



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 8, 2000

No. 55

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 8, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1452. An act to modernize the requirements under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 and to establish a balanced consensus process for the development, revision, and interpretation of Federal construction and safety standards for manufactured homes.

S. 2370. An act to designate the Federal building located at 500 Pearl Street in New York City, New York, as the "Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse".

S. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution honoring the members of the Armed Forces and Federal civilian employees who served the Nation during the Vietnam era and the families of those individuals who lost their lives or remain unaccounted for or were injured during that era in Southeast Asia or elsewhere in the world in defense of United States national security interests.

S. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution designating the week beginning on April 30, 2000, and ending on May 6, 2000, as "National Charter Schools Week".

S. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the ongoing persecution of 13 members of Iran's Jewish community.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

QUESTIONING THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ON ELIAN'S ABDUCTION

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I come to the House floor to not talk about the debate whether Elian should be reunited with his father or not. I think the majority of Americans say he should. What I am here to talk about is the constitutionality of what was done by the Justice Department, and to pose some questions and urge our leadership on this side to hold hearings.

Regrettably, the American people, the Miami relatives of Elian Gonzalez and the Congress still do not have all of the answers which led up to the events that transpired on that Easter recess by the Justice Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Madam Speaker, of course, the world has seen that famous photograph by now of an INS SWAT officer pointing an assault rifle at Elian, that assault rifle was a Heckler & Koch MP5 sub-machine gun.

The Attorney General during Easter weekend, ordered armed forces into the house of Mr. Lazaro Gonzalez in order to free Elian and reunite him with his father.

What the world, Americans and Congress do not know are the events that led up to activities that transpired during and after the government's raid on a private citizen's home, just as the Congress did in the case of the Waco and Ruby Ridge. I think it is the responsibility of this legislative branch to seek the truth and have government justify its actions in instances in which the sacred constitutional liberties of Americans have been jeopardized.

Madam Speaker, I submit this afternoon that there are many questions that still need to be answered, and we are not here to debate whether Elian should be reunited with his father. Those are answers that ultimately will be left up to the courts.

While the court struggles with the issue of immigration and family law, the Congress has the duty and responsibility to seek answers to the policies of the Justice Department that led up to the heavily armed Federal agents breaking into the house of peaceful American citizens, with agents pointing machine guns at American citizens in their own home and trashing their own home, too.

Just as important, oversight is needed to determine whether the judicial process was circumvented by the administration. Reports indicate that the nature by which the search warrants were issued were made under false pretenses. How many different judges did the administration go to before having the search warrant accepted? Did any of the judges refuse to issue a search warrant, and if so, on what grounds?

During the early days of Elian's arrival in the United States, the Justice Department and the INS were quick to point out that asylum and custody questions could only be answered in the courts.

What is the policy of the Department of Justice and INS when State courts do not agree with Federal agencies? Does the Attorney General have the

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2617

power to overrule the decisions of State courts such as ones which decide custody measures?

In addition, Madam Speaker, why was the Justice Department not willing to await the outcome of Elian's claim for asylum before the 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals? What does that say about how much weight the administration gives to our judicial branch of the government?

How will the Attorney General justify her actions if the 11th Circuit decides Elian's asylum claims are true in manners which contradict the Department's actions?

What constitutional authority does the Federal Government have in executing search warrants in cases that are not criminal? In how many other cases has the INS broken down doors and used armed agents in custody cases?

Additionally, why did the Attorney General feel compelled or pressured to use overwhelming armed force when Elian's life was not in danger?

The negotiations were still taking place at the time the INS broke down the door and trashed the Gonzalez house. Should it be the policy of the INS to present the possibilities of deadly force when confronting situations which are not criminal? Additionally, Gregory Craig, the attorney for Juan Miguel, also happened to be the attorney for the President during the impeachment trials.

Elian's Miami relatives and the American people have a right to know what role Gregory Craig played during the shaping of the Department's actions. Furthermore, what contact did the administration have with the Communist dictator Fidel Castro?

Was the President influenced by another Cuban boat lift? These are some of the questions I have, Madam Speaker. I call on Congress to hold hearings because the people across this Nation have a right to know. As Americans, we have inalienable rights to certain freedoms and protections. When government officials threaten or encroach on those rights, it is our duty to hold them responsible.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, focusing on livable communities is an opportunity for the major Presidential candidates to give citizens relief from the standard political fare by embracing a positive message: how to make our families safe, healthy, and economically secure.

One of the reasons this message has such potential for elevating the political discussion is because this is truly a national movement that is being driven at the grassroots level.

Every year it seems more State and local ballot initiatives are passed pro-

tecting open space, giving more transportation choices to our communities and controlling unplanned growth. One grassroots effort was dealt with this morning in the Washington Post describing the efforts to protect the Chesapeake Bay, one of our Nation's most cherished waterway and, sadly, Governor Gilmore of Virginia's reluctance for Virginia to provide true leadership.

For 15 years, citizens and communities across a six-State area and Federal partners and private citizens are developing solutions not necessarily to eliminate sprawl in this Chesapeake Bay watershed, but to cut it by one-third by the year 2012. The political leadership in Virginia, however, has been slow to respond and only recently provided its support for a new agreement, assuming that Virginians care less about the environment and protecting the Bay than their neighbors in the surrounding States. I think that is a sad commentary and a misreading of the citizens of Virginia.

In sharp contrast, one of the most exciting stories of regional cooperation and addressing unplanned growth is unfolding now in the Speaker's home State of Illinois. Metropolitan Chicago has a long tradition of being a leader in the heartland; its importance as a national transportation hub with the transcontinental railroads, so it is today with O'Hare Airport, the busiest in the Nation; and the important role that Chicago has played in the City Beautiful Movement at the turn of the century with the magnificent Burnham plan, one of the most influential city plans in world history, illustrating the power of planning for growth in a fashion that balanced downtown interests with open space and access to that city's majestic waterfront.

Chicago was unfortunately a leader in the consequence of unplanned growth. From 1970 to 1990, when metropolitan Chicago increased only 4 percent in population, it increased 46 percent in the urbanized area, 10 times faster than the rate of population increase and, clearly, a development pattern that is not sustainable. It has resulted in Chicago having the second longest average commute in the country, with 11 percent of its commuters traveling an hour or more each way each day.

But in keeping with the tradition of leadership, Chicago is now providing important direction on livability. I have had a chance to review the Metropolitan 2020 plan, a visionary document preparing metropolitan Chicago for the 21st century. It recalls the history and provides a vision for the future. This fascinating study is one of the best that I have seen, providing a framework for developing a regional vision of growth over the next 20 years while it recognizes the realities and challenges facing the region. It addresses the reality of the present system's inability to pave its way out of traffic congestion; the importance of the pro-

ductivity of the region's growing minority population, which will supply the majority of its future work force; the need on focusing the entire region's pool of talent to meet the specialized needs of a growing economy; and, most important, the symbiotic relationship between the suburbanites, who actually earn twice as much from their income from downtown as Chicagoans earn from suburban areas, \$14 billion versus \$21 billion.

With over 1300 units of local government and almost 70 percent of the State's population living in the metropolitan Chicago area, the Metropolitan 2020 effort is a powerful example of the potential for business and civic leaders, community leadership, and the planning profession to come together to develop solutions to guide governmental investments. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me today at 2 p.m. in SC-10 of the Capitol for a joint briefing of the Senate's Smart Growth Task Force and the Livable Communities Task Force, hearing from a group from Chicago who will give a comprehensive overview of their initiatives. They will also focus on the important role of the Federal Government in assisting the regional effort to create more livable communities.

Chicago is as good a model as we will find in an area of the country that a lot of us spend a lot of time in. It is a solution to make our communities more livable and our families safe, healthy and more economically secure.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Blessed be the God and Father of us all, Who in great mercy has given us a new birth and made us a living hope for the world.

As a nation, we have inherited great natural resources and unending principles to guide our destiny. By Your power, O God, You have safeguarded faith in Your people. You have made us ready to reveal in our time Your creativity and goodness active in us, but for the common good of all.

We rejoice in Your blessings upon this Congress and the people they represent. Even during times of various trials and moments of suffering, our gaze is fixed on You, as the source of all goodness and foundation of peace.

May genuine faith which is more precious than gold tested by fire be proven in us. Then the great tasks we undertake in Your Name may truly give You praise, glory and honor now and forever. 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 Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS 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.

PAST AND FUTURE SUCCESSES

(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, last Friday marked the 39th anniversary of the first United States space exploration mission.

On May 5, 1961 Alan B. Shepard, Jr., became the first American space explorer when he was rocketed 115 miles above the Earth's surface into space.

This feat proved to the world that the United States had the potential to become the winner in this space race.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of us to take a moment to reflect on our past accomplishments and to celebrate how far we have come since that historic flight in 1961. There are enormous possibilities for future progress and for our progress still lying ahead of us.

