Middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets.

(6) The Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHILD NUTRITION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) both Republicans and Democrats understand that an adequate diet and proper nutrition are essential to a child's general well-being;

(2) the lack of an adequate diet and proper nutrition may adversely affect a child's ability to perform up to his or her ability in school;

(3) the Government currently plays a role in funding school nutrition programs; and

(4) there is a bipartisan commitment to helping children learn.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in the House the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Agriculture and in the Senate the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry should examine our Nation's nutrition programs to determine if they can be improved, particularly with respect to services to low-income children.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) (referred to in this resolution as the ''Act''), Congress found that improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities.

(2) In the Act, the Secretary of Education is instructed to make grants to States to assist them in providing special education and related services to children with disabilities.

(3) The Act represents a commitment by the Federal Government to fund 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

(4) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 ignores the commitment by the Federal Government under the Act to fund special education and instead proposes the creation of new programs that limit the manner in which States may spend the limited Federal education dollars received.

(5) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 fails to increase funding for special education, and leaves States and localities with an enormous unfunded mandate to pay for growing special education costs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) should be fully funded at the originally promised level before any funds are appropriated for new education programs.

Subtitle B—Sense of the House Provisions

SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) persecution of individuals on the sole ground of their religious beliefs and practices occurs in countries around the world and affects millions of lives;

(2) such persecution violates international norms of human rights, including those established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Helsinki Accords, and the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief;

(3) such persecution is abhorrent to all Americans, and our very Nation was founded on the principle of the freedom to worship according to the dictates of our conscience; and

(4) in 1998 Congress unanimously passed, and President Clinton signed into law, the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which established the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to monitor facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom and authorized $3,000,000 to carry out the functions of the Commission for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution assumes that $3,000,000 will be appropriated within function 150 for fiscal year 2000 for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to carry out its duties; and

(2) the House Committee on Appropriations is strongly urged to appropriate such amount for the Commission.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ASSESSMENT OF WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the House that, recognizing the need to maximize the benefit of the Welfare-to-Work Program, the Secretary of Labor should prepare a report on Welfare-to-Work Programs pursuant to section 403(a)(5) of the Social Security Act. This report should include information on the following—

(1) the extent to which the funds available under such section have been used (including the number of States that have not used any of such funds), the types of programs that have received such funds, the number of and characteristics of the recipients of assistance under such programs, the goals of such programs, the duration of such programs, the costs of such programs, any evidence of the effects of such programs on such recipients, and accounting of the total amount expended by the States from such funds, and the rate at which the Secretary expects such funds to be expended for each of the fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002;

(2) with regard to the unused funds allocated for Welfare-to-Work for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999, identify areas of the Nation that have unmet needs for Welfare-to-Work initiatives; and

(3) identify possible Congressional action that may be taken to reprogram Welfare-to-Work funds from States that have not utilized previously allocated funds to places of unmet need, including those States that have rejected or otherwise not utilized prior funding.

(b) REPORT.—It is the sense of the House that, not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Labor should submit to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in writing, the report described in subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Sense of the Senate Provisions

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT INVEST THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS IN PRIVATE FINANCIAL MARKETS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should not directly invest contributions made to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) in private financial markets.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The health insurance coverage provided under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is an integral part of the financial security for retired and disabled individuals, as such coverage protects those individuals against the financially ruinous costs of a major illness.

(2) Expenditures under the medicare program for hospital, physician, and other essential health care services that are provided to nearly 39,000,000 retired and disabled individuals will be $232,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000.

(3) During the nearly 35 years since the medicare program was established, the Nation's health care delivery and financing system has undergone major transformations. However, the medicare program has not kept pace with such transformations.

(4) Former Congressional Budget Office Director Robert Reischauer has described the medicare program as it exists today as failing on the following 4 key dimensions (known as the ''Four I's''):

(A) The program is inefficient.

(B) The program is inequitable.

(C) The program is inadequate.

(D) The program is insolvent.

(5) The President's budget framework does not devote 15 percent of the budget surpluses to the medicare program. The Federal budget process does not provide a mechanism for setting aside current surpluses for future obligations. As a result, the notion of saving 15 percent of the surplus for the medicare program cannot practically be carried out.

(6) The President's budget framework would transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund more than $900,000,000,000 over 15 years in new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public, and these new IOUs would increase the gross debt of the Federal Government by the amounts transferred.

(7) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that the transfers described in paragraph (6), which are strictly intragovernmental, have no effect on the unified budget surpluses or the on-budget surpluses and therefore have no effect on the debt held by the public.

(8) The President's budget framework does not provide access to, or financing for, prescription drugs.

(9) The Comptroller General of the United States has stated that the President's medicare proposal does not constitute reform of the program and ''is likely to create a public misperception that something meaningful is being done to reform the medicare program''.

(10) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 enacted changes to the medicare program which strengthen and extend the solvency of that program.

(11) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that without the changes made to the medicare program by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the depletion of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund would now be imminent.

(12) The President's budget proposes to cut medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, primarily through reductions in payments to providers under that program.

(13) The recommendations by Senator John Breaux and Representative William Thomas received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(14) The Breaux-Thomas recommendations provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring new IOUs to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume the following:

(1) This resolution does not adopt the President's proposals to reduce medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, nor does this resolution adopt the President's proposal to spend $10,000,000,000 of medicare program funds on unrelated programs.

(2) Congress will not transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(3) Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the medicare program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

(4) The American public will be well and fairly served in this undertaking if the medicare program reform proposals are considered within a framework that is based on the following 5 key principles offered in testimony to the Senate Committee on Finance by the Comptroller General of the United States:

(A) Affordability.

(B) Equity.

(C) Adequacy.

(D) Feasibility.

(E) Public acceptance.

(5) The recommendations by Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(6) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the Chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(7) Congress should continue to work with the President as he develops and presents his plan to fix the problems of the medicare program.

SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EDUCATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the levels in this resolution assume that—

(A) increased Federal funding for elementary and secondary education should be directed to States and local school districts;

(B) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) should be fully funded at the originally promised level before any funds are appropriated for new education programs;

(C) decisionmaking authority should be placed in the hands of States, localities, and families to implement innovative solutions to local education challenges and to increase the performance of all students, unencumbered by unnecessary Federal rules and regulations; and

(D) the Department of Education, the States, and local education agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms; and

(2) within the discretionary allocation provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate for function 500 that to the maximum extent practicable—

(A) the Federal Pell Grant maximum award should be increased;

(B) funding for the Federal Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants Program should be increased;

(C) funding for the Federal capital contributions under the Federal Perkins Loan Program should be increased;

(D) funding for the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership Program should be increased;

(E) funding for the Federal Work-Study Program should be increased; and

(F) funding for the Federal TRIO Programs should be increased.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PROVIDING TAX RELIEF TO AMERICANS BY RETURNING THE NON-SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS TO TAXPAYERS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the levels in this concurrent resolution assume that the Senate not only puts a priority on protecting social security and medicare and reducing the Federal debt, but also on tax reductions for working families in the form of family tax relief and incentives to stimulate savings, investment, job creation and economic growth;

(2) such tax relief could include an expansion of the 15-percent bracket, marginal rate reductions, a significant reduction or elimination of the marriage penalty, retirement savings incentives, estate tax relief, an above-the-line income tax deduction for social security payroll taxes, tax incentives for education savings, parity between the self-employed and corporations with respect to the tax treatment of health insurance premiums, and capital gains tax fairness for family farmers;

(3) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 needs comprehensive reform, and Congress should move expeditiously to consider comprehensive tax reform and simplification proposals; and

(4) Congress should reject the President's proposed tax increase on investment income of associations as defined under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ACCESS TO MEDICARE SERVICES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume Congress should review payment levels in the medicare program to ensure beneficiaries have a range of choices available under the Medicare+Choice program and have access to high quality skilled nursing services, home health care services, and inpatient and outpatient hospital services in rural areas.

SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) significant resources should be provided for strong law enforcement and aggressive crimefighting programs and that funding in fiscal year 2000 for critical programs should be equal to or greater than funding for these programs in 1999;

(2) critical programs include—

(A) State and local law enforcement assistance, especially with respect to the development and integration of anticrime technology systems and upgrading forensic laboratories and the information and communications infrastructures upon which they rely;

(B) continuing efforts to reduce violent crime; and

(C) significant expansion of intensive Federal firearms prosecutions projects such as the ongoing programs in Richmond and Philadelphia into America's most crime plagued cities; and

(3) the existence of a strong Federal drug control policy is essential in order to reduce the supplies of illegal drugs internationally and to reduce the number of children who are exposed to or addicted to illegal drugs and this can be furthered by—

(A) investments in programs authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act and the proposed Drug Free Century Act; and

(B) securing adequate resources and authority for the United States Customs Service in any legislation reauthorizing the Service.

SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPROVING SECURITY FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) there is an urgent and ongoing requirement to improve security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel abroad; and

(2) additional budgetary resources should be devoted to programs within function 150 to enable successful international leadership by the United States.

SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that—

(1) there shall be a continuation of the pattern of budgetary increases for biomedical research; and

(2) additional resources should be targeted towards autism research.

SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR KYOTO PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION PRIOR TO SENATE RATIFICATION.

It is the sense of Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that funds should not be provided to put into effect the Kyoto Protocol prior to its Senate ratification in compliance with the requirements of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution and consistent with previous Administration assurances to Congress.

SEC. 330. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TEA–21 FUNDING AND THE STATES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and any legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that the President's fiscal year 2000 budget proposal to change the manner in which any excess Federal gasoline tax revenues are distributed to the States will not be implemented, but rather any of these funds will be distributed to the States pursuant to section 1105 of TEA–21.

SEC. 331. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION SHOULD REAUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals contained in this resolution assume that the One Hundred Sixth Congress, First Session will reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program.

SEC. 332. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO BECOME DISABLED.

It is the sense of the Senate that levels in the resolution assume that—

(1) social security plays a vital role in providing adequate income for individuals who become disabled; and

(2) Congress and the President should take this fact into account when considering proposals to reform the social security program.

SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REPORTING OF ON-BUDGET TRUST FUND LEVELS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume, effective for fiscal year 2001, the President's budget and the budget report of CBO required under section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 should include an itemization of the on-budget trust funds for the budget year, including receipts, outlays, and balances.

SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SOUTH KOREA'S INTERNATIONAL TRADE PRACTICES ON PORK AND BEEF.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate—

(1) believes strongly that while a stable global marketplace is in the best interest of America's farmers and ranchers, the United States should seek a mutually beneficial relationship without hindering the competitiveness of American agriculture;

(2) calls on South Korea to abide by its trade commitments;

(3) calls on the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to promote vigorously policies that encourage the opening of markets for beef and pork products by requiring South Korea to abide by its existing international trade commitments and to reduce trade barriers, tariffs, and export subsidies;

(4) calls on the President and the Secretaries of Treasury and Agriculture to monitor and report to Congress that resources will not be used

to stabilize the South Korean market at the expense of United States agricultural goods or services; and

(5) requests the United States Trade Representative and the United States Department of Agriculture to pursue the settlement of disputes with the Government of South Korea on its failure to abide by its international trade commitments on beef market access, to consider whether Korea's reported plans for subsidizing its pork industry would violate any of its international trade commitments, and to determine what impact Korea's subsidy plans would have on United States agricultural interests, especially in Japan.

SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR NATURAL DISASTERS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that, given that emergency spending for natural disasters continues to have an unpredictable yet substantial impact on the Federal budget and that consequently budgeting for disasters remains difficult, the Administration and Congress should review procedures for funding emergencies, including natural disasters, in any budget process reform legislation that comes before the Congress.

And the Senate agree to the same.

From the Committee on the Budget:

JOHN R. KASICH,
SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
DON NICKLES,
PHIL GRAMM,
SLADE GORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the Senate and the House at the conference on disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 68), setting forth the congressional budget for the United States for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommend in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all out of the House resolution after the resolving clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House resolution and the Senate amendment.

DISPLAYS AND AMOUNTS

The contents of concurrent budget resolutions are set forth in section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

House Resolution.—The House budget resolution includes all of the items required as part of a concurrent budget resolution under section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act other than the spending and revenue levels for Social Security (which is used to enforce a point of order applicable only in the Senate).

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment includes all of the items required under section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. As permitted under section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, Section 102 of the Senate amendment includes advisory levels on debt held by the public.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement includes all of the items required by section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

AGGREGATES AND FUNCTION LEVELS

House Resolution
Total Spending and Revenues
(In billions of dollars)