The continued advancement of our space program, as well as the overall development of new and innovative technologies, demand and require our support.

With the assistance of this Congress, the United States can and will remain a world leader in technological development.

A NATION BANNING GOD

(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, the courts started their assault on God by banning school prayer. The courts then banned the public display of the Christmas nativity scene. The courts then banned students from writing papers about Jesus.

Now, if that is not enough to say the devil perhaps made them do it, check

this out, the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that Ohio's motto with God all things are possible is unconstitutional.

Unbelievable Congress, what is next? Will "In God We Trust" be taken from the House Chamber? "In God We Trust" be removed from our currency? Beam me up, I say these judges make decisions while sitting on their brains.

I yield back the fact that a nation that bans God I believe promotes the devil.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, too many seniors and disabled people in this country cannot afford the prescription drugs their doctors say they need.

Seniors should never have to choose between food and medicine. This is an important issue that needs a meaningful solution, not the empty rhetoric that we are hearing from the other side.

House Republicans are proposing a plan to offer a fair and responsible drug plan that is affordable, available and voluntary to all seniors and disabled Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it will help folks to get prescription drug coverage at lower costs by creating group buying power without Washington interference or big government-style price controls.

We will reduce the runaway costs of medicine, but not with a Washington-based one-size-fits-all program that kills research and innovation of life-saving cures.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to modernize prescription drug coverage. We should all be working together on this important issue. Let us stop the partisan rhetoric and do the right thing for our seniors.

LET US WORK TO KEEP FRAUD OUT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, there are few things more important than taking care of our Nation's seniors. That means keeping the Medicare program healthy and solvent for the 39 million older Americans who depend on it.

Unfortunately, our efforts to improve Medicare will not work if we do not eliminate the waste and abuse that festers in the current programs. In FY 1998, Medicare's fee-for-service program made \$12.6 billion in improper payments. Part of the reason this waste, fraud, and abuse occurred was that the Clinton-Gore administration was careless in monitoring and oversight of Medicare payments. This neglect has created a troughful of Medicare money,

and crooks are glad to have it, to eat to their fill.

For example, a New York medical equipment company robbed Medicare of more than \$6 million. A Florida home health agency fraudulently billed Medicare for \$2.2 million.

Let us keep our seniors healthy. Let us work to keep fraud out of the Medicare program.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection and pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 89, 106th Congress, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies:

Mr. HASTERT of Illinois.

Mr. ARMEY of Texas.

Mr. GEPHARDT of Missouri.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 5, 2000 at 11:15 a.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2412.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

MARTHA C. MORRISON,
Deputy Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION OF MINIDOKA RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO, AUTHORIZATION INCREASE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3577) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the north side pumping division of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3577

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

SECTION 1. INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR MINIDOKA PROJECT, IDAHO.

Section 5 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (chapter 1114; 64 Stat. 1085), authorizing appropriations for the north side pumping division of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho, is amended by striking "\$11,395,000" and inserting "\$14,200,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. 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. 3577.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3577 is a bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the north side pumping division of the Minidoka reclamation project in Idaho.

A&B Irrigation is the contracting entity for the north side pumping division of the Minidoka project. The division, located on the southern portion of the State of Idaho, consists of some 80,000 acres. Construction of the division was completed in 1959 and control was transferred to the district in 1966.

Due to the lack of natural surface drainage outlets to the Snake River and constraints associated with the drainage onto the lower-lying Minidoka Irrigation District, most irrigation return flows and stormwater runoffs are injected into drain wells which are part of the original project design.

The drain wells pass the water directly into the underlying aquifer. In 1991, the United States Environmental Protection Agency designated the eastern Snake River plain aquifer a sole source of drinking water.

Under provisions of the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act, if a sole source of drinking water is contaminated it could result in a significant public health hazard. In an effort to comply with the Act, the district and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation developed a plan to dispose of this runoff.

The remaining work consists of constructing passive treatment and reuse systems at an estimated cost of \$2.8 million, of which up to \$1.3 million would be reimbursable to the district under a cost-sharing arrangement, 60 percent U.S. Federal Government, 40 percent irrigation, A&B irrigation.

As of now, 42 of the original 78 drain wells have been closed or abandoned,

but 36 wells are still active. This legislation would amend the original language to increase the authorization by \$2.8 million from \$11,395,000 to \$14,200,000.

In the energy and water appropriations bill for the fiscal year 2000, money was appropriated for the district to continue capping these wells in order to comply with the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act. Unfortunately, the ceiling was hit and no further funding could be used. By increasing the ceiling, the district will be able to complete its project, which in turn will help prevent the main source of drinking water from south central Idaho from being contaminated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all colleagues support H.R. 3577.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) has quite properly explained this legislation to increase the spending ceiling for the north side pumping division of the Minidoka project in Idaho by \$2,805,000. This increase would allow work already begun under the Minidoka north side drain water management plan to be completed.

We need to protect the underground drinking water supplies in this area of the Snake River plain because they are threatened by contaminated irrigation drain water. I would urge all members of the committee to support this legislation. The administration has testified in support of this legislation and it is not controversial.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. 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 Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3577.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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.

RECOGNIZING THE HERMANN MONUMENT AND HERMANN HEIGHTS PARK IN NEW ULM, MINNESOTA, AS A NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICANS OF GERMAN HERITAGE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) recognizing the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota, as a national symbol of the contributions of Americans of German heritage.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 89

Whereas there are currently more than 57,900,000 individuals of German heritage residing in the United States, who comprise nearly 25 percent of the population of the United States and are therefore the largest ethnic group in the United States;

Whereas those of German heritage are not merely descendants of one political entity, but of all German speaking areas;

Whereas numerous Americans of German heritage have made countless contributions to American culture, arts, and industry, the American military, and American government;

Whereas there is no recognized tangible, national symbol dedicated to German Americans and their positive contributions to the United States;

Whereas the story of Hermann the Cheruscan parallels that of the American Founding Fathers, because he was a freedom fighter who united ancient German tribes in order to shed the yoke of Roman tyranny and preserve freedom for the territory of present-day Germany;

Whereas the Hermann Monument located in Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota, was dedicated in 1897 in honor of the spirit of freedom and later dedicated to all German immigrants who settled in New Ulm and elsewhere in the United States; and

Whereas the Hermann Monument has been recognized as a site of special historical significance by the United States Government, by placement on the National Register of Historic Places; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota, are recognized by the Congress to be a national symbol for the contributions of Americans of German heritage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 89.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 89 introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) assures that Congress recognizes the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota, as a national symbol of German heritage.

Although there are currently almost 60 million individuals of German heritage residing in the United States, there is no recognized, tangible national symbol dedicated to German Americans and their positive contributions to American culture, arts, industry, military, and government.

1415

The Hermann Monument was erected in 1897 in honor of the spirit of freedom

and later dedicated to all German immigrants and has been placed on the National Register of Historical Places. House Concurrent Resolution 89 would recognize the achievements and contributions of Americans of German heritage at the Hermann Monument. I ask my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 89.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) would recognize the monument in New Ulm, Minnesota as a "national symbol for the contributions of Americans of German heritage." As the legislation points out, Americans of German heritage represent with one-quarter of the U.S. population, and yet there is no national symbol recognizing the contributions that have been made to this Nation.

The recognition provided by this measure is appropriate and I would like to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) for his very diligent work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that this concurrent resolution does not alter the status of the monument in any way, nor does it create any new Federal obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support it. I would again say that the effort on behalf of this legislation by the gentleman from Minnesota has really been outstanding, as many of us who serve on the committee know. He has, I think, talked to all of us individually, and to so many other Members on the floor, to bring this to the attention of the full House of Representatives. I also want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), his colleague, for his work in lobbying on behalf of this legislation to give due recognition to the contributions of Americans of German heritage. Mr. Speaker, I urge its strong support.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 89, which commemorates the many valuable contributions of German Americans to our society and culture through recognition of the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota.

House Concurrent Resolution 89 designates a national symbol for the contributions of Americans of German heritage. German-Americans make up the largest ethnic group in the United States, yet we have no tangible symbols recognizing their contributions to our society. My resolution establishes the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota as such a national symbol.

The story behind the historical figure Hermann is one of intrigue, valor and treachery that surpass any Hollywood script. Hermann was born into the nobility of the Germanic group called the Cherusker. He was sent to Rome for his formal education and military training. Hermann, then known as Arminius,

was soon noticed as a natural leader and became a general in the Roman army. So highly regarded was he that Arminius was to help lead a campaign to conquer the Germanic peoples.

Despite his years in the Roman army, Arminius still cherished the independence of the Germanic peoples. Roman occupation of modern day Germany would surely have crushed the independent tribes. Arminius returned to his Germanic heritage and persuaded the tribes to unite in order to fend off the Roman invasion. They were successful and the German people retained their freedom. The autonomy of these various regions formed the foundation of the current federal system of government in Germany. In Germany, he is still remembered as "the acknowledged liberator of the German race from Roman tyranny . . ." He symbolizes the independence of the German people.

That sense of freedom and independence stayed with the Germans for centuries. Millions of Germans came to America for opportunity, to escape economic or political oppression in their homeland and to lead a life with the freedoms guaranteed in our Constitution. As the immigrants settled throughout the country, they looked for a symbol of their heritage.

In 1885, at the Sons of Hermann Convention in Philadelphia, it was decided that a monument should be erected to honor Germans who came and helped build America. Hermann seemed the perfect symbol. Hermann was recast as a German-American symbol, representing the bravery, hard work, and unity they strived for in the New World. These immigrants found themselves in a new land, yet they remained true to their heritage. They felt pride that they had reached America, and in having established opportunity for the future.

The Hermann Monument stands at a crest of a hill overlooking the city of New Ulm and the Minnesota River Valley. To the residents of the heavily German-American New Ulm, the monument symbolizes the pride they take in their German heritage. To German-Americans scattered across the country, the Hermann Monument represents unity of the German people. The monument was built in Salem, Ohio and erected in New Ulm in 1897. This is truly a national symbol.

I would like to thank Representative JAMES HANSEN, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, for his assistance in moving this legislation. I would also like to thank Representatives GEORGE MILLER, DON YOUNG, and CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELO of the Resources Committee, for their support on this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all my colleagues support House Concurrent Resolution 89 and show their support for the contributions of German-Americans.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. 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 Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 89.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS AND TO REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1237) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit grants for the national estuary program to be used for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1237

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

SECTION 1. NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM.

(a) ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM.—Section 320(a)(2)(B) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(a)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting "Lake Ponchartrain Basin, Louisiana and Mississippi; Mississippi Sound, Mississippi;" before "and Peconic Bay, New York."

(b) GRANTS.—Section 320(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(g)) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

"(2) PURPOSES.—Grants under this subsection shall be made to pay for activities necessary for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan under this section.

"(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant to any person (including a State, interstate, or regional agency or entity) under this subsection for a fiscal year—

"(A) shall not exceed—

"(i) 75 percent of the annual aggregate costs of the development of a comprehensive conservation and management plan; and

"(ii) 50 percent of the annual aggregate costs of the implementation of the plan; and

"(B) shall be made on condition that the non-Federal share of the costs are provided from non-Federal sources."

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 320(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(i)) is amended by striking "\$12,000,000 per fiscal year for each of fiscal years 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991" and inserting "\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1237, introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), reauthorizes and improves the National Estuary Program, a broadly supported, nonregulatory approach to estuary conservation and management.

Under the current National Estuary Program, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, provides assistance to States, local governments, and other interested parties to form a management conference for an estuary of national significance and to develop a long-term management plan for that estuary.

A total of 28 estuaries are currently in the National Estuary Program, known as NEP, and an estimated \$50 billion will be needed to restore and to protect them. The majority of the estuaries in the program have already developed their long-term management plans and are now trying to implement them.

Unfortunately, the Clean Water Act, section 320, only allows Federal assistance for development of these plans and not for implementation. Passage of H.R. 1237 would authorize the Environmental Protection Agency to provide assistance for management plan implementation as well as development.

This bill is important for taking the next step to restore and protect our Nation's estuaries which provide important environmental and economic benefits to the entire Nation.

I thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, on which I serve, and their bipartisan leadership on both the full committee and the subcommittee. They deserve our thanks for their assistance in bringing this bill to the floor for action.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the passage of H.R. 1237, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1237, to amend and reauthorize the Environmental Protection Agency's National Estuary Program.

Estuaries and coastal environments are precious natural resources that need to be restored and protected. They provide essential habitat for numerous fish and wildlife especially suited for life at the shore. In addition, estuaries provide important recreation areas, transportation linkages, and sources of residential and industrial water supplies vital to the needs of this country.

Recognizing the importance of estuary areas, in 1987 Congress amended the Clean Water Act to establish the National Estuary Program to promote comprehensive planning for long-term protection of our Nation's estuaries. This program authorized funding for the development of Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans for estuaries of national significance.

Currently, 28 estuaries have been incorporated into the National Estuary Program. Of this number, 21 have completed the developments of their CCMPs and have begun implementation of the conservation plans. Funding for implementation has been provided

predominantly by State and local organizations. Only limited Federal funds have been provided through the annual appropriation process since 1998.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation under consideration today would amend the National Estuary Program to specifically authorize Federal funds for use in implementation of the CCMPs. H.R. 1237 would reauthorize the NEP through fiscal year 2004, and raise the authorization level to \$50 million per year to ensure that greater funding is available for implementation of the management plans.

In addition, H.R. 1237, as amended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, would authorize two additions to the list of estuaries eligible for priority consideration under the NEP. This would permit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to begin the process of developing CCMPs for the Mississippi Sound and the Lake Pontchartrain Basin. I want to commend our committee colleagues, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) for their work on this issue.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for their willingness to address the issue of treatment works as defined by the Clean Water Act and the application of section 513.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and urge its approval.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI). He has always been constructive and he has done a great job as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment. And I certainly thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the full committee, and I think we all thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for their very precise and hard-fought efforts for this very worthwhile legislation.

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of H.R. 1237. This bipartisan bill has great benefits to the people in my home State and I urge my colleagues to support it. H.R. 1237 reauthorizes the National Estuary Program, or NEP, which in turn provides desperately needed grants to improve the habitat, water quality and diverse plant and wildlife that depend on our Nation's estuaries.

In Oregon, the NEP has included the Lower Columbia River Estuary. Because of the NEP, the citizens businesses and governments of Oregon have been able to focus on the 146 miles of tidally influenced waters below the Bonneville Dam. The NEP requires the estuaries to create a management plan. The Co-

lumbia River plan defines specific actions for habitat, land use, and conventional and toxic pollutants. This common sense measure will serve fish and wildlife habitat and water quality in three important ways: prevention of further loss, protection and enhancement of existing resources, and restoration where damage has already occurred.

Mr. Speaker, one-in-six jobs in Oregon depends on the Columbia River. This magnificent river is home to many diverse animals and plants. In the Northwest we are faced with the challenge in ensuring that several of these species of plants and animals do not go extinct. Furthermore, in many of these resource-based communities, it is additionally challenging to ensure that the economies are developed and have a voice in the protection of their estuary.

With participation in the NEP, the Lower Columbia River Estuary Program has analyzed the problems with the estuary and has developed recommendations for dealing with them. Whether it is preserving the biological integrity of the estuary, mitigating the impacts of human activity and growth, controlling the entrance of conventional and toxic pollutants or engaging in public awareness, the NEP assists Oregon and other communities like it around the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1237.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work and dedication to the National Estuary Program (NEP) and their support of reauthorization of H.R. 1237 with the requested amount of funding. H.R. 1237, which I introduced, will reauthorize the NEP at \$50 million annually for FY 2000 through FY 2004 and allow Federal funds to be used for implementation, in addition to development of Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans (CCMPs).

Congress recognized the importance of preserving and enhancing coastal environments with the establishment of the National Estuary Program, as section 320 of the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1987. This popular program has not been authorized since 1991, but appropriately continues to be funded. The NEP's purpose is to facilitate state and local governments' preparation of "Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans" (CCMPs) for threatened and impaired estuaries.

In support of this effort, section 320 authorizes the EPA to make grants to States to develop CCMPs for 30 designated estuaries across the country. While the NEP has been successful in developing these CCMPs (20 of which have been completed), the law does not authorize appropriations for implementation of the CCMPs—a deficiency which threatens to slow our progress in restoring these estuaries.

My own State of New Jersey has three approved sites in the NEP, one of which, Barnegat Bay, lies primarily within my District. The Barnegat Bay watershed drains from a land area of approximately 550 square miles.

Over 450,000 people live within the Barnegat Bay watershed. That population doubles in the summer as people flock to the shore. The continued economic health of the Barnegat Bay watershed is dependent on the continued health and natural beauty of its waters. The Barnegat Bay Estuary is not only a

vital component of New Jersey's tourist industry, but is an important natural resource that supports populations of commercially and recreationally significant fish and rare and endangered species.

Non-point source pollution, while diffuse, is cumulatively the most important issue in addressing adverse impacts on water quality and the health of living resources in the Bay. The contaminants found in rain and snowmelt, as well as groundwater, contribute to non-point source pollution. The Final Comprehensive and Conservation Management Plan for Barnegat Bay will be available to the public in May 2000 for public review. But without the additional funding for this program, as well as explicitly permitting the NEPs to use Federal funds for implementation of their programs, the Federal government would have absolved itself of responsibility as a partner with the states in protecting and enhancing the Nation's most endangered habitats.