Fiscal year			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-2004	2000-2009
							Summary								
Total Spending		BA...	1,749.1	1,753.6	1,795.6	1,836.8	1,920.5	1,987.0	2,055.1	2,101.7	2,172.7	2,251.9	2,333.9	9,293.5	20,208.8
		O...	1,703.9	1,735.1	1,774.8	1,804.6	1,894.7	1,959.2	2,028.1	2,071.1	2,136.4	2,219.3	2,300.8	9,168.4	19,924.1
	On-Budget	BA...	1,432.8	1,426.6	1,456.1	1,487.3	1,558.3	1,611.7	1,665.6	1,697.0	1,752.2	1,813.8	1,874.4	7,540.0	16,343.0
		O...	1,387.6	1,408.1	1,435.3	1,455.1	1,532.5	1,583.9	1,638.6	1,666.4	1,715.9	1,781.2	1,841.3	7,414.9	16,058.3
	Off-Budget	BA...	316.3	327.0	339.5	349.5	362.2	375.3	389.5	404.7	420.5	438.1	459.5	1,753.5	3,865.8
		O...	316.3	327.0	339.5	349.5	362.2	375.3	389.5	404.7	420.5	438.1	459.5	1,753.5	3,865.8
Revenues	Total		1,816.1	1,876.5	1,923.0	1,962.6	2,059.9	2,134.0	2,227.8	2,286.2	2,361.5	2,457.2	2,548.8	9,956.0	21,837.5
	On-Budget		1,369.9	1,408.5	1,435.3	1,456.3	1,532.6	1,584.1	1,651.0	1,684.4	1,733.2	1,802.8	1,867.5	7,416.8	16,155.7
	Off-Budget		446.2	468.0	487.7	506.3	527.3	549.9	576.8	601.8	628.3	654.4	681.3	2,539.2	5,681.8
Surplus/Deficit (-)	Total		112.2	141.4	148.2	158.0	165.2	174.8	199.7	215.1	225.1	237.9	248.0	787.6	1,913.4
	On-Budget		-17.7	0.4	0	1.2	0.1	0.2	12.4	18.0	17.3	21.6	26.2	1.9	97.4
	Off-Budget		129.9	141.0	148.2	156.8	165.1	174.6	187.3	197.1	207.8	216.3	221.8	785.7	1,816.0
Debt Held by the Public (end of year)			3,626.8	3,501.8	3,369.3	3,227.4	3,076.2	2,918.6	2,733.1	2,531.5	2,319.0	2,092.4	1,855.7	na	na
Debt Subject to Limit (end of year)			5,543.6	5,627.7	5,707.7	5,791.5	5,875.0	5,954.8	6,019.6	6,075.4	6,128.7	6,168.1	6,198.1	na	na
							By Function								
National Defense (050)		BA...	279.0	288.8	303.6	308.2	318.3	327.2	328.4	329.6	330.9	332.2	333.5	1,546.1	3,200.7
		O...	273.1	276.6	285.9	291.7	303.6	313.5	316.7	315.1	313.7	317.1	318.0	1,471.3	3,051.9
International Affairs (150)		BA...	34.4	11.2	10.6	9.8	11.6	13.5	13.7	13.9	13.9	14.0	14.0	56.7	126.2
		O...	14.8	14.5	15.1	14.4	13.6	13.3	12.9	12.6	12.4	12.2	12.1	70.9	133.1
General Science, Space,		BA...	18.8	18.0	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.6	179.1
and Technology (250)		O...	18.2	18.2	17.9	17.9	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	89.6	178.6
Energy (270)		BA...	1.1	0.0	-1.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	-0.5	-0.2	-0.1	-2.0	-3.7
		O...	0.7	-0.7	-3.1	-1.1	-1.2	-1.4	-1.5	-1.5	-1.4	-1.1	-1.1	-7.5	-14.1
Natural Resources and		BA...	24.2	22.8	22.5	22.4	22.5	23.5	23.5	23.6	23.7	23.7	24.0	113.7	232.2
Environment (300)		O...	23.4	22.6	22.0	21.4	22.6	23.5	23.4	23.5	23.4	23.4	23.7	112.1	229.5
Agriculture (350)		BA...	22.5	14.3	13.5	11.8	12.0	12.1	10.6	10.6	10.7	10.8	10.9	63.7	117.3
		O...	20.4	13.2	11.3	10.0	10.3	10.5	9.9	9.1	9.1	9.2	9.2	55.3	101.8
Commerce and Housing		BA...	1.9	9.7	10.3	13.9	14.5	13.9	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.6	13.4	62.3	126.3
Credit (370)		O...	0.8	4.3	5.5	9.6	10.9	10.4	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.5	8.8	40.7	85.4
	On-budget	BA...	1.9	9.9	10.6	14.5	14.5	13.9	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.6	13.4	63.4	127.4
		O...	0.8	4.5	5.8	10.2	10.9	10.4	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.5	8.8	41.8	86.5
	Off-budget	BA...	0.0	-0.2	-0.3	-0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1.1	-1.1
		O...	0.0	-0.2	-0.3	-0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1.1	-1.1

4/13/99 2:43 PM

House Resolution
Total Spending and Revenues
(In billions of dollars)

Fiscal year		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-2004	2000-2009
Transportation (400)	BA...	51.3	51.8	51.0	50.8	52.3	52.3	52.3	52.3	52.4	52.4	52.4	258.2	520.0
	O...	44.0	45.8	47.7	47.3	46.8	46.3	46.1	46.0	46.0	46.1	46.1	233.9	464.2
Community and Regional	BA...	10.2	7.4	5.3	5.3	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	29.3	57.3
Development (450)	O...	11.4	10.7	9.1	7.0	6.1	5.5	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	38.4	60.7
Elementary and Secondary	BA...	16.8	22.0	24.1	24.5	25.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9	123.4	257.9
Education (501)	O...	17.8	20.1	21.9	22.7	24.5	25.6	26.6	26.8	26.9	26.9	26.9	114.8	248.9
Training, Employment and	BA...	44.2	43.3	41.4	41.2	42.7	43.0	43.9	44.6	45.5	46.5	46.5	211.6	438.6
Social Services (502-506)	O...	42.0	43.5	41.9	40.9	41.9	42.3	42.9	43.7	44.5	45.5	45.5	210.5	432.6
Health (550)	BA...	147.5	156.2	164.1	173.3	184.7	197.9	212.8	228.4	246.3	265.2	285.5	876.2	2,114.4
	O...	140.7	153.0	162.4	173.8	185.3	198.5	212.6	228.3	245.5	264.4	284.9	873.0	2,108.7
Medicare (570)	BA...	195.2	208.7	222.1	230.6	250.7	268.6	295.6	306.8	337.6	365.6	394.1	1,180.7	2,880.4
	O...	194.6	208.7	222.3	230.2	250.9	268.7	295.2	306.9	337.8	365.2	394.2	1,180.8	2,880.1
Income Security (600)	BA...	235.2	244.4	250.5	262.7	277.0	286.2	298.5	304.8	310.6	323.9	334.2	1,320.8	2,892.8
	O...	238.2	248.1	257.4	267.0	276.8	286.0	298.7	305.2	311.5	325.4	335.7	1,335.3	2,911.8
Social Security (650)	BA...	390.6	407.2	426.1	445.9	467.0	489.8	514.6	540.9	568.7	599.0	633.6	2,236.0	5,092.8
	O...	390.8	407.3	426.1	445.9	467.0	489.8	514.5	540.9	568.7	599.0	633.6	2,236.1	5,092.8
On-budget	BA...	14.5	14.2	13.8	15.6	16.3	17.1	18.0	18.9	19.9	21.0	22.2	77.0	177.0
	O...	14.7	14.3	13.8	15.6	16.3	17.1	17.9	18.9	19.9	21.0	22.2	77.1	177.0
Off-budget	BA...	376.1	393.0	412.3	430.3	450.7	472.7	496.6	522.0	548.8	578.0	611.4	2,159.0	4,915.8
	O...	376.1	393.0	412.3	430.3	450.7	472.7	496.6	522.0	548.8	578.0	611.4	2,159.0	4,915.8
Veterans Benefits and	BA...	43.0	44.7	44.3	44.7	45.9	46.2	48.8	47.3	47.8	48.5	49.1	225.8	467.3
Services (700)	O...	42.9	45.1	45.0	45.1	46.4	46.7	49.3	47.8	46.2	49.0	49.7	228.3	470.3
Administration of Justice (750)	BA...	26.7	23.4	24.7	24.7	24.6	26.2	26.3	26.4	26.4	26.5	26.5	123.6	255.7
	O...	25.1	25.3	25.1	24.9	24.4	26.1	26.2	26.2	26.3	26.3	26.4	125.8	257.2
General Government (800)	BA...	17.2	12.3	11.9	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.2	12.2	60.5	121.3
	O...	15.7	13.5	12.6	12.3	12.2	12.2	11.9	11.8	11.9	12.1	11.9	62.8	122.4
Net Interest (900)	BA...	229.4	217.7	207.0	196.3	186.4	176.5	165.2	153.3	141.5	128.5	115.4	983.9	1,687.8
	O...	229.4	217.7	207.0	196.3	186.4	176.5	165.2	153.3	141.5	128.5	115.4	983.9	1,687.8
On-budget	BA...	281.8	275.5	271.0	267.4	265.1	263.4	261.0	258.6	257.0	254.7	252.7	1,342.4	2,626.4
	O...	281.8	275.5	271.0	267.4	265.1	263.4	261.0	258.6	257.0	254.7	252.7	1,342.4	2,626.4
Off-budget	BA...	-52.4	-57.8	-64.0	-71.1	-78.7	-86.9	-95.8	-105.3	-115.5	-126.2	-137.3	-358.5	-938.6
	O...	-52.4	-57.8	-64.0	-71.1	-78.7	-86.9	-95.8	-105.3	-115.5	-126.2	-137.3	-358.5	-938.6
Allowances (920)	BA...	0.0	-8.0	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-31.8	-56.7
	O...	0.0	-10.1	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-52.8	-80.7

4/13/99 2:43 PM

House Resolution
Total Spending and Revenues
(In billions of dollars)

Fiscal year			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-2004	2000-2009
Undistributed Offsetting		BA...	-40.1	-42.3	-45.4	-52.7	-46.8	-47.6	-49.4	-50.8	-52.9	-54.6	-56.4	-234.8	-498.9
Receipts (950)		O...	-40.1	-42.3	-45.4	-52.7	-46.8	-47.6	-49.4	-50.8	-52.9	-54.6	-56.4	-234.8	-498.9
	On-budget	BA...	-32.7	-34.3	-36.9	-43.6	-37.0	-37.1	-38.1	-38.8	-40.1	-40.9	-41.8	-188.9	-388.6
		O...	-32.7	-34.3	-36.9	-43.6	-37.0	-37.1	-38.1	-38.8	-40.1	-40.9	-41.8	-188.9	-388.6
	Off-budget	BA...	-7.4	-8.0	-8.5	-9.1	-9.8	-10.5	-11.3	-12.0	-12.8	-13.7	-14.6	-45.9	-110.3
		O...	-7.4	-8.0	-8.5	-9.1	-9.8	-10.5	-11.3	-12.0	-12.8	-13.7	-14.6	-45.9	-110.3

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- SENATE-PASSED RESOLUTION
($ billions)

Function		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-04	2000-09
050	BA	288.8	303.6	308.2	318.3	327.2	328.4	329.6	330.9	332.2	333.5	1546.0	3200.5
	OT	274.6	285.9	291.7	303.6	313.5	316.7	315.1	313.7	317.1	318.0	1469.3	3049.9
Discr.	BA	290.0	304.8	309.3	319.4	328.1	329.3	330.5	331.8	333.1	334.3	1551.5	3210.5
	OT	275.8	287.1	292.8	304.7	314.4	317.6	316.0	314.6	318.0	318.9	1474.8	3060.0
Mand.	BA	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-5.5	-10.0
	OT	-1.2	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-5.5	-10.0
150	BA	12.5	12.7	12.0	13.6	14.5	14.7	14.8	14.9	15.0	15.0	65.3	139.7
	OT	14.9	15.4	14.8	14.4	14.1	13.8	13.5	13.4	13.2	13.1	73.5	140.4
Discr.	BA	17.7	17.5	17.2	17.0	16.9	16.8	16.7	16.5	16.4	16.3	86.3	169.0
	OT	18.5	19.0	18.2	17.7	17.3	16.9	16.6	16.5	16.3	16.2	90.6	173.1
Mand.	BA	-5.2	-4.7	-5.2	-3.5	-2.4	-2.1	-1.8	-1.6	-1.4	-1.3	-21.0	-29.3
	OT	-3.7	-3.6	-3.4	-3.3	-3.2	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-17.1	-32.7
250	BA	18.0	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.6	179.2
	OT	18.2	17.9	17.9	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	89.6	178.4
Discr.	BA	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.4	178.8
	OT	18.2	17.8	17.8	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	89.3	178.0
Mand.	BA	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4
	OT	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4
270	BA	0.0	-1.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	-0.5	-0.2	-0.1	-2.0	-3.6
	OT	-0.7	-3.1	-1.1	-1.2	-1.4	-1.5	-1.5	-1.4	-1.1	-1.1	-7.5	-14.1
Discr.	BA	1.8	0.5	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	8.0	17.5
	OT	2.6	0.8	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	9.3	18.9
Mand.	BA	-1.8	-1.9	-2.1	-2.0	-2.2	-2.3	-2.4	-2.4	-2.1	-2.0	-10.0	-21.2
	OT	-3.2	-3.9	-3.2	-3.2	-3.3	-3.4	-3.4	-3.4	-3.1	-3.0	-16.8	-33.0
300	BA	21.7	21.2	20.7	22.5	22.5	22.5	22.6	22.7	22.7	23.0	108.6	222.1
	OT	22.4	21.7	21.0	22.6	22.5	22.4	22.5	22.4	22.4	22.7	110.3	222.7
Discr.	BA	20.9	20.7	20.3	22.0	22.0	22.1	22.1	22.2	22.2	22.2	105.9	216.7
	OT	21.7	21.1	20.6	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.1	22.0	22.0	22.1	107.6	217.9
Mand.	BA	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	2.8	5.4
	OT	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.7	2.7	4.8
350	BA	14.8	13.5	11.3	12.0	12.1	10.6	10.6	10.7	10.8	10.9	63.7	117.2
	OT	13.7	11.3	9.5	10.3	10.5	9.9	9.1	9.1	9.2	9.2	55.3	101.8
Discr.	BA	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	18.6	36.8
	OT	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	18.7	36.7
Mand.	BA	10.9	9.8	7.6	8.3	8.4	6.9	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.2	45.1	80.4
	OT	9.6	7.5	5.8	6.7	6.9	6.3	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.6	36.5	65.0
370	BA	9.5	10.3	13.8	14.5	13.9	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.6	13.4	62.0	126.0