Therefore, I would like to thank my colleagues for supporting this important bill and protecting our Nation's natural resources for future generations.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1237, the National Estuary Program (NEP) Reauthorization. In 1987, the National Estuary Program was established to promote protection and restoration of the health of estuaries and their living resources. This program has made a profound difference nationally. This program has been tremendously important to the restoration of Galveston Bay which borders my district in Texas.

In 1995, the Galveston Bay Estuary Program (GBEP) received approval for its Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) to improve water quality and enhance living resources. Galveston Bay's watershed lies in one of the most heavily industrialized and most heavily populated regions in the United States. Wastewater discharges from communities and industries in Galveston Bay account fully for half of Texas' total wastewater discharges every year. Since some pollution entering the Houston Ship Channel comes from industrial businesses located along or near the Channel, GBEP worked with the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission to decrease the amount of pollution through source reduction and waste minimization techniques. Together they developed one of the largest voluntary prevention programs in the country. Under this program, businesses located along or near the Channel are selected to voluntarily participate in environmental training and to submit to pollution prevention audits. Lessons learned from GBEP's voluntary program have been incorporated into the State's Clean Texas 2000 program.

GBEP has funded the Galveston Bay Foundation (GBF) Volunteer Water Quality Monitoring Program to not only monitor water quality but also recruit and train volunteers, obtain and distribute monitoring supplies and equipment. GBEP has also developed the Galveston Bay Information Center Project, a vital project to preserve long-term access to Galveston Bay research and information had occurred in the Bay's history.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the National Estuary Program has been instrumental in preserving and protecting America's treasured bays and estuaries including Galveston Bay. This legislation should be adopted.

I challenge my colleagues who support reauthorization of this vital program to take the next step to protect the almost 40 percent of our Nation's estuary waters under threat. I urge you to sign on as sponsors of H.R. 1775, the Estuary Habitat Restoration Act of 1999. To date, this legislation, which Representative GILCHREST of Maryland introduced last May along with myself and many others now has 121 cosponsors. The legislation would provide dedicated Federal funds to habitat restoration for estuaries like Galveston Bay. Moreover, H.R. 1775 would enhance the work of the National Estuary Program by developing new ways to optimize the numerous existing Federal restoration programs. It also promotes voluntary community estuary restoration efforts and the establishment of public-private partnerships to work with community-based organizations and local governments to protect estuaries.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1237 and reauthorize this vital national program for another five years. We must strive to promote efforts on the local level to develop and implement long-term estuary conservation and management plans.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1237, introduced by Representative JIM SAXTON, would reauthorize and improve the National Estuary Program, a broadly supported, comprehensive approach to estuary conservation and management.

I want to thank the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BUD SHUSTER, Ranking Democratic Members Representative JIM OBERSTAR, and BOB BORSKI, the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee Ranking Democratic Member, for their leadership and assistance.

Under the current National Estuary Program, EPA provides assistance to State, local governments, and other interested parties to form a management conference for an estuary of national significance, and develop a comprehensive conservation and management plan for that estuary.

Of the 28 estuaries currently in the National Estuary Program, 21 have finished this planning process and are now trying to implement their management plans.

Unfortunately, section 320 only allows Federal assistance for development of these plans, and not for implementation.

Passage of H.R. 1237 would authorize EPA to provide assistance for management plan implementation, as well as development.

This bill will help protect and restore our Nation's estuaries—those natural resource treasures that are constantly under siege, yet continue to provide invaluable environmental and economic benefits to the entire Nation.

I strongly support passage of H.R. 1237 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. HORN. 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 California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1237, 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1237, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NECESSITY TO EXPEDITE SETTLEMENT PROCESS FOR DISCRIMINATION CLAIMS AGAINST DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BROUGHT BY AFRICAN-AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 296) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the necessity to expedite the settlement process for discrimination claims against the Department of Agriculture brought by African-American farmers.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 296

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has conceded that the Department of Agriculture and agents of the Department discriminated against certain African-American farmers during the period from 1981 through 1996 in the delivery of Commodity Credit Corporation and disaster assistance programs;

Whereas, to permit the resolution of complaints that were filed by these farmers before July 1, 1997, but not responded to by the Department of Agriculture in a timely manner, section 741 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681-30; 7 U.S.C. 2279 note; as contained in section 101(a) of division A of Public Law 105-277), waived relevant statutes of limitation that prevented the adjudication of these complaints;

Whereas, on April 14, 1999, United States District Judge Paul Friedman issued a final opinion and order that finalized class action lawsuits filed by African-American farmers;

Whereas the farmers were ordered to file claims to determine their eligibility for the settlement ordered by the court;

Whereas the court has set and the Secretary of Agriculture has entered into a final settlement consent decree that has become the order of the court;

Whereas, once a claimant is deemed to be a member of the class and has proven discrimination, the claimant is entitled to the settlement set forth by the consent decree; and

Whereas the large volume of claims filed as ordered by the court have severely delayed

the settlement process as defined by the consent decree: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture, the Attorney General, and the adjudicator and facilitator named in the consent decree should strictly follow the consent decree, commit the resources necessary to expedite the settlement process, and ensure that settlements are reached in an expeditious manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

1430

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 296.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) be allowed to control the time allotted to the majority.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue involving the plight of the black farmers and their efforts to get reparations in their farming activities from the Department of Agriculture.

I started this project in 1993 when, at the time I started getting complaints, it was my first year in office, and I started getting complaints from black farmers to such a degree that I said we must have some type of public hearing for this. I asked then-Secretary of Agriculture Mike Espy to come to Pine Bluff, Arkansas and hold a black farmers seminar. That was held.

Mikes were set up all over the auditorium, and story after story after story came to us of the plight of the black farmers and how they had been discriminated against. It was such a big task at that time that we fell back to handling it case by case in what we call casework.

Since then, I had gone to five, six, seven different meetings of the black farmers in three different cities. I have listened to what they have had to say, and I have tried to bring their concerns up here to Washington.

It was not, though, until the lawsuit called Pigford versus Glickman that brought about progress. But then, in the meeting of January 8 of this year, a particular person stood up. We had

another meeting. The mikes were still there. I was the only elected official present. One black farmer stood up. He was bawling. He was maybe 70 years old, 75, and he said, "Mr. Dickey, I want you to know something. I wanted you to know how difficult it is to even hold out hope." He said, "We have fought. We have tried to be in the farming industry for years and years and years. We have had our problems; there is no question about that. But we have also seen that we have been stopped from getting the full benefits from our government through the USDA.

"We then were told that we could bring this lawsuit, and we signed up, assigning some hope to it, only to find out that, once the lawsuit was won, that we are now facing the same people who used to discriminate against us in the first place to administer the lawsuit." He said, "It is just hard sometimes to get your hopes up."

I am seeing today that this concurrent resolution is answering the call of this man. It is saying that the legislative branch is coming out in agreement that the court decree needs to be followed, it needs to be followed quickly. We do not need to have any further reasons for a delay. Some of the reasons for delay now are that the USDA and the structure that is set in the administration, the structure that is set up to try to help the black farmers have, in fact, added another layer, and that is an investigation by the FBI.

What has occurred in response to this man who stood up and said it is hard to keep hope, what has occurred is the presumption has gone from all of the claims are proper, maybe some are not, to the presumption that all the claims were not proper and maybe some are. The delays are unbelievable.

I have been asked by the USDA to go over and talk to the people who are making the investigations to tell them how important it is. I got to stand before them and hear their stories. They had planned for some 3,000 petitions, and they got almost 20,000 petitions.

This is the sort of thing that was supposed to be handled by the court decree. Liquidated damages were given to each farmer who attempted or did farm and was discriminated against. It was supposed to be liquidated damages, which means there is not any proof needed except to prove the existence of the farming intent or the presence.

They have gone through delay after delay after delay after delay. Now we come to the concurrent resolution, which may not be the strongest thing that we could do, but, timewise, we thought it was the best. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and I have looked at this thing and said this is probably the best.

Now, that man who stood there on January 8 and said what he had to say is, again, seeing a frustration, and that is that people who should be helping are now objecting to this concurrent resolution.

I have instructed my office to contact every member of the Black Caucus. We have the name, the telephone number, the time we called. Every office has been contacted, asking them, can you support this. If not, what do you have as an alternative?

I believe, as they have stated before, that they are going to object to this resolution because it has some political overtones, or because it might not be as strong as it could be. Well, I am going to have to go back to that gentleman who stood up and said we have got even further delays. Rather than having a stamp of approval on the actions of the court as directed to the administration, we are going to have a defeat, if it happens, of our effort to try to get support.

I want my colleagues to know that the black farmers at home are in complete agreement with what I am saying here today. There has been some controversy, but the controversy has been created outside of the black farmers. They know who has been there. They know who is assigned the staff. They know who has been trying to help.

This is a press release that they issued Saturday. "The Executive Director of the Arkansas Chapter of Black Farmers and Agriculturalists Association today are calling for all Members of the United States House of Representatives to support the black farmers resolution," H. Con. Res. 296, "introduced by Congressman J.C. WATTS and Congressman JAY DICKEY."

"Those of us who are affected by Pigford v. Glickman believe that the resolution will get us closer to our goal of getting all rightful claims approved and paid. 'Some may say that Congressman DICKEY is presenting this legislation to save himself, but for us, he has already proven himself to be willing to be a true representative for the people in his district,' said Fernando Burkett. 'We want to commend Congressman JAY DICKEY for this effort and we challenge Arkansas' other representatives to show their support by signing onto this legislation. This challenge is also extended to all other Members of Congress who say that they are concerned about the plight of the black farmer.'

"The Arkansas Chapter will not allow our efforts to be politicized in this election year. We are asking for, and it is critical that we receive bipartisan sponsorship on this issue across America. Those who would object and condemn those who are trying to help us have not to this day offered an alternative to Congressman DICKEY'S Concurrent Resolution. We have no choice but to support those who are trying to help us. Even though some may say the help is small, it is better than no help at all!" said Burkett. "To us the issue is not Democrat or Republican. The real issue is who is doing, who is helping, who is fighting for what is right!"

So we have placed before the black farmers another obstacle, and that is

that there might be some political reasons for the efforts that are being done. But the black farmers know and they have asked me to concoct all the things that I have done.

They know what is on this list. They know I worked to get the statute of limitations extended so that the farmers would not be precluded from asking for their help. They know that I have aggressively sought after and sought after protecting their rights through casework and through solicitations up here. They know that I have supported an increase of \$10 million for section 2501. It provides small farmers assistance in filing these claims.

They know that I have met with the Secretary of Agriculture, I have met with the monitor, I have met with the litigators, I have met with all of the people that are involved in this sort of thing. So they know that, and that is why this particular endorsement is so significant.

I would wish those people who want to curse the darkness and not light a candle would come talk to our farmers in Arkansas and find out how they feel. I think it is all over the Nation. We must pursue this. We must pass this so that they can keep going.

Now my colleagues may say, well, what difference does it make? I am on the Committee on Appropriations, and I have pledged to the black farmers that, if I can get the support of the Members of Congress up here, if I can, that I will go and try to get increased funds for the investigation of these claims so that we can hurry them up.

At one point, it was stated that there was not enough time, that the money was too scarce, and that the budget was in jeopardy; and that is the reason why they had to slow down.

I went over and said that I would pledge whatever I could to do that. This is how critical it is, if we had this vote, and this concurrent resolution in support of the black farmers is, in fact, defeated, then I do not know how we can go and ask for additional appropriations. All we can do then is just wait for the members of the Black Caucus to give us an alternative or the members of the Democratic Party.

Our farmers just this Saturday went to visit a representative of the Black Caucus who came to Arkansas. They thought he is going to come, we are going to have bipartisan support, which we have been trying to get all this time, and he is going to help. It turned out that that was not the case, that he came and asked them to do some political chores that they said they could not do at this time. So there is hope dashed again for the black farmers.

I just hope, Mr. Speaker, that today we would honor the intent of the court decree, we will honor the effort of these farmers who have, all these years, tried to stay in the profession, tried to stay in farming, and have been, by court order, found to be discriminated against.

We ask, through this resolution, the administration to please comply with the court order expeditiously so that we can, in fact, bring this to a close and solve the problems that have existed for all these years for the black farmers.

One other thought that I want to state, this is not the only discrimination that exists. If people think that we can just abandon this whole idea once we pay the \$50,000 to those people who are worthy of it, abandon the idea that there is no more discrimination, that is not the case. There still is. These black farmers still need a listening ear. They need somebody who will listen and will react. That is another reason why I say vote for the concurrent resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the time allocated to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) will be controlled by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the plane of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) is late, and I am pleased to manage on my side and in his absence.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express some concerns regarding this resolution. H. Con. Res. 296 is offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WATTS), which attempts to express the sense of this Congress regarding their urgency to expedite the settlement process for the Pigford Black Farmer class action suit that has been filed against the Federal government. No one can disagree with the essential concept of this resolution when more than 9,000 claims remain unresolved.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, when all the claims are settled in accordance with the Pigford consent decree, an estimated \$2 billion will be expended to redress past discrimination in agricultural lending and program benefits. But outreach and technical assistance funding for future needs will remain inadequate.

I do want to indicate that this consent decree is the result of a bill that was introduced by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who also cannot be here; and that were it not for the Congressional Black Caucus, this consent decree could not have gotten through. It was the energy and the determination of the Congressional Black Caucus that made that consent decree possible. It was the Congressional Black Caucus that got the time extended so that these farmers could, indeed, file for these claims, if there is any dispute about what members of the Caucus have done.

Regardless of what we do or say in this resolution, it is questionable whether USDA, Justice or the monitor can legally expedite the settlement

process where denials can be overturned due to rushed or inadequate decisions.

Although I do have some appreciation for the concept between H. Con. Res. 296, we question the sincerity of the efforts to help keep African American farmers on their land as well as to help them remain competitive in production agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, all of us who are familiar with production agriculture under the current economic conditions of low commodity prices recognize that farmers need to modernize operations in order to make a profit. Most of our farmers cannot afford to modernize without having an extension of credit.

The extension of credit was a major issue in the Pigford class action suit. Under the factual background section of the Pigford's court's opinion, Judge Freidman said, "It is of utmost importance that credit and benefit applications be processed quickly, or the farmers will lose all or most of the anticipated income for the entire year." Further, Judge Friedman said that "it does a farmer no good to receive a loan to buy seeds after the planting season is past."

In the Pigford class action, there was sufficient facts to support a finding that Federal employees discriminated against African American farmers when they denied, delayed, or otherwise frustrated the loan applications of those farmers.

1445

Therefore, it is clear that the evenhanded extension of agricultural credit is the main issue that this resolution should address.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, none of the language in H. Con. Res. 296 makes a specific reference to discrimination in the agricultural lending process; therefore, it cannot express the sense of Congress regarding the expedited settlement of this class action suit.

The Commodity Credit Corporation and disaster assistance program language of paragraph two of this resolution should not be linked to credit in a meaningful way to adequately express Congress' resolve to alleviate lending discrimination that affects farmers.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress really wants to help African American farmers stay on their land and be productive, we should fully fund section 2501, the outreach and technical assistance program for minority and limited resource farmers and ranchers. This program provides assistance with loan applications and farm implementation plans so that these African American farmers can effectively demonstrate their ability to handle cash flow if they receive a loan from USDA's Farm Service Agency.

My colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY), is a sponsor of this resolution. The gentleman from Arkansas is a member of the House Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the

Committee on Appropriations that funds the section 2501 program. It would be interesting to know whether the gentleman from Arkansas would support the full funding of this program in an effort to provide some real meaning to this resolution. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, let me from the outset associate myself with my colleague's comments in opposition to this sense of Congress resolution.

This sense of Congress resolution produces a cruel hoax on African American farmers in this country. Those of us who have labored very diligently trying to get relief, to no avail under the last two Congresses, really got to the point of having to go to court rather than an administrative remedy. But as I look at House Concurrent Resolution 296, it provides no relief, no direction, nothing other than some comfort or cover for Members of Congress when they have not done the representative acts that they should in their respective districts.

The 2501 program, which was a program specifically designed for outreach for African American farmers, languishes in the administration's budget and it is constantly opposed by members of the other side on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. I challenge the supporters of this amendment to provide the necessary monies so that outreach and other things can be complemented rather than curtailed.

If we look at the Department of Agriculture and its historic discrimination against African American farmers, this sense of Congress resolution addresses none of those past discriminations. The last plantation is still the last plantation. Employees of the Department of Agriculture continue to pose a problem for many borrowers of color. This resolution is a hollow effort to try to correct some political missteps made by my colleague from Arkansas. This is not the way to do it. The way to do it is to provide in appropriation language monies necessary to assist these black farmers who have proven the historic discrimination.

In addition to this, John Boyd, President of the National Black Farmers Union, said that should kill this resolution. It did not and will not do anything for African American farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the other issue that I want to bring before my colleagues today is the notion that the Congressional Black Caucus labored long and hard trying to get support from this body on behalf of African American farmers. It was only with the help of the President and some Members on the Republican side, not the sponsors of this sense of Congress resolution that we were able to get language in-

serted in the last two appropriation bills allowing for lawsuits to be brought on behalf of black farmers. It was only because we were able to get the language inserted that we were able to bring suit and the farmers, through the help of Judge Friedman, received some support.

But it is still very difficult, Mr. Speaker. Sure, there are problems associated with the lawsuit, but it is because of a cumbersome government, a government that continues to only work for those who have when it should work for those who have not. This sense of Congress resolution does not get at the heart of the problem at the Department of Agriculture. We still have 14,000 employees who work for the Department of Agriculture who are paid by Federal dollars yet they are not Federal employees.