	OT	4.1	5.4	9.5	10.9	10.4	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.5	8.8	40.4	85.1
Discr.	BA	3.5	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.8	11.0	20.9
	OT	3.7	2.2	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.7	11.2	20.7
Mand.	BA	6.0	8.1	12.1	12.7	12.1	10.9	10.8	10.9	10.8	10.7	51.0	105.1
	OT	0.4	3.2	7.8	9.1	8.7	7.7	7.4	7.1	6.7	6.2	29.2	64.4
400	BA	51.3	51.1	51.5	52.5	52.6	52.6	52.6	52.7	52.7	52.7	259.1	522.4
	OT	45.3	47.7	47.8	46.7	46.2	46.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	233.7	463.8
Discr.	BA	12.2	11.9	11.3	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	57.9	113.9
	OT	43.4	45.4	45.8	44.9	44.5	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	223.9	445.4
Mand.	BA	39.1	39.2	40.2	41.3	41.4	41.4	41.4	41.5	41.5	41.5	201.2	408.5
	OT	1.9	2.3	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	9.8	18.4
450	BA	5.3	2.7	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	14.0	24.1
	OT	10.3	7.5	4.7	3.0	2.1	1.2	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7	27.5	31.9
Discr.	BA	5.3	2.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	14.1	24.1
	OT	10.7	8.0	5.2	3.5	2.6	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.3	30.1	37.4
Mand.	BA	0.0	-0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0
	OT	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-2.5	-5.4
500	BA	67.4	66.5	67.3	73.3	76.6	77.5	78.2	79.1	80.1	80.1	351.2	746.2
	OT	64.0	65.4	66.0	68.5	72.5	75.9	77.2	78.1	79.1	79.1	336.4	725.7
Discr.	BA	52.2	51.2	52.2	56.7	59.7	59.7	59.7	59.7	59.7	58.6	271.8	569.0
	OT	48.7	49.6	50.9	52.3	55.9	58.7	59.2	59.3	59.3	58.3	257.3	552.2
Mand.	BA	15.2	15.4	15.1	16.7	17.0	17.8	18.6	19.5	20.5	21.4	79.4	177.2
	OT	15.3	15.8	15.1	16.3	16.6	17.2	18.0	18.8	19.8	20.7	79.0	173.6
550	BA	156.2	164.1	173.3	184.7	197.9	212.8	228.4	246.3	265.2	285.5	876.2	2114.4
	OT	153.0	162.4	173.8	185.3	198.5	212.6	228.3	245.5	264.4	284.9	872.9	2108.7
Discr.	BA	29.3	27.9	27.7	27.5	27.3	27.0	26.7	26.4	26.1	25.8	139.7	271.7
	OT	28.3	27.4	27.3	27.2	26.9	26.6	26.3	26.0	25.7	25.4	137.1	267.1
Mand.	BA	126.9	136.2	145.6	157.2	170.6	185.8	201.7	219.9	239.1	259.7	736.5	1842.7
	OT	124.7	135.0	146.4	158.1	171.6	186.0	202.0	219.5	238.7	259.5	735.8	1841.6
570	BA	208.7	222.1	230.6	250.7	268.6	295.6	306.8	337.6	365.6	394.1	1180.7	2880.3
	OT	208.7	222.3	230.2	250.9	268.7	295.2	306.9	337.8	365.2	394.2	1180.8	2880.1
Discr.	BA	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	14.9	29.9
	OT	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	14.9	29.8
Mand.	BA	205.7	219.1	227.6	247.8	265.6	292.6	303.8	334.6	362.7	391.1	1165.7	2850.4
	OT	205.7	219.3	227.2	247.9	265.8	292.2	303.9	334.8	362.2	391.3	1165.9	2850.3
600	BA	244.4	250.9	263.6	276.4	285.6	297.9	304.2	310.0	323.3	333.6	1320.8	2889.9
	OT	248.1	257.0	266.6	276.2	285.4	298.1	304.6	310.9	324.8	335.1	1333.3	2906.8
Discr.	BA	28.7	28.3	30.9	34.6	35.2	35.7	36.2	36.7	37.2	37.9	157.6	341.4
	OT	39.4	39.4	39.4	39.3	39.4	39.7	40.0	40.4	40.9	41.4	196.9	399.3
Mand.	BA	215.7	223.6	233.7	242.8	251.4	263.2	269.4	275.3	288.1	297.7	1167.2	2561.0
	OT	208.7	218.3	228.0	237.8	247.0	259.4	266.0	272.4	285.8	295.7	1139.9	2519.1

650	BA	407.2	426.0	445.9	467.0	489.8	514.6	540.9	568.7	599.0	633.6	2235.9	5092.7
	OT	407.3	426.0	445.9	467.0	489.7	514.5	540.8	568.7	599.0	633.6	2235.9	5092.6
Discr.	BA	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	15.8	31.6
	OT	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.9	31.6
Mand.	BA	404.1	422.9	442.7	463.8	486.6	511.4	537.7	565.6	595.8	630.5	2220.1	5061.0
	OT	404.1	422.9	442.7	463.8	486.6	511.4	537.7	565.6	595.8	630.5	2220.1	5061.0
700	BA	46.7	44.3	44.7	45.5	45.9	48.3	46.8	47.4	48.0	48.6	227.1	466.2
	OT	47.1	45.0	45.1	46.0	46.3	48.8	47.4	45.8	48.5	49.2	229.5	469.2
Discr.	BA	22.2	19.1	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	98.4	193.0
	OT	22.4	19.5	19.1	19.1	19.0	18.9	18.9	18.8	18.8	18.8	99.2	193.4
Mand.	BA	24.5	25.1	25.7	26.5	26.9	29.4	27.9	28.5	29.1	29.7	128.7	273.2
	OT	24.6	25.5	26.0	26.9	27.4	29.9	28.5	27.0	29.7	30.4	130.3	275.8
750	BA	23.4	24.7	24.7	24.6	24.5	24.4	24.2	24.1	24.0	23.8	121.8	242.3
	OT	25.3	25.1	24.9	24.4	24.4	24.2	24.1	24.0	23.9	23.7	124.2	244.1
Discr.	BA	23.1	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	120.8	242.3
	OT	25.1	25.0	24.8	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	123.7	245.3
Mand.	BA	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	-0.0	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.4	1.0	-0.0
	OT	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	-0.0	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	0.5	-1.1
800	BA	12.3	11.9	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.2	12.2	60.5	121.2
	OT	13.5	12.6	12.3	12.2	12.2	11.9	11.8	11.9	12.1	11.9	62.7	122.3
Discr.	BA	11.4	11.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	55.6	111.3
	OT	12.3	11.7	11.4	11.2	11.0	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	57.5	112.0
Mand.	BA	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.9	10.0
	OT	1.2	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.0	5.2	10.3
900	BA	217.9	207.4	196.8	186.9	176.9	165.6	153.9	142.2	129.0	115.7	985.9	1692.3
	OT	217.9	207.4	196.8	186.9	176.9	165.6	153.9	142.2	129.0	115.7	985.9	1692.3
Discr.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	BA	217.9	207.4	196.8	186.9	176.9	165.6	153.9	142.2	129.0	115.7	985.9	1692.3
	OT	217.9	207.4	196.8	186.9	176.9	165.6	153.9	142.2	129.0	115.7	985.9	1692.3
920	BA	-10.0	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-33.8	-58.8
	OT	-10.1	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-52.8	-80.6
Discr.	BA	-10.0	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-33.8	-58.8
	OT	-10.1	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-52.8	-80.6
Mand.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
950	BA	-42.2	-45.3	-52.8	-47.2	-48.0	-49.8	-51.2	-53.2	-54.9	-56.7	-235.6	-501.4
	OT	-42.2	-45.3	-52.8	-47.2	-48.0	-49.8	-51.2	-53.2	-54.9	-56.7	-235.6	-501.4
Discr.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	BA	-42.2	-45.3	-52.8	-47.2	-48.0	-49.8	-51.2	-53.2	-54.9	-56.7	-235.6	-501.4
	OT	-42.2	-45.3	-52.8	-47.2	-48.0	-49.8	-51.2	-53.2	-54.9	-56.7	-235.6	-501.4

Total	BA	1754.0	1795.8	1837.0	1922.7	1987.5	2055.3	2102.0	2173.2	2251.9	2333.5	9297.0	20212.8
	OT	1735.4	1774.7	1804.6	1893.2	1957.3	2027.9	2071.2	2136.5	2218.8	2300.2	9165.2	19919.9
Discr.	BA	536.3	541.3	550.4	571.8	583.8	585.0	586.2	587.0	588.2	589.6	2783.5	5719.6
	OT	570.9	571.0	567.0	592.7	603.6	608.0	606.1	603.9	607.0	607.9	2905.3	5938.2
Mand.	BA	1217.7	1255.4	1287.6	1351.9	1404.7	1471.3	1517.3	1588.2	1665.7	1745.8	6517.4	14505.7
	OT	1164.4	1204.3	1238.5	1301.5	1354.7	1420.9	1466.5	1534.4	1613.7	1694.2	6263.5	13993.3
Revenues		1870.0	1923.7	1962.3	2059.3	2135.8	2226.1	2284.6	2365.7	2461.8	2551.8	9951.1	21841.3
Surplus		134.6	149.0	157.6	166.1	178.5	198.2	213.4	229.2	243.0	251.6	785.9	1921.4
On-budget		-6.3	0.7	0.8	1.0	3.9	10.8	16.2	21.6	26.7	29.8	0.1	105.3
Off-budget		140.9	148.3	156.8	165.1	174.6	187.4	197.2	207.7	216.3	221.8	785.8	1816.1

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
($ billions)

Function		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2000-04	2000-09
050	BA	288.8	303.6	308.2	318.3	327.2	328.4	329.6	330.9	332.2	333.5	1546.0	3200.5
	OT	276.6	285.9	291.7	303.6	313.5	316.7	315.1	313.7	317.1	318.0	1471.3	3051.9
Discr.	BA	290.0	304.8	309.3	319.4	328.1	329.3	330.5	331.8	333.1	334.3	1551.5	3210.5
	OT	277.8	287.1	292.8	304.7	314.4	317.6	316.0	314.6	318.0	318.9	1476.8	3062.0
Mand.	BA	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-5.5	-10.0
	OT	-1.2	-1.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-5.5	-10.0
150	BA	12.5	11.7	10.9	12.6	14.0	14.2	14.4	14.4	14.5	14.5	61.7	133.6
	OT	14.9	15.2	14.6	14.0	13.7	13.4	13.1	12.9	12.7	12.6	72.3	136.9
Discr.	BA	17.7	16.4	16.1	16.0	16.4	16.3	16.2	16.0	15.9	15.8	82.7	162.8
	OT	18.5	18.8	18.0	17.3	16.9	16.5	16.2	16.0	15.8	15.7	89.5	169.6
Mand.	BA	-5.2	-4.7	-5.2	-3.5	-2.4	-2.1	-1.8	-1.6	-1.4	-1.3	-21.0	-29.3
	OT	-3.7	-3.6	-3.4	-3.3	-3.2	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-17.1	-32.7
250	BA	18.0	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.6	179.2
	OT	18.2	17.9	17.9	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	89.6	178.4
Discr.	BA	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.9	89.4	178.8
	OT	18.2	17.8	17.8	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.7	89.3	178.0
Mand.	BA	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4
	OT	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4
270	BA	0.0	-1.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	-0.5	-0.2	-0.1	-2.0	-3.6
	OT	-0.7	-3.1	-1.1	-1.2	-1.4	-1.5	-1.5	-1.4	-1.1	-1.1	-7.5	-14.1
Discr.	BA	1.8	0.5	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	8.0	17.5
	OT	2.6	0.8	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	9.3	18.9
Mand.	BA	-1.8	-1.9	-2.1	-2.0	-2.2	-2.3	-2.4	-2.4	-2.1	-2.0	-10.0	-21.2
	OT	-3.2	-3.9	-3.2	-3.2	-3.3	-3.4	-3.4	-3.4	-3.1	-3.0	-16.8	-33.0
300	BA	22.8	21.8	21.6	22.5	23.0	23.0	23.1	23.2	23.2	23.5	111.7	227.7
	OT	22.6	21.9	21.2	22.6	23.0	22.9	23.0	22.9	22.9	23.2	111.3	226.2
Discr.	BA	22.0	21.3	21.1	22.0	22.5	22.6	22.6	22.7	22.7	22.7	109.0	222.3
	OT	21.9	21.2	20.8	22.1	22.6	22.6	22.6	22.5	22.5	22.6	108.7	221.5
Mand.	BA	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	2.8	5.4
	OT	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.7	2.7	4.8

350	BA	14.3	13.5	11.8	12.0	12.1	10.6	10.6	10.7	10.8	10.9	63.7	117.2
	OT	13.2	11.3	10.0	10.3	10.5	9.9	9.1	9.1	9.2	9.2	55.3	101.7
Discr.	BA	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	18.6	36.8
	OT	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	18.7	36.7
Mand.	BA	10.4	9.8	8.1	8.3	8.4	6.9	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.2	45.1	80.4
	OT	9.1	7.5	6.3	6.7	6.9	6.3	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.6	36.5	65.0
370	BA	9.5	10.3	13.8	14.5	13.9	12.7	12.6	12.7	12.6	13.4	62.0	126.0
	OT	4.1	5.4	9.5	10.9	10.4	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.5	8.8	40.4	85.1
Discr.	BA	3.5	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.8	11.0	20.9
	OT	3.7	2.2	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.7	11.2	20.7
Mand.	BA	6.0	8.1	12.1	12.7	12.1	10.9	10.8	10.9	10.8	10.7	51.0	105.1
	OT	0.4	3.2	7.8	9.1	8.7	7.7	7.4	7.1	6.7	6.2	29.2	64.4
370 on-budget	*BA*	*9.7*	*10.6*	*14.5*	*14.5*	*13.9*	*12.7*	*12.6*	*12.7*	*12.6*	*13.4*	*63.1*	*127.1*
	OT	*4.3*	*5.8*	*10.2*	*10.9*	*10.4*	*9.4*	*9.1*	*8.9*	*8.5*	*8.8*	*41.5*	*86.2*
Discr.	*BA*	*3.5*	*2.1*	*1.7*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*1.8*	*2.8*	*11.0*	*20.9*
	OT	*3.7*	*2.2*	*1.7*	*1.8*	*1.7*	*1.7*	*1.7*	*1.8*	*1.7*	*2.7*	*11.2*	*20.7*
Mand.	*BA*	*6.1*	*8.5*	*12.7*	*12.7*	*12.1*	*10.9*	*10.8*	*10.9*	*10.8*	*10.7*	*52.1*	*106.2*
	OT	*0.6*	*3.5*	*8.5*	*9.1*	*8.7*	*7.7*	*7.4*	*7.1*	*6.7*	*6.2*	*30.4*	*65.6*
400	BA	51.8	51.0	50.8	52.3	52.3	52.3	52.3	52.4	52.4	52.4	258.2	520.1
	OT	45.8	47.7	47.3	46.8	46.3	46.1	46.0	46.0	46.1	46.1	233.8	464.1
Discr.	BA	12.2	11.9	11.3	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	57.9	113.9
	OT	43.4	45.4	45.8	44.9	44.5	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	223.9	445.4
Mand.	BA	39.6	39.1	39.5	41.0	41.1	41.1	41.1	41.2	41.2	41.2	200.3	406.2
	OT	2.4	2.3	1.5	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	9.9	18.7
450	BA	6.4	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	21.7	40.7
	OT	10.5	8.3	5.9	4.5	3.8	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.5	33.0	46.3
Discr.	BA	6.4	4.1	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	21.7	40.7
	OT	10.9	8.8	6.4	5.1	4.3	3.6	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.1	35.5	51.8
Mand.	BA	0.0	-0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.0
	OT	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-2.5	-5.4
500	BA	66.3	66.0	66.5	71.0	73.3	74.1	74.9	75.8	76.8	76.7	343.1	721.3
	OT	63.8	64.6	64.8	67.5	70.2	72.7	73.8	74.7	75.7	75.7	330.8	703.5
Discr.	BA	51.1	50.6	51.3	54.3	56.3	56.3	56.3	56.3	56.3	55.2	263.7	544.1
	OT	48.5	48.8	49.7	51.2	53.6	55.5	55.9	55.9	55.9	54.9	251.8	530.0
Mand.	BA	15.2	15.4	15.1	16.7	17.0	17.8	18.6	19.5	20.5	21.4	79.4	177.2
	OT	15.3	15.8	15.1	16.3	16.6	17.2	18.0	18.8	19.8	20.7	79.0	173.6