We have three personnel systems operating within the Department of Agriculture. So, clearly, we have a problem with the Department of Agriculture that no sense of Congress resolution can correct. We need legislation making sure that all the employees who work for the Department of Agriculture are, in fact, in one personnel system, unlike the three personnel systems that we have now.

We also need legislation, Mr. Speaker, that will also look at the discrimination that has gone on historically. We need to fully fund the civil rights division of the Department of Agriculture. As my colleagues know, this division was dismantled for a number of years and it was only because the Congressional Black Caucus fought that we did put monies back into the Department of Civil Rights in the Department of Agriculture.

There are a number of other problems associated with this resolution, Mr. Speaker. It is called too little, too late. It cannot be decided, after people have lost their land, some have even, because of stress associated with land loss, died, now provide a sense of Congress resolution that is really a Band-Aid on a cancer. What we need is comprehensive legislation to address the black land loss issues in this country, to look at the systemic discrimination continuing to exist in the Department of Agriculture, and the full funding of the outreach programs necessary for African American farmers in this country to be viable.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not in the best interest of African American farmers. All of us are interested in making sure that all Americans benefit from the goodness of this country, but to now decide at this late juncture, when the gates are open, when all the livestock has been gone, the land is sold, to decide to come here with a sense of Congress resolution is not where we should be.

I challenge my colleagues who are supporting this sense of Congress resolution to help join the Congressional Black Caucus in fashioning comprehensive legislation that will really provide

long-term relief for the African American farmers in this country and not a Band-Aid just to get by this election cycle.

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

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand I have 8½ minutes remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman is correct.

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

I want to say quickly that I agree with what the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) says to a very large degree. I have been involved in this, as I said, since 1993. I have heard the complaints straight on. I have not known how to handle them. It has been only since 1995 that I have been on the Committee on Appropriations.

I will say that I have voted for everything they have mentioned. I voted for 2501, I voted for the statute of limitations, I voted for every other measure in the appropriations subcommittee, every one, and not one time has any member of the Black Caucus come to my office and asked me to help in any way.

I want my colleagues all to know that I am available. If it is necessary for me to come to the Black Caucus, like I have tried to do on this resolution to ask my colleagues to help on this, I will come. We have to find a solution.

My problem is it looks like there is some kind of qualification as to who can help the black farmers in the minds of the opposition to this and who cannot. I understand that I am a Republican and I am a white person, but I am also concerned and I have been active, as this list shows, in trying to be an advocate for the black farmers in their dilemma.

I have said before, and I will say it again, that it is not something that we can say we are going to handle just with this lawsuit and settling it. We have to move forward and get complete cooperation. I want to find a way. I waited a long time before filing this resolution. I was waiting for the Black Caucus or anybody else who is interested, any Member of the Democrat or Republican Party to come forward with some kind of idea. No idea has come forward. So we are now cursing the darkness again and not lighting the candle.

I will pledge my time, my energy, and my position on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations to push as hard as I can, no matter what the results of this might be, for the black farmers.

I want to answer the question about political missteps. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) said I have made political missteps. That is only in his eyes. I will read again from the Black Farmers and Agriculturalists Association release. These are the people I spoke before. I spoke for about 45

minutes. I stayed there after that and took casework and everything else. There was not a problem then. But, again, for some reason, somehow the fact I would make statements to the people who I was closest to, and who they were the closest to as far as an elected official, it has been called a political misstep.

"The Executive Director of the Arkansas Chapter Black Farmers & Agriculture Association today are calling for all Members of the United States House of Representatives to support the black farmers resolution introduced by Congressman J.C. WATTS and Congressman JAY DICKEY.

"Those of us who are affected by *Pigford v. Glickman* believe the resolution will get us closer to our goal of getting all rightful claims approved and paid. 'Some may say Congressman DICKEY is presenting this legislation to save himself, but for us, he has already proven himself to be willing to be a true representative for the people in his district,' said Fernando Burkett. 'We want to commend Congressman DICKEY for this effort and we challenge Arkansas' other representatives to show their support by signing onto this legislation. This challenge is also extended to all other Members of Congress who say that they are concerned about the plight of the black farmer.'

"The Arkansas Chapter will not allow our efforts to be politicized in this election year. We are asking for and it is critical that we receive bipartisan sponsorship on this issue across America. Those who would object and condemn those who are trying to help us have not to this day offered an alternative to Congressman DICKEY's resolution. We have no choice but to support those who are trying to help us. 'Even though some may say the help is small, it is better than no help at all,' says Burkett. 'To us the issue is not Republican or Democrat. The real issue is who is doing, who is helping, who is fighting for what is right.'

And what this statement says, I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), is that these people are recognizing that the person who is standing up for them is doing it for what is right, not because it is political. There is no political gain in this from the standpoint of trying to get help for the black farmers, for me or for anybody else at this point, because it is beyond politics. It is that serious a problem.

1500

And I pledge, I ask for help. I would like for my colleague to communicate. I have asked him to support this. He said he did not know about the resolution. I tried to get a copy to him. When I talked to him at the airport, he said he had not read it yet.

As far as John Boyd is concerned, he is a member of another organization. He is not involved. He has never been to any of the five or six meetings that I have been to. He has never seen what

it is like in Arkansas. He does not know what motivates me to try to help.

Even though John Boyd has been in my office, we have had our picture taken together, he asked me for a favor even, and I did it because we had something in common. John Boyd does not have a problem with me or he would not have come to my office, he would not have had his picture made with me. We have talked about it because we have something in common.

So what is the deal? Why are we going to let this become a public record where we have rejected the pleas of the black farmers? As stated by this letter, we rejected their plea for help that someone please and come and help them, no matter what it might be to support those who are trying to help us. It is better than no help at all.

All they see and all they hear in this effort on behalf of the Black Caucus and other people is that this is just one more reason for them to hear the word "no." "No." "No." "No."

What we can do is if we can work together, we can work through the appropriations process through the Committee on Agriculture and everybody else, we can work through all of those if we will just get together.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the time remaining and to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) reclaims her time and yields to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the sense of Congress regarding it necessary to expedite the settlement process for discrimination claims against USDA brought by black farmers.

This resolution is well intended. However, much more needs to be done.

Mr. Speaker, in 1997, following four decades of systemic discrimination at USDA, black farmers from throughout the Nation consolidated their claims of discrimination into one class action lawsuit. In that lawsuit, *Pigford v. Glickman*, the lead plaintiff was from my congressional district.

On January 5, 1999, the plaintiff entered into a 5-year consent decree with USDA. The Court approved the settlement on April 14, 1999.

Since that time, we have had reason to be hopeful and reason to be fearful. We are hopeful because, after months and months of discussion and negotiations, the name plaintiff's case, *Mr. Pigford's*, has been settled.

Yet we are fearful, because more than a year after the Court approved

the settlement, thousands of cases have not yet been adjudicated.

That fact alone makes this resolution somewhat useful. We are hopeful because more than 8,000 cases have been upheld by the adjudicator. Yet, we are fearful because almost 40 percent of the cases have been denied.

We are hopeful because more than \$200 million has been paid to claimants. Yet, we are fearful because only a little more than 4,000 claimants have been paid thus far.

Indeed, USDA, in its April 2000 report, *Commitment to Progress*, acknowledged that there has been some difficulty in coordinating payments and that, in some cases, payments have been delayed.

We are hopeful because the adjudicator has identified more than 2,000 loans for cancellation. Yet, we are fearful because, to date, less than 150 of those loans have actually been canceled although promised. We are fearful because only three of Track B claims, the major claims, have been tried.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that our fear outweighs our hope. It greatly concerns me, and it should greatly concern each of us as well that in my home State of North Carolina, much like every State where farming is a way of life, there has been a 64 percent decline in minority farmers in just over 15 years, from 6,996 in 1978 to 2,498 farms in 1992.

Black farmers are declining at three times the rate of white farmers.

There are several reasons why the number of black farmers are declining so rapidly. But the one that has been documented time and time again is the discriminatory environment present in the Department of Agriculture, the very agent established to accommodate and assist the special needs of farmers.

The plight of the black farmer in America is a plight that has been fueled by the sting of discrimination. Once land is lost, it is very, very difficult to recover. And land has been lost by black farmers and black families.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult enough for small farmers to eke out an existence in this time of inclement weather, economic downturns, and big farm takeovers. This difficult situation should not be made more difficult by discrimination rearing its ugly head.

When the history of this century is written, it is my hope that the year 2000 will be recorded as significant in the effort to change the course and the culture of the United States Department of Agriculture and the muddled legacy that it has left for black farmers.

This resolution is a step, perhaps, well-intended in the right direction, but it is a very, very limited step.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs.