550	BA	156.2	164.1	173.3	184.7	197.9	212.8	228.4	246.3	265.2	285.5	876.2	2114.4
	OT	153.0	162.4	173.8	185.3	198.5	212.6	228.3	245.5	264.4	284.9	872.9	2108.7
Discr.	BA	29.3	27.9	27.7	27.5	27.3	27.0	26.7	26.4	26.1	25.8	139.7	271.7
	OT	28.3	27.4	27.3	27.2	26.9	26.6	26.3	26.0	25.7	25.4	137.1	267.1
Mand.	BA	126.9	136.2	145.6	157.2	170.6	185.8	201.7	219.9	239.1	259.7	736.5	1842.7
	OT	124.7	135.0	146.4	158.1	171.6	186.0	202.0	219.5	238.7	259.5	735.8	1841.6
570	BA	208.7	222.1	230.6	250.7	268.6	295.6	306.8	337.6	365.6	394.1	1180.7	2880.3
	OT	208.7	222.3	230.2	250.9	268.7	295.2	306.9	337.8	365.2	394.2	1180.8	2880.1
Discr.	BA	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	14.9	29.9
	OT	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	14.9	29.8
Mand.	BA	205.7	219.1	227.6	247.8	265.6	292.6	303.8	334.6	362.7	391.1	1165.7	2850.4
	OT	205.7	219.3	227.2	247.9	265.8	292.2	303.9	334.8	362.2	391.3	1165.9	2850.3
600	BA	244.4	250.5	263.0	276.4	286.1	298.4	304.7	310.5	323.8	334.1	1320.3	2891.8
	OT	248.1	257.0	266.6	276.2	285.5	298.4	305.1	311.4	325.3	335.6	1333.4	2909.2
Discr.	BA	28.7	27.9	30.3	34.6	35.2	35.7	36.2	36.7	37.2	37.9	156.6	340.3
	OT	39.4	39.4	39.4	39.3	39.4	39.7	40.0	40.4	40.9	41.4	196.9	399.3
Mand.	BA	215.7	222.6	232.7	241.8	250.9	262.7	268.4	273.8	286.6	296.2	1163.7	2551.5
	OT	208.7	217.6	227.2	236.8	246.2	258.7	265.1	271.1	284.4	294.2	1136.5	2510.0
650	BA	407.2	426.0	445.9	467.0	489.8	514.6	540.9	568.7	599.0	633.6	2235.9	5092.7
	OT	407.3	426.0	445.9	467.0	489.7	514.5	540.8	568.7	599.0	633.6	2235.9	5092.6
Discr.	BA	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	15.8	31.6
	OT	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	15.9	31.6
Mand.	BA	404.1	422.9	442.7	463.8	486.6	511.4	537.7	565.6	595.8	630.5	2220.1	5061.0
	OT	404.1	422.9	442.7	463.8	486.6	511.4	537.7	565.6	595.8	630.5	2220.1	5061.0
650 on-budget	*BA*	*14.2*	*13.8*	*15.6*	*16.3*	*17.1*	*18.0*	*18.9*	*19.9*	*21.0*	*22.2*	*77.0*	*177.0*
	OT	*14.3*	*13.8*	*15.6*	*16.3*	*17.1*	*17.9*	*18.9*	*19.9*	*21.0*	*22.2*	*77.0*	*176.9*
Discr.	*BA*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*3.2*	*15.8*	*31.6*
	OT	*3.3*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*3.1*	*15.9*	*31.6*
Mand.	*BA*	*11.1*	*10.6*	*12.4*	*13.1*	*13.9*	*14.8*	*15.7*	*16.7*	*17.9*	*19.1*	*61.1*	*145.4*
	OT	*11.1*	*10.6*	*12.4*	*13.1*	*13.9*	*14.8*	*15.7*	*16.7*	*17.9*	*19.1*	*61.1*	*145.4*
700	BA	45.4	44.3	44.7	45.9	46.2	48.8	47.3	47.8	48.5	49.1	226.6	468.0
	OT	45.6	45.0	45.1	46.4	46.7	49.3	47.8	46.2	49.0	49.7	228.8	470.8
Discr.	BA	20.9	19.1	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	97.1	191.7
	OT	20.9	19.5	19.1	19.1	19.0	18.9	18.9	18.8	18.8	18.8	97.7	191.9
Mand.	BA	24.5	25.1	25.7	26.9	27.3	29.8	28.3	28.9	29.6	30.2	129.4	276.3
	OT	24.6	25.5	26.0	27.3	27.7	30.4	28.9	27.4	30.2	30.9	131.1	278.9

750	BA	23.4	24.7	24.7	24.6	26.2	26.3	26.4	26.4	26.5	26.5	123.5	255.5
	OT	25.3	25.1	24.9	24.4	26.1	26.2	26.2	26.3	26.3	26.4	125.9	257.4
Discr.	BA	23.1	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	120.8	242.3
	OT	25.1	25.0	24.8	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.3	24.3	24.3	123.7	245.3
Mand.	BA	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.7	13.2
	OT	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	1.7	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.2	12.1
800	BA	12.3	11.9	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.2	12.2	60.5	121.2
	OT	13.5	12.6	12.3	12.2	12.2	11.9	11.8	11.9	12.1	11.9	62.7	122.3
Discr.	BA	11.4	11.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	55.6	111.3
	OT	12.3	11.7	11.4	11.2	11.0	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	57.5	112.0
Mand.	BA	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.9	10.0
	OT	1.2	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.0	5.2	10.3
900	BA	217.7	207.1	196.4	186.5	176.6	165.4	153.7	142.0	128.9	115.6	984.3	1689.9
	OT	217.7	207.1	196.4	186.5	176.6	165.4	153.7	142.0	128.9	115.6	984.3	1689.9
Discr.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	BA	217.7	207.1	196.4	186.5	176.6	165.4	153.7	142.0	128.9	115.6	984.3	1689.9
	OT	217.7	207.1	196.4	186.5	176.6	165.4	153.7	142.0	128.9	115.6	984.3	1689.9
900 on-budget	*BA*	*275.5*	*271.1*	*267.5*	*265.2*	*263.5*	*261.1*	*259.0*	*257.5*	*255.1*	*253.0*	*1342.7*	*2628.4*
	OT	*275.5*	*271.1*	*267.5*	*265.2*	*263.5*	*261.1*	*259.0*	*257.5*	*255.1*	*253.0*	*1342.7*	*2628.4*
Discr.	*BA*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	*BA*	*275.5*	*271.1*	*267.5*	*265.2*	*263.5*	*261.1*	*259.0*	*257.5*	*255.1*	*253.0*	*1342.7*	*2628.4*
	OT	*275.5*	*271.1*	*267.5*	*265.2*	*263.5*	*261.1*	*259.0*	*257.5*	*255.1*	*253.0*	*1342.7*	*2628.4*
920	BA	-9.8	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-33.6	-58.6
	OT	-10.8	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-53.5	-81.3
Discr.	BA	-9.8	-8.5	-6.4	-4.4	-4.5	-4.5	-4.6	-5.2	-5.3	-5.3	-33.6	-58.6
	OT	-10.8	-12.9	-20.0	-4.8	-5.0	-5.1	-5.2	-5.8	-5.9	-5.9	-53.5	-81.3
Mand.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
950	BA	-42.3	-45.3	-52.8	-46.9	-47.8	-49.8	-51.4	-53.6	-55.6	-57.6	-235.1	-503.1
	OT	-42.3	-45.3	-52.8	-46.9	-47.8	-49.8	-51.4	-53.6	-55.6	-57.6	-235.1	-503.1
Discr.	BA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	BA	-42.3	-45.3	-52.8	-46.9	-47.8	-49.8	-51.4	-53.6	-55.6	-57.6	-235.1	-503.1
	OT	-42.3	-45.3	-52.8	-46.9	-47.8	-49.8	-51.4	-53.6	-55.6	-57.6	-235.1	-503.1

950 on-budget	*BA*	*-34.3*	*-36.9*	*-43.7*	*-37.1*	*-37.3*	*-38.5*	*-39.4*	*-40.9*	*-41.9*	*-43.0*	*-189.2*	*-392.9*
	OT	*-34.3*	*-36.9*	*-43.7*	*-37.1*	*-37.3*	*-38.5*	*-39.4*	*-40.9*	*-41.9*	*-43.0*	*-189.2*	*-392.9*
Discr.	*BA*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	OT	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mand.	*BA*	*-34.3*	*-36.9*	*-43.7*	*-37.1*	*-37.3*	*-38.5*	*-39.4*	*-40.9*	*-41.9*	*-43.0*	*-189.2*	*-392.9*
	OT	*-34.3*	*-36.9*	*-43.7*	*-37.1*	*-37.3*	*-38.5*	*-39.4*	*-40.9*	*-41.9*	*-43.0*	*-189.2*	*-392.9*
Total	BA	1753.8	1795.2	1836.4	1921.3	1988.2	2056.1	2102.8	2173.9	2252.7	2334.3	9294.8	20214.7
	OT	1735.2	1774.3	1804.2	1893.7	1959.0	2029.1	2072.4	2137.7	2220.0	2301.4	9166.4	19926.9
Discr.	BA	536.3	541.3	550.4	570.2	582.2	583.4	584.6	585.4	586.6	588.1	2780.4	5708.5
	OT	570.9	571.0	567.0	592.8	603.1	606.6	604.6	602.3	605.4	606.4	2904.9	5930.2
Mand.	BA	1217.5	1253.9	1286.0	1351.1	1405.9	1472.7	1518.2	1588.6	1666.1	1746.2	6514.4	14506.1
	OT	1164.2	1203.2	1237.2	1300.9	1355.9	1422.5	1467.8	1535.3	1614.5	1695.0	6261.5	13996.7
Total on-budget	*BA*	*1426.7*	*1455.8*	*1486.9*	*1559.1*	*1612.9*	*1666.7*	*1698.2*	*1753.3*	*1814.5*	*1874.8*	*7541.4*	*16348.9*
	OT	*1408.1*	*1434.8*	*1454.8*	*1531.5*	*1583.8*	*1639.6*	*1667.8*	*1717.0*	*1781.9*	*1841.9*	*7412.9*	*16061.1*
Discr.	*BA*	*536.3*	*541.3*	*550.4*	*570.2*	*582.2*	*583.4*	*584.6*	*585.4*	*586.6*	*588.1*	*2780.4*	*5708.5*
	OT	*570.9*	*571.0*	*567.0*	*592.8*	*603.1*	*606.6*	*604.6*	*602.3*	*605.4*	*606.4*	*2904.9*	*5930.2*
Mand.	*BA*	*890.4*	*914.5*	*936.5*	*988.9*	*1030.7*	*1083.2*	*1113.6*	*1167.9*	*1227.9*	*1286.7*	*4761.0*	*10640.4*
	OT	*837.1*	*863.8*	*887.7*	*938.7*	*980.7*	*1033.0*	*1063.2*	*1114.7*	*1176.4*	*1235.5*	*4508.1*	*10130.9*
Revenues		1876.1	1922.6	1961.1	2058.8	2134.8	2225.1	2283.3	2363.9	2459.9	2549.8	9953.4	21835.5
On-budget		*1408.1*	*1434.8*	*1454.8*	*1531.5*	*1585.0*	*1648.3*	*1681.4*	*1735.6*	*1805.5*	*1868.5*	*7414.2*	*16153.5*
Surplus		140.9	148.3	156.8	165.1	175.8	196.0	210.8	226.3	239.9	248.5	787.0	1908.6
On-budget		--	--	--	--	*1.2*	*8.7*	*13.6*	*18.6*	*23.7*	*26.6*	*1.2*	*92.4*

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

Section 301(g)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act requires that the joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution set forth the common economic assumptions upon which the joint statement and conference report are based. The conference agreement is built upon the economic forecasts developed by the Congressional Budget Office and presented in CBO's ''The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 2000–2009'' (January 1999). A modification was made to near-term real GDP growth, however, to reflect recent economic strength.

House Resolution.—The House modified CBO's economic assumptions to reflect the near-term strength of economy which became evident after CBO completed its winter forecast. The assumption for 1999 real GDP growth was increased from 2.3 percent to 2.4 percent, while the assumption for 2000 real GDP growth was boosted from 1.7 percent to 2.0 percent. In both cases, the modified GDP growth rate assumptions are well below Blue Chip's current forecasts. These changes boosted revenues slightly relative to the CBO baseline in 1999, 2000 and 2001.

Senate Amendment.—CBO's economic assumptions were used.

Conference Agreement.—House economic assumptions were used, with minor technical adjustments.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

[By calendar years]

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Percent change, year over year:						
Real GDP	2.4	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4
Consumer Price Index	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6
GDP Price Index	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Percent, annual:						
Unemployment rate	4.6	5.1	5.4	5.6	5.7	5.7
Three-month Treasury bill rate	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Ten-Year Treasury bond rate	5.1	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4

FUNCTIONS AND REVENUES

FUNCTION 050, NATIONAL DEFENSE

Major Programs in Function.—Function 050. National Defense, totals $270.7 billion in budget authority [BA] and $268.7 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one time emergencies enacted in the 105th Congress. This budget function includes funding for the Department of Defense (95 percent of function total), defense activities of the Department of Energy (5 percent), and small amounts expended by the Selective Service, the General Services Administration, the Departments of Transportation and Justice, and other federal agencies.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $288.8 billion in BA and $276.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,546.1 billion in BA and $1,471.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $3,200.5 billion in BA and $3,051.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $288.8 billion in BA and $274.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,546.0 billion in BA and $1,469.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $3,200.5 billion in BA and $3,050.0 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $288.8 billion in BA and $276.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,546.0 billion in BA and $1,471.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $3,200.5 billion in BA and $3,051.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 150: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Major Programs in Function.—Function 150, International Affairs, totals about $13.7 billion in BA and $14.4 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding emergencies and other one-time spending increases including contributions to the International Monetary Fund and arrears to international organizations. This function includes funding for operation of the foreign affairs establishment including embassies and other diplomatic missions abroad, foreign aid loan and technical assistance activities in developing countries, security assistance to foreign governments, activities of the Foreign Military Sales Trust Fund, U.S. contributions to international financial institutions, Export-Import Bank and other trade promotion activities, and refugee assistance.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $11.2 billion in BA and $14.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $56.7 billion in BA and $70.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $126.1 billion in BA and $133.0 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $12.5 billion in BA and $14.9 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $65.3 billion in BA and $73.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $139.7 billion in BA and $140.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $12.5 billion in BA and $14.9 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $61.7 billion in BA and $72.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $133.6 billion in BA and $136.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 250: GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 250, General Science, Space & Technology, totals $18.8 billion in BA and $18.2 billion in outlays for 1999. This function includes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) civilian space program and basic research programs of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Department of Energy (DOE).

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $18.0 billion in BA and $18.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $89.6 billion in BA and $89.6 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $179.2 billion in BA and $178.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $18.0 billion in BA and $18.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $89.6 billion in BA and $89.6 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $179.2 billion in BA and $178.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Amendment.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $18.0 billion in BA and $18.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $89.6 billion in BA and $89.6 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $179.2 billion in BA and $178.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 270: ENERGY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 270, Energy, totals about $1.1 billion in BA and $677 million in outlays for 1999. This function includes civilian activities of the Department of Energy, the Rural Utilities Service, the power programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Mandatory spending in this function contains large levels of offsetting receipts, resulting in net mandary spending of −$1.8 billion in BA and −$2.6 billion in outlays for 1999. Congress provided $3.0 billion in discretionary BA for 1999.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $0.0 billion in BA and −$0.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$2.0 billion in BA and −$7.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$3.6 billion in BA and $14.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The House resolution sets forth $0.0 billion in BA and −$0.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$2.0 billion in BA and −$7.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$3.6 billion in BA and $14.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $49 million in BA and −$0.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$2.0 billion in BA and −$7.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$3.6 billion in BA and $14.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 300: NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Major Programs in Function.—function 300, Natural Resources and Environment, totals about $23.9 billion in BA and $23.3 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding emergency and other one-time spending items. This function includes funding for water resources, conservation and land management, recreation resources, and pollution control and abatement. Agencies with major program activities within the function include the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Army Corps of Engineers, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Forest Service (within the Department of Agriculture), and the Department of the Interior, including the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, among others.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $22.8 billion in BA and $22.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $113.7 billion in BA and $112.2 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $232.2 billion in BA and $229.6 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $21.7 billion in BA and $22.4 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $108.6 billion in BA and $110.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $222.1 billion in BA and $222.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $22.8 billion in BA and $22.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $111.7 billion in BA and $111.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $227.7 billion in BA and $226.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 350: AGRICULTURE

Major Programs in Function.—Function 350, Agriculture, totals about $16.8 billion in BA and $14.9 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one-time emergency spending provided for natural disasters and export market losses. This function includes funding for federal programs intended to promote the economic stability of agriculture through direct assistance and loans to food and fiber producers, provide regulatory, inspection and reporting services for agricultural markets, and promote research and education in agriculture and nutrition.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $14.3 billion in BA and $13.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.7 billion in BA and $55.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $117.2 billion in BA and $101.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $14.8 billion in BA and $13.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.7 billion in BA and $55.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years: and $117.2 billion in BA and $101.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $14.3 billion in BA and $13.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.7 billion in BA and $55.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $117.2 billion in BA and $101.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 370: COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

Major Programs in Function.—Function 370, Commerce and Housing Credit, totals about

$1.9 billion in BA and $0.8 billion in outlays for 1999. This function includes funding for discretionary housing programs, such as subsidies for single and multifamily housing in rural areas and mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration; net spending by the Postal Service; discretionary funding for commerce programs, such as international trade and exports, science and technology, the census, and small business; and mandatory spending for deposit insurance activities related to banks, savings and loans, and credit unions.

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth $9.9 billion in BA and $4.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.3 billion in BA and $41.7 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $127.4 billion in BA and $86.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—For on-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth $9.7 billion in BA and $4.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.1 billion in BA and $41.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $127.1 billion in BA and $86.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years. For off-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth −$0.2 billion in BA and outlays in 2000; −$1.2 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$1.2 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.— For on-budget amounts, the Conference Agreement sets forth $9.7 billion in BA and $4.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $63.1 billion in BA and $41.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $127.1 billion in BA and $86.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 400: TRANSPORTATION

Major Programs in Function.—Function 400, Transportation, totals $50.8 billion in BA and $43.8 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one-time emergency spending provided for the Federal Aviation Administration and the Coast Guard. This function includes ground transportation programs, such as the federal-aid highway program, mass transit, and the National Rail Passenger Corporation (Amtrak); air transportation through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport improvement program, facilities and equipment program, and operation of the air traffic control system; water transportation through the Coast Guard and Maritime Administration; the Surface Transportation Board; the National Transportation Safety Board; and related transportation safety and support activities within the Department of Transportation.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $51.8 billion in BA and $45.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $258.1 billion in BA and $233.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $520.0 billion in BA and $464.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $51.3 billion in BA and $45.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $259.1 billion in BA and $233.7 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $522.4 billion in BA and $463.8 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $51.8 billion in BA and $45.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $258.2 billion in BA and $233.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $520.1 billion in BA and $464.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 450: COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Major Programs in Function.—Function 450, Community and Regional Development, totals about $8.8 billion in BA and $11.7 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding emergency funding and other one-time appropriations. This function includes funding for community and regional development and disaster relief. The function includes the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), non-power programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Economic Development Administration (EDA) within the Commerce Department, and portions of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Department of Agriculture.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $7.4 billion in BA and $10.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $29.3 billion in BA and $38.4 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $57.3 billion in BA and $60.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $5.3 billion in BA and $10.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $14.0 billion in BA and $27.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $24.1 billion in BA and $31.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $6.4 billion in BA and $10.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $21.7 billion in BA and $33.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $40.7 billion in BA and $46.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 500: EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Major Programs in Function.—Function 500, Education, Training, Employment and Social Services totals about $61 billion in BA and $59.8 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one-time emergency spending items. This function includes funding for elementary and secondary, vocational, and higher education; job training; children and family services programs; adoption and foster care assistance; statistical analysis and research related to these areas; and funding for the arts and humanities.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $65.3 billion in BA and $63.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $335.0 billion in BA and $325.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $696.3 billion in BA and $681.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendments sets forth $67.4 billion in BA and $64.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $351.2 billion in BA and $336.4 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $746.2 billion in BA and $725.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $66.3 billion in BA and $63.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $343.1 billion in BA and $330.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $721.3 billion in BA and $703.5 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years. The Conference agreement provides that an additional $0.5 billion is available for funding the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act for fiscal year 2000.

FUNCTION 550: HEALTH

Major Programs in Function.—Function 550, Health, totals about $147.3 billion in BA and $140.6 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding one-time emergency spending. This function covers all health spending except that for Medicare, military health, and veterans' health. The major programs include Medicaid, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, health benefits for federal workers and retirees, the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, the Health Resources and Services Administration, Indian Health Services, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $156.2 billion in BA and $153.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $876.2 billion in BA and $873.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,114.4 billion in BA and $2,108.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $156.2 billion in BA and $153.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $876.2 billion in BA and $872.9 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,114.4 billion in BA and $2,108.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $156.2 billion in BA and $153.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $876.2 billion in BA and $872.9 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,114.4 billion in BA and $2,108.7 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 570: MEDICARE

Major Programs in Function.—Function 570, Medicare, totals about $195.2 billion in BA and $194.6 billion in outlays for 1999.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $208.7 billion in BA and $208.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,180.7 billion in BA and $1,180.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,880.3 billion in BA and $2,880.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $208.7 billion in BA and $208.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,180.7 billion in BA and $1,180.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,880.3 billion in BA and $2,880.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $208.7 billion in BA and $208.7 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,180.7 billion in BA and $1,180.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,880.3 billion in BA and $2,880.1 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 600: INCOME SECURITY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 600, Income Security, totals $234.6 billion in BA and $237.8 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding spending which requires a cap adjustment or is for an emergency. This function contains: 1) major cash and in-kind means-tested entitlements; 2) general retirement, disability, and pension programs excluding Social Security and Veterans' compensation programs; 3) federal and military retirement programs; 4) unemployment compensation; 5) low-income housing programs; and 6) other low-income support programs. Function 600 is the third largest functional category after Social Security and defense. Mandatory programs account for 86 percent of total spending in this function.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $244.4 billion in BA and $248.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,320.7 billion in BA and $1,335.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,892.8 billion in BA and $2,911.8 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $244.4 billion in BA and $248.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,324.8 billion in BA and $1,336.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,902.4 billion in BA and $2,918.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $244.4 billion in BA and $248.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,320.3 billion in BA and $1,333.4 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,891.8 billion in BA and $2,909.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years. The Conference Agreement assumes $3 billion in new mandatory spending for families with children to cover child care expenditures.

FUNCTION 650: SOCIAL SECURITY

Major Programs in Function.—Function 650, Social Security, totals about $14.5 billion in

BA and $14.7 billion in outlays for 1999 for on-budget activities. This function includes Social Security benefits and administrative expenses.

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth $14.2 billion in BA and $14.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $77.0 billion in BA and $77.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $177.0 billion in BA and $177.0 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $14.2 billion in BA and $14.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $77.0 billion in BA and $77.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $177.0 billion in BA and $176.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years. For off-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth $393.0 billion in BA and outlays in 2000; $2,158.9 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $4,915.7 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $14.2 billion in BA and $14.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $77.0 billion in BA and $77.0 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $177.0 billion in BA and $176.9 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 700: VETERANS' BENEFITS AND SERVICES

Major Programs in Function.—Function 700, Veterans Benefits, totals $43.0 billion in BA and $42.9 billion in outlays for 1999. This budget function includes income security needs of disabled veterans, indigent veterans, and survivors of deceased veterans through compensation benefits, pensions, and life insurance programs. Major education, training, and rehabilitation and readjustment programs include the Montgomery GI Bill, the Veterans Educational Assistance Program, and the Vocational Rehabilitation and Counseling program. Veterans can also receive guarantees on home loans. Roughly half of all spending in this function is for the Veterans Health Administration, which is comprised of over 700 hospitals, nursing homes, domiciliaries, and outpatient clinics.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $44.7 billion in BA and $45.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $225.9 billion in BA and $228.3 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $467.3 billion in BA and $470.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $46.7 billion in BA and $47.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $227.1 billion in BA and $229.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $466.2 billion in BA and $469.2 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $45.4 billion in BA and $45.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $226.6 billion in BA and $228.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $468.0 billion in BA and $470.8 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 750: ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Major Programs in Function.—Function 750, Administration of Justice, totals about $26.3 billion in BA and $24.8 billion in outlays for 1999. This function includes funding for federal law enforcement activities, including criminal investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), border enforcement and the control of illegal immigration by the Customs Service and Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), as well as funding for prison construction, drug treatment, crime prevention programs and the federal Judiciary.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $23.4 billion in BA and $25.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $123.5 billion in BA and $125.9 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $255.5 billion in BA and $257.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $23.4 billion in BA and $25.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $121.8 billion in BA and $124.2 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $242.3 billion in BA and $244.1 billion in outlays over 10 years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $23.4 billion in BA and $25.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $123.5 billion in BA and $125.9 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $255.5 billion in BA and $257.4 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 800: GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Major Programs in Function.—Function 800, General Government, totals $15.2 billion in BA and $14.8 billion in outlays for 1999, excluding spending which requires a cap adjustment or is for an emergency. This function consists of the activities of the Legislative Branch, the Executive Office of the President, U.S. Treasury fiscal operations (including the Internal Revenue Service), personnel and property management, and general purpose fiscal assistance to states, localities, and U.S. territories. Discretionary spending represents 93 percent of total spending in this function. The Internal Revenue Service accounts for 62 percent of the discretionary total.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth $12.3 billion in BA and $13.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $60.5 billion in BA and $62.7 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $121.2 billion in BA and $122.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth $12.3 billion in BA and $13.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $60.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $121.2 billion in BA and $122.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth $12.3 billion in BA and $13.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; $60.5 billion in BA and $62.7 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $121.2 billion in BA and $122.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 900: NET INTEREST

Major Programs in Function.—Function 900, Net Interest, totals $229.4 billion in BA and outlays in 1999. Net interest is a mandatory payment; there are no discretionary programs in Function 900. Net interest includes interest on the public debt after deducting the interest income received by the federal government.

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth $275.5 in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,342.4 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,626.5 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—For on-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth $275.7 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,344.4 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,630.8 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—For on-budget amounts, the Conference Agreement sets forth $375.5 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; $1,342.7 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and $2,628.4 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

DEBT LEVELS

The following table compares the levels of debt held by the public and debt subject to limit associated with the Conference Agreement, the President's Budget and the baseline.

Under the Conference Agreement, debt held by the public declines year by year, and by 2009 would be nearly $1.8 trillion below its present level. Debt held by the public under the President's Budget would decline by about $1.4 trillion over the next ten years. After ten years, debt held by the public would be $465 billion lower under the Conference Agreement than under the President's Budget.

The statutory debt limit, which now stands at $5.95 trillion, would not have to be increased until the very end of 2004 under the Conference Agreement. Under the President's Budget, the statutory debt limit would have to be raised sometime in 2001.

Clause 3 of House rule XXIII requires that the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying a budget resolution provide a statement of the effect of adoption of the concurrent resolution upon the statutory limit on the debt. This resolution will have no direct effect upon the statutory limit on the debt because the House resolution providng for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 68 suspended the automatic engrossment of an increase in the statutory limit upon the adoption of a conference report.

COMPARISON OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT WITH PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND BASELINE

[In billions of dollars]

Debt	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Conference agreement:											
Held by Public	3,627.1	3,502.4	3,370.1	3,229.3	3,080.6	2,920.1	2,738.2	2,540.6	2,326.7	2,098.3	1,861.1
Subject to limit	5,543.9	5,628.4	5,708.5	5,793.5	5,877.4	5,956.3	6,024.6	6,084.6	6,136.5	6,173.9	6,203.4
President's Budget:											
Held by Public	3,629.5	3,564.9	3,491.0	3,395.8	3,302.4	3,188.5	3,055.4	2,891.1	2,709.7	2,522.1	2,323.6
Subject to limit	5,546.3	5,778.6	5,999.8	6,243.0	6,498.4	6,765.1	7,042.9	7,337.9	7,661.1	8.018.6	8,409.0
Baseline:											
Held by Public	3,627.1	3,515.8	3,389.7	3,215.1	3,021.0	2,781.3	2,501.1	2,152.1	1,751.8	1,311.4	823.3
Subject to limit	5,543.9	5,641.7	5,728.1	5,779.2	5,817.8	5,817.6	5,787.5	5,696.1	5,561.6	5,387.0	5,165.7
Conference agreement compared to:											
President's Budget:											
Held by Public	−2.4	−62.5	−120.9	−166.5	−221.8	−268.4	−317.2	−350.5	−383.0	−423.8	−462.5
Subject to limit	−2.4	−150.2	−291.3	−449.5	−621.0	−808.8	−1,018.3	−1,253.3	−1,524.6	−1,844.7	−2,205.6
Baseline:											
Held by Public	.....	−13.3	−19.6	14.3	59.6	138.8	237.1	388.5	574.9	786.9	1,037.8
Subject to limit	.....	−13.3	−19.6	14.3	59.6	138.8	237.1	388.5	574.9	786.9	1,037.8

FUNCTION 920: ALLOWANCES

Major Programs in Function.—Function 920, Allowances, usually displays the budgetary effects of proposals that cannot be easily distributed across other budget functions. In past years. Function 920 has included total savings or costs from proposals associated with emergency spending or proposals contingent on certain events that have uncertain chances of occurring, such as the President's proposal for increased discretionary spending from the Social Security Surplus contingent on Social Security reform.