CLAYTON) for her statements. And I think those are the reasons why I have gotten involved. It has taken me a longer time to learn that than she has. But since 1993, I have been listening, I have been meeting, I have been listening, I have been talking, I have been trying to find out. Now what we have is one last plea on my part on behalf of the black farmers.

My statement of January 8 was we cannot proceed any further without my colleagues in Congress being supportive of this effort. If we vote this concurrent resolution down, we are going to be changing it from legislative remedies to political, and I beg my colleagues not to do that.

These black farmers have not, in any way, done anything to deserve this, to be considered a political football, that someone has to be of a certain party or had to be a certain type of person to be able to bring something like this. It is a legislative matter. It is brought so that we can show concurrence. That is what it is.

I plead with my colleagues to let this pass so that we can, at least, say we are in unity with the black farmers. And then we can go forward from there. If we take it away from that, from being legislative, and we make it political and say, no, sir, we are not going to do this because somebody may get credit or can blame somebody else, then the black farmers are going to get a no in the same way that they have been getting noes for years and years and years. A no is a no, no matter what we say to it.

I think it would be a real disservice to their commitment and to their sacrifice for us to say no to them again. I plead with my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today the House will be considering House Concurrent Resolution 296, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the settlement process for discrimination claims brought by African-American farmers against the Department of Agriculture be carried out in a timely and expeditious manner.

The Secretary of Agriculture has conceded that the Department of Agriculture discriminated against certain African-American farmers in the delivery of payments from the Commodity Credit Corporation and disaster assistance programs during the period from 1981 through 1996. This discrimination has had a significant impact on the lives and economic well-being of these African-American farmers and their families.

A Federal District Court Judge ruled in April, 1999, that these African-American farmers, as a result of this discrimination, are entitled to settlement from the Department of Agriculture. However, even a year later, these claims have not been addressed by the Department of Agriculture in a timely manner. These settlements are desperately needed and much-deserved. The Court-mandated funds will help these farmers recover their losses due to this discrimination and provide them with the financial means to get back on their feet.

I rise in strong support of this resolution and I would like to thank Representative DICKEY for

his efforts to ensure that these claims are dealt with fairly and expeditiously. I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in urging the Department of Agriculture to expedite the settlement process and commit the necessary resources to assist these farmers.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that their remarks are to be directed to the Chair and not in the second person to other Members of the House.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY), that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 296.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 296.

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

There was no objection.

SOUTHEAST FEDERAL CENTER PUBLIC-PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3069) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to provide for redevelopment of the Southeast Federal Center in the District of Columbia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3069

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 "Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Development Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. SOUTHEAST FEDERAL CENTER DEFINED.

In this Act, the term "Southeast Federal Center" means the site in the southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia that is under the control and jurisdiction of the General Services Administration and extends from Issac Hull Avenue on the east to 1st Street on the west, and from M Street on the north to the Anacostia River on the south, excluding an area on the river at 1st Street owned by the District of Columbia and a building west of Issac Hull Avenue and south of Tingey Street under the control and jurisdiction of the Department of the Navy.

SEC. 3. SOUTHEAST FEDERAL CENTER DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services may enter into agreements (includ-

ing leases, contracts, cooperative agreements, limited partnerships, joint ventures, trusts, and limited liability company agreements) with a private entity to provide for the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, operation, maintenance, or use of the Southeast Federal Center, including improvements thereon, or such other activities related to the Southeast Federal Center as the Administrator considers appropriate.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—An agreement entered into under this section—

(1) shall have as its primary purpose enhancing the value of the Southeast Federal Center to the United States;

(2) shall be negotiated pursuant to such procedures as the Administrator considers necessary to ensure the integrity of the selection process and to protect the interests of the United States;

(3) may provide a lease option to the United States, to be exercised at the discretion of the Administrator, to occupy any general purpose office space in a facility covered under the agreement;

(4) shall not require, unless specifically determined otherwise by the Administrator, Federal ownership of a facility covered under the agreement after the expiration of any lease of the facility to the United States;

(5) shall describe the consideration, duties, and responsibilities for which the United States and the private entity are responsible;

(6) shall provide—

(A) that the United States will not be liable for any action, debt, or liability of any entity created by the agreement; and

(B) that such entity may not execute any instrument or document creating or evidencing any indebtedness unless such instrument or document specifically disclaims any liability of the United States under the instrument or document; and

(7) shall include such other terms and conditions as the Administrator considers appropriate.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—An agreement entered into under this section shall be for fair consideration, as determined by the Administrator. Consideration under such an agreement may be provided in whole or in part through in-kind consideration. In-kind consideration may include provision of space, goods, or services of benefit to the United States, including construction, repair, remodeling, or other physical improvements of Federal property, maintenance of Federal property, or the provision of office, storage, or other usable space.

(d) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—In carrying out an agreement entered into under this section, the Administrator is authorized to convey interests in real property, by lease, sale, or exchange, to a private entity.

(e) OBLIGATIONS TO MAKE PAYMENTS.—Any obligation to make payments by the Administrator for the use of space, goods, or services by the General Services Administration on property that is subject to an agreement under this section may only be made to the extent that necessary funds have been made available, in advance, in an annual appropriations Act, to the Administrator from the Federal Buildings Fund established by section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)).

(f) NATIONAL CAPITOL PLANNING COMMISSION.—

(1) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority of the National Capital Planning Commission with respect to the Southeast Federal Center.

(2) VISION PLAN.—An agreement entered into under this section shall ensure that redevelopment of the Southeast Federal Center is consistent, to the extent practicable (as determined by the Administrator), with the objectives of the National Capital Planning Commission's vision plan entitled "Extending the Legacy: Planning America's Capital in the 21st Century", adopted by the Commission in November 1997.

(g) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authority of the Administrator under this section shall not be subject to—

(A) section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b);

(B) sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483, 484);

(C) section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 606(a)); or

(D) any other provision of law (other than Federal laws relating to environmental and historic preservation) inconsistent with this section.

(2) UNUTILIZED OR UNDERUTILIZED PROPERTY.—Any facility covered under an agreement entered into under this section may not be considered to be unutilized or underutilized for purposes of section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411).

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before entering into an agreement under section 3, the Administrator of General Services shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the proposed agreement.

(b) CONTENTS.—A report transmitted under this section shall include a summary of a cost-benefit analysis of the proposed agreement and a description of the provisions of the proposed agreement.

(c) REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—A proposed agreement under section 3 may not become effective until the end of a 30-day period of continuous session of Congress following the date of the transmittal of a report on the agreement under this section. For purposes of the preceding sentence, continuity of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment sine die, and there shall be excluded from the computation of such 30-day period any day during which either House of Congress is not in session during an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

SEC. 5. USE OF PROCEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Net proceeds from an agreement entered into under section 3 shall be deposited into, administered, and expended, subject to appropriations Acts, as part of the fund established by section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)). In this subsection, the term "net proceeds from an agreement entered into under section 3" means the proceeds from the agreement minus the expenses incurred by the Administrator with respect to the agreement.

(b) RECOVERY OF EXPENSES.—The Administrator may retain from the proceeds of an agreement entered into under section 3 amounts necessary to recover the expenses incurred by the Administrator with respect to the agreement. Such amounts shall be deposited in the account in the Treasury from which the Administrator incurs expenses related to disposals of real property.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for his close cooperation in waiving jurisdiction over certain portions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following exchange of letters between the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) regarding this matter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2000.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3069, the "Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Development Act of 2000." As you know, this bill contains certain provisions related to matters in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform. Specifically, Section 3 of the bill waives current law regarding the treatment of Federal property, which is under the Government Reform Committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting Floor consideration of the bill, the Committee will not exercise its jurisdiction over H.R. 3069. This action should not, however, be construed as waiving the Committee's jurisdiction over future legislation of a similar nature.

Thank you for your cooperation on this matter.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2000.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, In the near future, the House will consider H.R. 3069, the "Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Development Act of 2000." While H.R. 3069 primarily contains provisions related to matters in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I recognize that certain provisions of Section 3 of the bill, which waive current law regarding the treatment of Federal property affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform.

I agree that allowing this bill to go forward in no way impairs upon your jurisdiction over these provisions, and I would be pleased to place this letter and any response you may have in the Report on this bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this bill, I would support your request to have the Committee on Government Reform be represented on the conference with respect to the matters in question.

I look forward to passing this bill on the Floor soon and thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), for her tireless efforts to move this bill forward. I know that this legislation means a great deal to the residents of the District of Columbia and will greatly improve the quality of life in the area of the Anacostia River, where the center is located.

H.R. 3069, as amended, the Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Development Act of 2000, authorizes the Administrator of the General Services Ad-

ministration to enter into agreements, including leases, contracts, partnerships, joint venture trusts, and limited liability agreements with private entities to acquire, construct, rehabilitate, operate, maintain, or use land and make improvements at the Southeast Federal Center.