House Resolution.—The House resolution sets forth −$8.0 billion in BA and −$10.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$31.8 billion in BA and −$52.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$56.8 billion in BA and −$80.6 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth −10.0 billion in BA and −$10.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$33.8 billion in BA and −$52.8 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$58.8 billion in BA and −$80.6 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth −$9.8 billion in BA and −$10.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$33.6 billion in BA and −53.5 billion in outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$58.6 billion in BA and −$81.3 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

FUNCTION 950: UNDISTRIBUTED OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

Major Programs in Function.—Function 950, Undistributed Offsetting Receipts, totals about $40.1 billion in receipts (BA and outlays) for 1999. This function records offsetting receipts (receipts, not federal revenues or taxes, that the budget shows as offsets to spending programs) that are too large to record in other budget functions. Such receipts are either intrabudgetary (a payment from one federal agency to another, such as agency payments to the retirement trust funds) or proprietary (a payment from the public for some type of business transaction with the government). The main types of receipts recorded as undistributed in this function are: the payments federal agencies make to retirement trust funds for their employees, payments made by companies for the right to explore and produce oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf, and payments by those who bid for the right to buy or use the public property or resources, such as the electromagnetic spectrum.

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth −$34.3 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$188.9 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$388.4 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.—For on-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth −$34.3 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$189.8 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$391.2 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years. For off-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth −$8.0 billion in BA and outlays in 2000; −$45.8 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$110.2 billion in BA and outlays over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth −$34.3 billion in BA and outlays in fiscal year 2000; −$189.2 billion in BA and outlays over 5 fiscal years; and −$392.9 billion in BA and −$392.8 billion in outlays over 10 fiscal years.

REVENUES

House Resolution.—For on-budget amounts, the House resolution sets forth $1,408.5 billion in revenues in fiscal year 2000; $7,416.9 billion over 5 fiscal years; and $16,155.8 billion over 10 fiscal years.

Senate Amendment.— For on-budget amounts, the Senate amendment sets forth $1,402.0 billion in revenues in fiscal year 2000; $7,408.3 billion over 5 fiscal years; and $16,147.7 billion over 10 fiscal years.

Conference Agreement.—For on-budget amounts, the Conference Agreement set forth $1,408.1 billion in revenues in fiscal year 2000; $7,414.2 billion over 5 fiscal years; and $16,153.5 billion over 10 fiscal years. The conference agreement assumes that the tax relief provided by this resolution will include tax cuts to help cover the costs of raising a child. Tax cuts for families with children—child care credits—will be no less than $3 billion.

RECONCILIATION

House Resolution.—Section 4 of the House resolution directs the Committee on Ways and Means to report by September 30, 1999, a reconciliation bill that reduces revenues by $142.5 billion for the total of fiscal year 2000 through 2005 and $768.5 billion for fiscal years 2000 through 2009. The House resolution does not reconcile a reduction in the statutory limit on the debt.

Senate Amendment.—Section 104 of the Senate amendment directs the Senate Committee on Finance to report by June 18, 1999, a reconciliation bill that reduced revenues by $138.485 billion for the total of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and $765.985 billion for the total of the fiscal years 2000 through 2009. The Senate amendment also instructs the Finance Committee to report a reduction in the statutory limit on the debt of $85 billion for fiscal year 2000 only. In anticipation that the budget resolution might be resolved by the adoption of amendments between the Houses, section 105 of the Senate amendment includes reconciliation instructions for the House Committee on Ways and Means to report legislation by June 11, 1999 that reduces revenues and the statutory limit on the debt by the same amounts set out in section 104.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference agreement directs the Committees on Ways and Means and Finance to report by July 16, 1999 and July 23, 1999 respectively, a reconciliation bill that reduces revenues by $0 for fiscal year 2000, $142.3 billion for the total of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and $777.9 billion for the total of fiscal years 2000 through 2009. The Conference agreement does not include an instruction to reconcile a reduction in the statutory limit on the debt.

ALLOCATIONS

As required in section 302 of the Budget Act, the joint statement of the managers includes an allocation, based upon the conference report, of the levels of total budget authority, total budget outlays among each of the appropriate House and Senate committees.

The allocation for each House consist of a set of two tables for the House and the Senate. The first set of tables shows the allocation for the budget year, fiscal year 2000. The House allocates funding for each fiscal year covered by the budget resolution. The second set of tables shows the amount allocated for the totals of the first five years and the ten years covered by the budget resolution.

The allocations are as follows:

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

Appropriations Committee

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year 2000	Budget authority	Outlays
General Purpose [1]	531,771	536,700
Violent Crime Reduction [1]	4,500	5,554
Highways [1]	0	24,574
Mass Transit [1]	0	4,117
Total Discretionary Action	536,271	570,945
Current Law Mandatory	321,108	303,938

[1] Shown for display purposes only.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Committees Other than Appropriations

Budget year		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total 2000-2004	Total 2000-2009
Agriculture Committee													
Current Law	BA	11,042	8,795	6,983	2,709	2,579	2,637	2,686	2,743	2,792	3,222	32,108	46,188
	OT	8,134	5,109	3,999	-259	-174	-160	-169	-146	-196	172	16,809	16,310
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	28,391	29,177	29,873	30,549	31,282	31,964	32,701	57,568	213,937
	OT	0	0	0	27,737	29,167	29,864	30,530	31,262	31,945	32,681	56,904	213,186
Total	BA	11,042	8,795	6,983	31,100	31,756	32,510	33,235	34,025	34,756	35,923	89,676	260,125
	OT	8,134	5,109	3,999	27,478	28,993	29,704	30,361	31,116	31,749	32,853	73,713	229,496
Armed Services Committee													
Current Law	BA	49,330	50,977	52,705	54,405	56,367	58,198	60,111	62,038	63,980	66,038	263,784	574,149
	OT	49,415	50,940	52,597	54,315	56,276	58,107	60,018	61,944	63,885	65,942	263,543	573,439
Banking and Financial Services Committee													
Current Law	BA	4,676	5,345	5,319	5,619	4,946	5,303	5,488	5,748	5,924	6,075	25,905	54,443
	OT	-1,839	-675	-169	327	-80	386	235	54	-178	-387	-2,436	-2,326
Committee on Education and the Workforce													
Current Law	BA	4,790	5,222	5,508	5,403	5,154	5,367	5,578	5,807	6,021	6,234	26,077	55,084
	OT	4,188	4,618	4,969	5,016	4,811	4,871	5,070	5,277	5,477	5,668	23,602	49,965
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	305	305	810	835	859	3,692	3,791	3,893	1,420	14,490
	OT	0	0	58	244	721	831	856	2,846	3,680	3,864	1,023	13,100
Total	BA	4,790	5,222	5,813	5,708	5,964	6,202	6,437	9,499	9,812	10,127	27,497	69,574
	OT	4,188	4,618	5,027	5,260	5,532	5,702	5,926	8,123	9,157	9,532	24,625	63,065
Commerce Committee													
Current Law	BA	10,268	12,255	15,762	16,037	16,327	17,417	17,508	18,551	18,643	18,638	70,649	161,406
	OT	8,365	10,951	16,470	16,962	17,327	17,630	17,849	18,072	18,300	18,335	70,075	160,261
International Relations Committee													
Current Law	BA	9,362	9,171	8,509	7,860	7,734	7,876	7,740	7,721	7,965	7,924	42,636	81,862
	OT	11,984	11,553	11,608	9,397	8,411	8,384	8,018	7,898	8,014	7,992	52,953	93,259
Government Reform Committee													
Current Law	BA	59,501	61,320	63,344	65,557	67,979	70,502	73,076	75,755	78,591	81,514	317,701	697,139
	OT	57,941	59,703	61,674	63,848	66,208	68,662	71,162	73,746	76,482	78,953	309,374	678,379
Committee on House Administration													
Current Law	BA	114	95	93	93	93	94	92	92	92	92	488	950
	OT	289	45	28	57	241	56	30	63	233	98	660	1,140
Resources Committee													
Current Law	BA	2,398	2,301	2,127	2,166	2,098	2,111	2,150	2,190	2,238	2,367	11,090	22,146
	OT	2,271	2,319	2,125	2,191	2,161	2,175	2,247	2,315	2,378	2,444	11,067	22,626
Judiciary Committee													
Current Law	BA	4,759	4,737	4,704	4,773	4,818	3,364	3,445	3,502	3,566	3,647	23,791	41,315
	OT	4,235	4,529	4,620	4,681	4,727	3,283	3,339	3,393	3,449	3,519	22,792	39,775

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Committees Other than Appropriations

Budget year		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total 2000-2004	Total 2000-2009
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee													
Current Law	BA	51,081	50,632	51,684	52,832	15,100	15,178	15,371	15,528	16,091	16,520	221,329	300,017
	OT	16,152	16,151	15,992	15,997	15,694	15,482	15,489	15,537	16,040	16,441	79,986	158,975
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	0	37,673	37,673	37,673	37,673	37,673	37,673	37,673	226,038
	OT	0	0	0	0	104	306	452	538	590	615	104	2,605
Discretionary Action	BA	2,475	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	12,115	24,165
	OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	BA	53,556	53,042	54,094	55,242	55,183	55,261	55,454	55,611	56,174	56,603	271,117	550,220
	OT	16,152	16,151	15,992	15,997	15,798	15,788	15,941	16,075	16,630	17,056	80,090	161,580
Science Committee													
Current Law	BA	92	83	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	322	567
	OT	72	80	80	58	51	49	49	49	49	49	341	586
Small Business Committee													
Current Law	BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	OT	-155	-140	-125	-110	-95	-75	-55	-35	-20	-10	-625	-820
Veterans' Affairs Committee													
Current Law	BA	1,106	1,058	1,002	1,044	887	813	746	689	629	566	5,097	8,540
	OT	1,377	1,440	1,371	1,481	1,416	1,380	1,358	1,331	1,312	1,280	7,085	13,746
Discretionary Action	BA	394	874	1,367	1,868	2,390	3,132	3,475	4,036	4,610	5,199	6,893	27,345
	OT	360	833	1,325	1,824	2,347	3,132	3,475	3,694	4,562	5,150	6,689	26,702
Total	BA	1,500	1,932	2,369	2,912	3,277	3,945	4,221	4,725	5,239	5,765	11,990	35,885
	OT	1,737	2,273	2,696	3,305	3,763	4,512	4,833	5,025	5,874	6,430	13,774	40,448
Ways and Means Committee													
Current Law	BA	668,250	685,676	697,591	702,427	724,718	754,305	765,945	796,632	822,775	848,116	3,478,662	7,466,435
	OT	663,507	681,335	693,657	701,549	723,463	752,433	764,569	795,241	820,714	846,593	3,463,511	7,443,061
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	19,542	19,542	19,542	19,542	19,542	19,542	19,542	39,084	136,794
	OT	0	0	0	17,559	18,667	19,317	19,967	20,667	21,367	22,117	36,226	139,661
Discretionary Action	BA	0	0	0	0	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	3,000
	OT	0	0	0	0	145	296	500	500	500	500	145	2,441
Total	BA	668,250	685,676	697,591	721,969	744,760	774,347	785,987	816,674	842,817	868,158	3,518,246	7,606,229
	OT	663,507	681,335	693,657	719,108	742,275	772,046	785,036	816,408	842,581	869,210	3,499,882	7,585,163

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
BUDGET YEAR TOTAL 2000
(in millions of dollars)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations act	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations			0	0
General Prupose Discretionary	531,771	536,700	0	0
Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund	4,500	5,554	0	0
Highways	0	24,574		
Mass Transit	0	4,117		
Mandatory	321,502	304,297	0	0
Total	857,773	875,242	0	0
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	10,843	7,940	26,696	9,419
Armed Services	49,327	49,433	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	4,676	(1,843)	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	8,420	5,774	721	717
Energy and Natural Resources	2,336	2,258	40	63
Environment and Public Works	36,532	2,041	0	0
Finance	683,333	676,384	156,910	157,096
Foreign Relations	9,354	11,976	0	0
Governmental Affairs	59,501	57,941	0	0
Judiciary	4,759	4,235	234	234
Labor and Human Resources	9,023	8,363	1,309	1,309
Rules and Administration	114	289	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	1,106	1,381	23,667	23,540
Indian Affairs	151	150	0	0
Small Business	0	(155)	0	0
Unassigned to Committee	(310,297)	(293,097)	0	0
TOTAL	1,426,931	1,408,292	209,577	192,378

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
5-YEAR TOTAL: 2000-2004
(in millions of dollars)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	40,012	24,704	100,467	52,240
Armed Services	263,769	263,577	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	31,606	(2,459)	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	64,653	50,445	3,887	3,868
Energy and Natural Resources	11,023	11,009	200	236
Environment and Public Works	179,132	8,214	0	0
Finance	3,569,039	3,569,977	905,958	909,007
Foreign Relations	42,596	52,913	0	0
Governmental Affairs	317,701	309,374	0	0
Judiciary	23,791	22,792	1,170	1,170
Labor and Human Resources	48,269	45,687	6,784	6,784
Rules and Administration	488	660	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	5,097	7,108	125,438	125,110
Indian Affairs	716	717	0	0
Small Business	0	(625)	0	0

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
10-YEAR TOTAL: 2000-2009
(in millions of dollars)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	75,410	45,523	198,127	117,538
Armed Services	574,119	573,458	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	88,649	(2,399)	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	144,512	116,013	8,558	8,519
Energy and Natural Resources	21,822	22,406	400	436
Environment and Public Works	339,303	13,501	0	0
Finance	7,754,731	7,732,409	2,237,130	2,239,681
Foreign Relations	81,782	93,179	0	0
Governmental Affairs	697,139	678,379	0	0
Judiciary	41,315	39,775	2,336	2,340
Labor and Human Resources	101,790	96,528	14,180	14,180
Rules and Administration	950	1,140	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	8,540	13,819	269,182	266,592
Indian Affairs	1,407	1,403	0	0
Small Business	0	(820)	0	0

RULEMAKING AND BUDGETARY PROCEDURES

House Resolution.—Section 5(a) of the House resolution includes findings that Social Security is, by law, off-budget; that Social Security has been running surpluses; that these surpluses have been used to balance the Federal budget; that this resolution, for the first time, balances the budget without counting such surpluses, and that the only way to present the diversion of the surpluses for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of the surpluses, and both the Congress and the Administration should take the necessary steps to ensure that future budgets are balanced exclusive of the surpluses.

Section 5(b) of the House resolution prohibits the consideration of any budget resolution that sets forth an on-budget deficit. The intent of this provision is to prevent Congresses from considering future budget resolutions that implicitly use the Social Security surplus to finance other governmental operations. Section 5 is enforced by a point of order that, if sustained, precludes further consideration of the measure. In addition to any budget resolution reported by the Budget Committee, the point of order may be raised against amendments to the budget resolution and accompanying conference reports. Consistent with enforcement of key Budget Act requirements in the House and Senate, section 5 may be waived by a simple majority of those present in the House and three-fifths of those Members voting in the Senate. An exception is provided for legislation enhancing retirement security or reforming Medicare pursuant to section 6 of the House resolution.

Subsection (c)(1) provides a sense of the House that legislation should be enacted that excludes the outlays and receipts of the Social Security trust funds from official budgetary projections of the surplus or deficit. Subsection (c)(2) further provides that legislation should be considered that further safeguards the surpluses, such as modifying pay-as-you-go requirements to permit the enactment of retirement security and Medicare legislation or establishing a statutory limit on debt held by the public that would be reduced by the amount of the Social Security surpluses.

Section 6 of the House resolution establishes a reserve fund for retirement security and Medicare in the House. The Budget Committee chairman is permitted to increase the allocations and aggregates established in the budget resolution for legislation that either enhances retirement security or extends the solvency of the Medicare trust funds or reforms the Medicare benefits or payment structure. The adjustments may be made for bills, amendments, and conference reports.

The sum of the adjustments for all measures considered under this section may not exceed an amount equal to an up-to-date estimate of the Social Security surplus for fiscal year 2000, the total for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and 2000 through 2009. Furthermore, the chairman is prohibited from making any adjustment if the measure, together with any other measure considered under this section, would exceed the estimated surplus for any of these periods.

For purposes of this section, the projected Social Security surpluses are the levels assumed in the joint statement or the levels set forth in CBO's midsession report. In making this projection, CBO is directed to consult with the Social Security trustees.

Section 7 of the House resolution establishes a reserve fund in the House for special education. The Budget Committee chairman is permitted to increase the budget aggregates and allocations to the Committee on Appropriations for legislation providing appropriations for special education. The adjustments may be made for bills, joint resolutions, amendments, and conference reports. Any adjustments must be made in the amount of BA provided by the measure for that purpose (and the resulting outlays) are subject to two limitations. First, the adjustments may not exceed an up-to-date estimate of the on-budget surplus. Second, the adjustments may not exceed the amount necessary to fully fund special education at its authorize levels.

Section 8 of the House resolution provides that changes in the budgetary aggregates and committee allocations permitted by the resolution shall be made while the measure is pending and upon enactment and shall be published in the Congressional Record. The section also provides that the revised aggregates and allocations shall be, for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the aggregates and allocations in this resolution.

Section 9 of the House resolution requires the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to update CBO's budgetary projections on a quarterly basis.

Senate Amendment.—In addition to setting forth budgetary levels as called for in the Budget Act, title I of the Senate amendment contains two provisions—the first, to address the fact that Congress did not adopt a fiscal year 1999 budget resolution, and the second, to focus attention on debt held by the public levels. Section 1(a)(2) of the Senate amendment contains language that incorporates the levels in the deeming resolution passed by the Senate at the end of the 105th Congress as the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution. Section 101(6) provides advisory debt held by the public levels in the budget resolution. These debt-held-by-the-public levels reflect the fact that the resolution devotes the entire Social Security surplus to the reduction of debt held by the public.

Title II of the Senate amendment contains ten sections that either modify budget procedures for consideration of legislation or authorize the Chairman of the Budget Committee to alter the levels in the budget resolution to accommodate Senate consideration of certain legislation.

Section 201 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund for Agriculture. The Senate amendment ensures that up to $6 billion is made available for legislation that addresses risk management and income assistance to agriculture producers through a reserve fund. If the Senate Agriculture Committee reports legislation that provides risk management and income assistance to agriculture producers, then the Chairman of the Budget Committee is authorized to increase the Agriculture Committee's allocation of budget authority and outlays to accommodate this additional spending. The reserve fund provides that this legislation cannot cause an on-budget deficit. The Senate amendment also permits $500 million (within the $6 billion total) in agriculture spending in fiscal year 2000, but this additional spending must be offset by reductions in direct spending in other programs.

Section 202 of the Senate amendment provides a tax reduction reserve fund which allows the Chairman of the Budget Committee to adjust the spending and revenue limits for legislation that reduces revenues as long as the legislation does not cause an on-budget deficit for the first fiscal year, the sum of the first five fiscal years covered by the budget resolution, and the sum of the ten fiscal years covered by the resolution.

Section 203 of the Senate amendment contains a clarification of the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule make it clear that this rule still applies until the budget is balanced excluding the transactions of the Social Security trust fund. This change would prohibit the expenditure of Social Security surpluses, but would allow on-budget surpluses to be used to offset tax reductions or direct spending increases.

Section 204 of the Senate amendment provides a majority point of order against emergency spending provisions. The Senate amendment would curb the abuse of spending the Social Security surplus on so-called emergencies. Under sections 251(1)(b)(2)(A) and 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if Congress and the President designate a provision of legislation an emergency, it is exempt from the statutory limits on appropriations legislation and the pay-as-you-go requirement for all other legislation. Under the Senate amendment, committee reports and any statement of managers accompanying legislation containing emergency spending must contain an analysis whether the proposed emergency spending satisfies all the criteria set out in the resolution. A point of order is available against any emergency spending provision regardless of whether the criteria are met. The Presiding Officer does not determine whether or not the criteria have been satisfied when ruling on the point of order. If a point of order was raised and sustained against an emergency spending provision then the language making the emergency designation and providing the spending would both be stricken from the measure by way of a procedure similar to the Byrd rule (see section 313 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974).

Section 205 of the Senate amendment provides authority to the Budget Committee chairmen to provide committee allocations. Section 302 of the Budget Act requires the statement of managers accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution to include an allocation of spending authority to committees. At the time the Senate amendment was adapted there existed the possibility that this budget resolution would not go to conference. Therefore, the Senate amendment requires the Chairman of the Budget Committee to file allocations that are consistent with the budget resolution.

Section 206 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund for use of Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) receipts. This section would allow committee allocations to be adjusted for legislation providing new or additional direct spending for historic preservation, recreation and land, water, fish, and wildlife conservation efforts to support coastal needs and activities. This reserve fund is intended to accommodate an increase in spending for these programs if the increases are offset by reductions in direct spending. It would not allow revenue increases to offset spending increases.

Section 207 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund for Medicare managed care plans. This section permits committee allocations to be adjusted for legislation providing new or additional direct spending for Medicare managed care plans agreeing to serve elderly patients for at least 2 years and whose reimbursement was reduced because of risk management regulations. This reserve fund is intended to accommodate an increase in spending for these programs if they are offset by spending reductions. It would not allow revenue increases to offset spending increases.

Section 208 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund for Medicare and prescription drugs. This section permits committee allocations and spending aggregates to be adjusted for legislation that significantly extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund. This reserve fund is designed to

accommodate legislation that reforms the Medicare program and extends the solvency of the HI trust fund. It would not allow revenue increases to offset spending increases. This reserve fund does allow committee allocations and spending aggregates to be adjusted to use an on-budget surplus to offset the additional cost of prescription drugs as part of legislation that reforms Medicare and significantly extends the solvency of the HI trust fund.

Section 209 of the Senate amendment contains language regarding the rulemaking authority of each of the Houses of Congress.

Section 210 of the Senate amendment provides a reserve fund to foster the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities so long as the legislation does not increase the deficit or reduce the surplus.

Conference Agreement.—Title II of the Conference agreement includes the rules and procedures for implementing and enforcing the budget resolution.

Section 201 of the Conference agreement creates a safe deposit box for Social Security surpluses and reflects the language in section 5 of the House resolution with modifications. The resolution contains the findings from section 5(a) and creates a majority point of order from section 5(b) with modifications in the House and Senate against a budget resolution which sets forth an on-budget deficit unless the deficit results from legislation enacted pursuant to section 202 of this resolution. The Conference agreement does not contain the sense of Congress provisions set forth in section 5(c).

Section 202 of the Conference agreement provides a reserve fund for retirement security and reflects the language of section 6 of the House resolution with modifications. The reserve fund for retirement security applies in both the House and Senate and permits the Budget Committee chairman to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations for legislation that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform. It is the conferees' intention that retirement security includes Medicare.

Section 203 of the Conference agreement provides a reserve fund for Medicare legislation and reflects the language of section 208 of the Senate amendment with modifications. The Conference agreement applies the reserve fund to the House and Senate, requires the legislation to make structural reforms to Medicare and extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund without the use of intragovernmental transfers, and provides that it may be used for legislation which includes a prescription drug benefit. The conferees do not intend for the reserve fund to encompass legislation making incremental changes to the Medicare system.

Section 204 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 201 of the Senate amendment regarding a reserve fund which would increase the allocations by an additional $6 billion for agriculture with modifications. The Senate amendment only applied in the Senate. Although the House does not have a comparable provision, it includes $6 billion in mandatory spending over 5 years for function 350 (Agriculture), and in the allocation to the House Committee on Agriculture. The Conference agreement provides that the reserve fund applies in both the House and the Senate and may be triggered by legislation which provides risk management and/or income assistance to agricultural producers. For the purposes of this section, risk management includes crop insurance.

Section 205 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 202 of the Senate amendment regarding a tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate. The House does not have a comparable provision. The House has standing authority under section 302(g) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as amended by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to consider legislation reducing taxes in excess of the levels in the budget resolution, if the revenue loss is offset by spending reductions. The Conference agreement retains the Senate language with modifications and only applies in the Senate.

Section 206 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 204 of the Senate amendment regarding an emergency designation point of order with modifications. The House does not have a comparable provision. However, according to the Oversight Plan of the House Committee on the Budget, the Budget Committee will consider budget process reform during the spring of 1999 (which will include a codification of a definition of budgetary emergencies and establish a reserve fund for such emergencies). The Conference agreement provides a supermajority point of order in the Senate against language designating a provision as an emergency and includes an exemption for defense spending.

Section 207 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 203 of the Senate amendment regarding the application of the Senate's pay-go point of order with a modification. The House does not have a comparable provision (the pay-go point of order is not applicable in the House of Representatives). The Conference agreement restates the entire pay-go point of order with modifications which permit on-budget surpluses to be used for the tax reductions or spending increases. The conferees intend that the on-budget surplus be placed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard. The baseline on-budget surpluses are shown in the table below:

	Fiscal Year—										5 yr.	10 yr.
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		
Baseline on Budget surpluses	.....	8.510	54.930	33.301	52.100	72.459	123.375	154.858	174.844	204.332	148.841	878.709

Section 208 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 8 of the House resolution regarding the application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates made pursuant to the resolution with modifications. The Senate does not have a comparable provision. Subsections (a) and (b) of the Conference agreement would be applicable in both the House and Senate. Subsection (d) applies only in the House and provides that only the first fiscal year and the five fiscal year totals of the section 302 allocations will be enforced under section 302 and 311 of the Budget Act.

Section 209 of the Conference agreement clarifies the status of the interim House and Senate levels for fiscal year 1999. The House resolution does not have a comparable provision. However interim budget allocations and aggregates for the House were printed in the Congressional Record pursuant to H. Res. 5. Section 1(a)(2) of the Senate amendment contains language that incorporates the levels passed by the Senate at the end of the 105th Congress as the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution. The conference agreement reflects the Senate amendment with a modification which clarifies that the levels previously submitted by the House and the Senate constitute a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

Section 210 of the Conference agreement reflects the language of section 210 of the Senate amendment regarding a reserve fund in the Senate for legislation that finances certain programs to foster the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities with modifications. The House does not have a comparable provision. The Conference agreement adopts the Senate language with technical amendments which conform the reserve fund to the form of other reserve funds set out in the Conference agreement.

Section 211 provides for a reserve fund for a fiscal year 2000 surplus. The Conference agreement calls upon the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to complete its update of the economic and budget forecast for the 2000 budget by July 1, 1999. If CBO's revised projection shows an on-budget surplus for 2000, this reserve fund allows the Chairman of the Budget Committee to adjust the revenue aggregate, the pay-go balance, and the revenue reconciliation instructions by the amount of the on-budget surplus for 2000.

Section 212 provides for a reserve fund in the Senate for education for legislation that causes an increase in direct spending by virtue of a change in the purpose for which previously appropriated funds may be spent.

Section 213 contains the boilerplate rulemaking authority of the House and the Senate.

Section 7 of the House resolution provides a reserve fund for special education. The Senate amendment does not have a comparable provision. The House recedes to the Senate on this issue.

Section 9 of the House resolution requires the Congressional Budget Office to provide quarterly updates of its projections. The Senate amendment does not have a comparable provision. The House recedes to the Senate on this issue.

Section 205 of the Senate amendment contained authority for the Chairman of the Budget Committee in the Senate to provide committee allocations in the Congressional Record in the event that there was not a statement of managers accompanying a conference report on the budget resolution. The House resolution does not have a comparable provision. The Senate recedes to the House on this issue.

Section 206 of the Senate amendment contained a reserve fund for the use of OCS receipts. The House resolution does not have a comparable provision. The Senate recedes to the House on this issue.

Section 207 of the Senate amendment contained a reserve fund for managed care plans. The House resolution does not have a comparable provision. The Senate recedes to the House on this issue.

Miscellaneous Provisions Regarding Budget Enforcement.—Some interpret a surplus to be a negative deficit. The conferees intend that this interpretation not apply for the purposes of this resolution. More specifically, for the purposes of title II, a reduction in the on-budget surplus is not considered an increase in the on-budget deficit.

Some 301 of the Conference agreement sets forth a sense of the Congress regarding the protection of the Social Security surpluses.

The conferees strongly support this language—particularly the language found in subsection (b)(1) and intend that legislation should be enacted that prevents the Social Security surpluses from being used for any purpose other than Social Security, retirement security and the reduction of the federal debt.

SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE AND SENATE PROVISIONS

House Resolution.—The House resolution included the following sense of the House or sense of Congress provisions:

Sense of Congress on the commission on international religious freedom.

Sense of the House on providing additional dollars to the classroom.

Sense of Congress on asset-building for the working poor.

Sense of Congress on access to health insurance and preserving home health services for all Medicare beneficiaries.

Sense of the House on medicare payment.

Sense of the House on assessment of welfare-to-work programs.

Sense of Congress on providing honor guard services for veterans' funerals.

Sense of Congress on child nutrition.

Senate amendment.—The Senate amendment included the following sense of the Senate or sense of the Congress provisions:

Sense of the Senate on marriage penalty.

Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplomatic missions.

Sense of the Senate on access to Medicare home health services.

Sense of the Senate regarding the deductibility of health insurance premiums of the self-employed.

Sense of the Senate that tax reductions should go to working families.

Sense of the Senate on the National Guard.

Sense of the Senate on effects of Social Security reform on women.

Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

Sense of Congress on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.

Sense of the Senate on Federal research and development investment.

Sense of the Senate on counter-narcotics funding.

Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.

Sense of the Senate on the Social Security surplus.

Sense of the Senate on need-based student financial aid programs.

Findings; sense of Congress on the protection of the Social Security surpluses.

Sense of the Senate on providing adequate funding for United States international leadership.

Sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not invest the Social Security Trust Funds in private financial markets.

Sense of the Senate concerning on-budget surplus.

Sense of the Senate on TEA–21 funding and the States.

Sense of the Senate that agricultural risk management programs should benefit livestock producers.

Sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the medicare program.

Sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to all Americans by returning non-Social Security surplus to taxpayers.

Sense of the Senate regarding tax incentives for education savings.

Sense of the Senate that the One Hundred Sixth Congress, First Session should reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program.

Sense of the Senate on tax cuts for lower and middle income taxpayers.

Sense of the Senate regarding reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986

Sense of the Senate regarding Davis-Bacon.

Sense of the Senate regarding access to items and services under medicare program.

Sense of the Senate concerning autism.

Sense of the Senate on women's access to obstetric and gynecological services.

Sense of the Senate on LIHEAP.

Sense of the Senate on transportation firewalls.

Sense of the Senate on funding existing, effective public health programs before creating new programs.

Sense of the Senate concerning funding for special education.

Sense of the Senate on the importance of Social Security for individuals who become disabled.

Sense of the Senate regarding funding for intensive firearms prosecution programs. Honest reporting of the deficit.

Sense of the Senate concerning fostering the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities.

Sense of the Senate regarding asset-building for the working poor.

Sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that it is the policy of the United States to provide as soon as is technologically possible an education for every American child that will enable each child to effectively meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Sense of the Senate concerning exemption of agricultural commodities and products, medicines, and medical products from unilateral economic sanctions.

Sense of the Senate regarding capital gains tax fairness for family farmers. Budgeting for the Defense Science and Technology Program.

Sense of the Senate concerning funding for the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program.

Sense of the Senate on social promotion.

Sense of the Senate on women and Social Security reform.

Sense of the Congress regarding South Korea's international trade practices on pork and beef.

Sense of the Senate regarding support for State and local law enforcement.

Sense of the Senate on merger enforcement by Department of Justice.

Sense of the Senate to create a task force to pursue the creation of a natural disaster reserve fund.

Sense of the Senate concerning Federal tax relief.

Sense of the Senate on eliminating the marriage penalty and across-the-board income tax rate cuts.

Sense of the Senate on important of funding for embassy security.

Sense of the Senate on funding for after school education.

Sense of the Senate concerning recovery of funds by the Federal Government in tobacco-related litigation.

Sense of the Senate on offsetting inappropriate emergency spending.

Findings; sense of Congress on the President's fiscal year 2000 budget proposal to tax association investment income.

Sense of the Senate regarding funding for counter-narcotics initiatives.

Sense of the Senate on modernizing America's schools.

Sense of the Senate concerning funding for the land and water conservation fund.

Sense of the Senate regarding support for Federal, State and local law enforcement and for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

Sense of the Senate regarding Social Security notch babies.

Conference Agreements.—Title III of the resolution contains the following non-binding language that expresses the will or intent of either or both Houses of the Congress:

Subtitle A: The Sense of the Congress provisions are as follows:

Sense of the Congress on the protection of the Social Security surpluses.

Sense of the Congress on providing addition dollars to the classroom.

Sense of the Congress on asset-building for the working poor.

Sense of the Congress on child nutrition.

Sense of the Congress concerning funding for special education.

Subtitle B: The Sense of the House provisions are as follows:

Sense of the House on the commission on international religious freedoms.

Sense of the House on assessment of welfare-to-work programs.

Subtitle C: The Sense of the Senate provisions are as follows:

Sense of the Senate that the federal government should not invest the Social Security trust funds in private financial markets.

Sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the Medicare program.

Sense of the Senate on education.

Sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to Americans by returning the non-Social Security surplus to taxpayers.

Sense of the Senate on access to Medicare services.

Sense of the Senate on law enforcement.

Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplomatic missions.

Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

Sense of the Senate on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.

Sense of the Senate on TEA–21 funding and the States.

Sense of the Senate that the one hundred sixth Congress, first session, should reauthorize funds for the farmland protection program.

Sense of the Senate on the importance of Social Security for individuals who become disabled.

Sense of the Senate on reporting of on-budget trust fund levels.

Sense of the Senate regarding South Korea's international trade practices on pork and beef.

Sense of the Senate on funding for natural disasters.

From the Committee on the Budget:

JOHN R. KASICH,
SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
DON NICKLES,
PHIL GRAMM,
SLADE GORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0102

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–92) on the resolution (H. Res. 137) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 472, LOCAL CENSUS QUALITY CHECK ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–93) on the resolution (H. Res. 138) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 472) to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the use of postcensus local review as part of each decennial census, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 37, TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–94) on the resolution (H. Res. 139) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1999

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of the death of her mother.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and Tuesday, April 13 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and Tuesday, April 13 on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of business in the district.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and April 14.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today and April 14.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PORTMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, April 14, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1468. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Brucellosis; Procedures for Retaining Class Free State Status [Docket No. 98–060–2] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1469. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Quinclorac; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300820; FRL–6069–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1470. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; FCS Board Compensation Limits (RIN: 3052–AB79) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1471. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Builder Warranty for High-Ratio FHA-Insured Single Family Mortgages for New Homes [Docket No. FR–4288–I–01] (RIN: 2502–AH08) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1472. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs Conforming Rule; Technical Amendment [Docket No. FR–4054–C–05] (RIN: 2577–AB63) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1473. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention in Certain Residential Structures-Information Collection Approval Numbers; Technical Amendment [Docket No. FR–4444–F–02] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1474. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—FHA Single Family Mortgage Insurance; Statutory Changes for Maximum Mortgage Limit and Downpayment Requirement [Docket No. FR–4431–F–01] (RIN: 2502–AH31) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1475. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Builder Warranty for High-Ratio FHA-Insured Single Family Mortgages for New Homes [Docket No. FR–4288–C–02] (RIN: 2502–AH08) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1476. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs Conforming Rule; Technical Amendment [Docket No. FR–4054–C–04] (RIN: 2577–AB63) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1477. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Deposit Insurance Regulations; Joint Accounts and ''Payable-on-Death'' Accounts (RIN: 3064–AC16) received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1478. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (CFDA No. 84.342) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1479. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (''Appliance Labeling Rule'')—received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1480. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to manage the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more effectiviely and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

1481. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Removal of Commercial Communications Satellites and Related Items from the Department of Commerce's Commerce Control List for Retransfer to the Department of State's United States Munitions List [Docket No. 990311067–9067–01] (RIN: 0694–AB84) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1482. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Entity List: Addition of Russian Entities; and Revisions to Certain Indian and Pakistani Entities [Docket No. 970428099–9015–08] (RIN: 0694–AB60) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1483. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Maryland Regulatory Program [MD–045–FOR] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1484. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ohio Regulatory Program [OH–244–FOR] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1485. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Resources.

1486. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Trawling in Steller Sea Lion Critical Habitat in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 033199A] received April 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1487. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-water Species Fishery by Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 031999A] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1488. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Deep-water Species Fishery by Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 032399C] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1489. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 961204340–7087–02; I.D. 031599C] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1490. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Amendment 56 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska and Amendment 56 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Groundfish Fishery of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area [I.D. 101498C] (RIN: 0648–AJ50) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1491. A letter from the United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1492. A letter from the United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1493. A letter from the United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's final rule—Danger Zone, Chesapeake Bay, Point Lookout to Cedar Point, Maryland—received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1495. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

1496. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 208. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow for the contribution of certain rollover distributions to accounts in the Thrift Savings Plan, to eliminate certain waiting-period requirements for participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 928. A bill to require that the 2000 decennial census include either a general or targeted followup mailing of census questionnaires, whichever, in the judgment of the Secretary of Commerce, will be more effective in securing the return of census information from the greatest number of households possible (Rept. 106–88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 1009. A bill to authorize the awarding of grants to cities, counties, tribal organizations, and certain other entities for the purpose of improving public participation in the 2000 decennial census; with an amendment (Rept. 106–89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1376. A bill to extend the tax benefits available with respect to services performed in a combat zone to services performed in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavaia (Serbia/Montenegro) and certain other areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASICH: Committee of Conference. Conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 68. Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009 (Rept. 106–91). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on rules. House Resolution 137. Resolution waiving points of order against a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2009 (Rept. 106–92). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 472) to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the use of postcensus local review as part of each decennial census (Rept. 106–93). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations (Rept. 106–93). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS,

Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 1376. A bill to extend the tax benefits available with respect to services performed in a combat zone to services performed in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia/Montenegro) and certain other areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. EWING, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. PHELPS):

H.R. 1377. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 13234 South Baltimore Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''John J. Buchanan Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 1378. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out pipeline safety activities under chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 1379. A bill to amend the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, to make a technical correction relating to an emergency supplemental appropriation for international narcotics control and law enforcement assistance; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. DUNN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 1380. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. DICKEY):

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee's ''regular rate'' for purposes of calculating overtime compensation will not be affected by certain additional payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 1382. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide an exemption from overtime compensation for firefighters and rescue squad members who volunteer their services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow registered vendors to administer refunds of Federal excise taxes on kerosene used in unvented heaters for home heating purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 1384. A bill to authorize an interpretive center and related visitor facilities within the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 1385. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the financial limitation on rehabilitation services under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 1386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain on the sale of a family farming business to a family member; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. NEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for Government furnished headstones or markers for the marked graves of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 1388. A bill to establish a demonstration project to study and provide coverage of routine patient care costs for Medicare beneficiaries with cancer who are enrolled in an approved clinical trial program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HILL of Montana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. SALMON, Mr. EWING, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 1389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the information reporting requirement relating to the Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credits imposed on educational institutions and certain other trades and businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rates of income tax imposed on indvidual taxpayers by 3 percentage points, to provide for a carryover basis of property acquired from a decedent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 1391. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program under which States may be certified to carry out voluntary environmental cleanup programs and to amend CERCLA regarding the liability of landowners and prospective purchasers; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1392. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into contracts with providers of services to furnish certain inpatient hospital services at an all-inclusive rate of payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1393. A bill to provide wage parity for certain Department of Defense employees in Texas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1394. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal district judges in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 1395. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to suspend the application of certain motor vehicle fuel requirements in areas within the State of California during certain periods in order to reduce the retail cost of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. MCKINNEY (for herself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 1396. A bill to save taxpayers money, reduce the deficit, cut corporate welfare, and protect and restore America's natural heritage by eliminating the fiscally wasteful and ecologically destructive commercial logging program on Federal public lands and to facilitate the economic recovery and diversification of communities dependent on the Federal logging program; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Education and the Workforce, 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. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EWING, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution urging the Congress and the President to fully fund the Federal Government's obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

17. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Hampshire, relative to Senate Resolution No. 4 urging the President and the Congress to fund 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States as promised under the IDEA to ensure that all children, regardless of disability, received a quality education and are treated with the dignity and respect they deserve; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

18. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a memorial urging Congress and the President of the United States to take immediate action to work in unison to pass a Patient's Bill of Rights and confront this impending health care crisis in the best interest of all Americans; to the Committee on Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska introduced a bill (H.R. 1397) for the relief of Herman J. Koehler, III; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 14: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 25: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 36: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 40: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 45: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 49: Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 53: Mr. DICKEY and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 61: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 119: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. THUNE.

H.R. 120: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 121: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 152: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 205: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 212: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 216: Mr. WOLF and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 218: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JOHN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 353: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KLINK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 371: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 372: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 380: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 382: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 383: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 389: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 407: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 417: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 443: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 486: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 488: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 505: Mr. FROST, Mr. HORN, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 538: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 544: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 566: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 570: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 573: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. HULSHOF.

H.R. 574: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 583: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 595: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 632: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 655: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. NEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 673: Mr. CANADY of Florida and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 681: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 691: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 716: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 721: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 732: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 740: Mr. COYNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 745: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 746: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 765: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 775: Mr. METCALF, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 803: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. RILEY.

H.R. 815: Mr. BAKER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 833: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 881: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 889: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 890: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 912: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 914: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 925: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 941: Mr. CAMP and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 952: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 961: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 984: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 989: Mr. FROST, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 991: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 999: Mr. SHAW and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1006: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1029: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1040: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1046: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1050: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1051: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1053: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1063: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 1070: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BASS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1080: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1082: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WU, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1084: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1085: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1086: Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1108: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1112: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1115: Mr. WYNN, Mr. KLINK, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1118: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1123: Mr. OLVER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1144: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1145: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1169: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAFALCE, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1170: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1177: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1178: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GOODE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HILL of Montana, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. Lucas of Kentucky, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1180: Mr. DIXON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. QUINN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1187: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WU, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1193: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 1195: Mr. JOHN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1199: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1221: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1222: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1227: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1244: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1250: Mr. KING.

H.R. 1283: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1285: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1288: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1291: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WISE, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. WU, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1307: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1335: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1342: Mr. PORTER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1355: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HALL of Ohio and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1356: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1370: Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 1371: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. LAZIO.

H.J. Res. 1: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OLVER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WEINER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. GOODLING.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. BONILLA and Mr. SUNUNU.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 35: Ms. DANNER and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. LARGENT and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FRANKS, of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. DANNER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. OXLEY.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. HERGER, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. DUNN.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. MCKEON.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WISE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. FATTAH.

H. Con. Res. 82: Mr. GOODLING and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WEINER.

H. Res. 55: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H. Res. 80: Mr. GEKAS.

H. Res. 82: Mr. OLVER and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Res. 89: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. COYNE, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 94: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 472

OFFERED BY: MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 2, line 7, strike ''142'' and insert ''141''. Page 2, line 8, strike ''143'' and insert ''142''. Page 4, line 25, strike ''142'' and insert ''141''. Page 4, after line 25, strike ''143'' and insert ''142''.