The Southeast Federal Center is a 55-acre parcel of land located on the Anacostia River in Southeast Washington, D.C., adjacent to the Navy Yard. The bill will also allow the GSA to leverage private capital and expertise to develop this site for use by the Government and private sector, including retail, commercial, and other uses.

This bill bars the Government from debt, obligation or liability in connection with development and allows GSA to prescribe terms and conditions for any lease by GSA for developed space as appropriate.

The Administrator is permitted to accept in-kind consideration of payment, including construction, repair or remodeling of physical improvements of Federal property. To ensure maximum development flexibility, any agreements shall not be subject to the Economy Act of 1932, which prohibits GSA from accepting in-kind contributions.

Further, certain provisions of the Property Act of 1949, the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the McKinney Homeless Act and other laws, not related to environmental law or historic preservation laws, are waived. These laws are waived to make an agreement with private-sector entities more attractive. GSA shall report to the committee prior to entering into any agreement, including master leases.

I support the bill and ask our colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his kind words and for his generous support.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, for their hard work in bringing H.R. 3069, the Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Redevelopment Act of 2000, to the floor today.

I also want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE), the subcommittee ranking member, for his strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS), the subcommittee chairman, because, were it not for his leadership and attention to the Southeast Federal Center, we would not finally be on the path toward making this valuable Federal asset productive and beneficial to American taxpayers.

The Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Redevelopment Act of 2000

reflects the best and strongest bipartisan intents of the Congress. It arose out of a hearing in May 1999, where I was engaged in perennial questioning concerning the failure of the Federal Government since 1962 to develop its largest tract of land in the city while leasing massive amounts of office space here and throughout the region.

1515

Over many years, consistent criticism from our subcommittee concerning the magnitude of the waste never brought results until the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) at that hearing took a deep interest, suggested a tour and then worked with me in developing H.R. 3069, the Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Redevelopment Act of 2000 that is before us now.

H.R. 3069 would allow the GSA wide latitude to contract for arrangements to bring any appropriate development to the site, private, Federal, local or some combination. Our bill specifies that any agreement entered into between the GSA and the developing entity must: One, have as its primary purpose enhancing the value of the Southeast Federal Center; two, be negotiated pursuant to procedures that protect the Federal Government's interest and promote a competitive bidding process; three, provide an option for the Federal Government to lease and occupy any office space in the developed facilities; four, not require unless otherwise determined by the GSA Federal ownership of any developed facilities; and, five, describe the duties and consideration for which the government and the public and private entities involved are responsible. The bill also authorizes GSA to accept non-monetary, in-kind consideration such as the provision of goods and services at the site.

A site centrally and strategically located just 5 minutes from the Capitol, the SEFC is considered one of the most valuable undeveloped parcels on the East Coast. Yet it has become a wasteland that also has triggered decay in the surrounding neighborhoods. The SEFC represents an astonishing denial of productive use to the Federal Government and of revenue to the taxpayers, particularly considering that the location is so close to the Mall and the Capitol.

Efforts by the Federal Government to develop the land exclusively for Federal uses have consistently failed. Most recently the Reagan and Bush administrations in a thoughtful innovation proposed a mall infrastructure to be built by the Federal Government with amenities to be provided by the private sector to attract Federal agencies, but regrettably this proposal had no effect on agency decisions and no relocation of Federal agencies to the SEFC occurred as a result. The Clinton administration also has encouraged Federal agencies to locate at the site, to no avail. The Washington Navy yard lo-

cated next to the SEFC is being redeveloped successfully with civilian Navy personnel, but its very visible innovation has not reversed the fortunes of the SEFC. Nor has the Metro station which was located there in December 1991.

The subcommittee's analysis of the site and of the real estate industry makes clear that the reason that so attractive a site has not been developed after decades of trying by the Federal Government is that it is not developable as a traditional government-owned site today. Moreover, the limited set of tools available to the GSA do not enable the government to make productive use of the SEFC. The subcommittee's work demonstrates that without new tools, the Federal Government will not be able to capitalize on this valuable asset or to offer an economic incentive for private developers to develop the land. H.R. 3069 is applicable to this single parcel alone and its value to the government and to this city makes it important to proceed without further costly delay.

What are the government's realistic options? The land certainly is too valuable to sell in light of the scarcity of land in the District and the sale of federally owned land in any case would never be tolerated by Congress when the Federal Government is leasing space throughout the District and the region at a cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers. Yet an OMB bureaucrat recently threw up his hands and was so anxious to get this embarrassment of unused land off the government's books that he did a pass-through to the District of Columbia until it was called back by higher authorities at the OMB. For years, the Congress has not allowed cost-free transfers of Federal land. Alternatively Congress, which has not appropriated funds for its own development of the SEFC, would clearly not fund a pass-through to another jurisdiction. Another alternative, leasing the land, is also unworkable and has at least two major drawbacks that would undercut the concept and purposes of the bill. First, the GSA is limited to supplying general purpose special office space and lacks mixed use authority through leasing. Second, leasing a government-owned site requires the sale of the site under the existing scoring rules. If leasing were the answer, GSA would have pursued it long ago, Mr. Speaker. The smart way to develop this property in today's climate is to combine the government's value in ownership with the private sector's ability to develop land.

H.R. 3069 not only represents the subcommittee's thinking, this bill is entirely in keeping with the reinventing government public-private partnership ideas and practices fostered by the present administration. Moreover, the Congress itself has long sanctioned the use of Federal land value in exchange for private development. The Veterans' Administration, the Department of Interior and the Department of Defense

have this general authority not on a one-time basis as provided by H.R. 3069. The extensive experience from these agencies demonstrates conclusively that public-private partnerships involving the Federal Government not only are cost effective, these arrangements protect the government from risk because the scoring rules ensure that every GSA expenditure is accounted and appropriated for in a manner that insulates the Federal Government from financial risk. This bill allows the private sector to do the kind of development it does every day. At the same time, H.R. 3069 provides an option of locating Federal facilities as part of the mix and, therefore, of meeting Federal agency needs for which the SEFC has been unavailable for decades.

The Federal Government has been unable to commit financial resources for the development of the SEFC. Considering the competition with other resources, it is fair to say that the Federal Government is unwilling to develop the site notwithstanding the continuing loss in productivity and in revenue to the taxpayers. H.R. 3069, establishing a public-private partnership to develop the site, represents an important breakthrough in achieving the highest and best use of a wasted Federal asset, securing revenue for the Federal Government and providing enhanced opportunities for Federal agency occupancy while at the same time contributing to the local D.C. economy and revival of the surrounding neighborhood whose deterioration traces significantly to this large brownfield site. The approach is mutually beneficial. It is win-win. The Federal Government makes its property available for Federal and private development, including revenue-producing occupancy for the government, and the developer, selected competitively, receives a valuable opportunity to add value. Democrats, Republicans and the President, who have all said they will come together when government and private responsibilities are appropriately apportioned, have found a meeting place in H.R. 3069. I appreciate the bipartisan partnership we have achieved here in the House for the public-private partnership H.R. 3069 represents.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3069 is a great idea. It is a good bill. I urge its passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3069, 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3069, as amended, the measure just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS BUDGET REQUEST, FY 2001—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-233)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the District of Columbia Code, as amended, I am transmitting the FY 2001 Budget Request of the District of Columbia Courts.

The District of Columbia Courts have submitted a FY 2001 budget request for \$104.5 million for operating expenses, \$18.3 million for capital improvements to courthouse facilities, and \$41.8 for Defender Services in the District of Columbia Courts. My FY 2001 budget includes recommended funding levels of \$98.0 million for operations, \$5.0 million for capital improvements, and \$38.4 million for Defender Services. My transmittal of the District of Columbia Courts' budget request does not represent an endorsement of its contents.

This transmittal also includes information on grants and reimbursements forwarded by the Courts in response to the request in Conference Report H. Rept. 106-479.

I look forward to working with the Congress throughout the FY 2001 appropriation process.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2000.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 7 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 7 p.m.

1901

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 7 o'clock and 1 minute 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.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H Con. Res. 296, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 3577, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 89, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NECESSITY TO EXPEDITE SETTLEMENT PROCESS FOR DISCRIMINATION CLAIMS AGAINST DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BROUGHT BY AFRICAN-AMERICAN FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 296.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 296, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 180, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 146] YEAS—216

- Aderholt Deal Hoekstra Archer DeLay Horn Army DeMint Hostettler Bachus Diaz-Balart Houghton Baker Dickey Hulshof Baldacci Dingell Hunter Conyers Dreier Hutchinson Costello Hyde Coyne Cramer Isakson Crowley Ehlers Istook Cummings Jenkins Johnson (CT) Danner Johnson, Sam Davis (FL) Jones (NC) Davis (IL) Kanjorski DeFazio Kelly Kind (WI) Delahunt Kind (NY) DeLauro Kingston Dicks Kleczka Dixon Kolbe Doggett LaHood Doyle Edwards Largent Eshoo Latham Etheridge LaTourette Evans Lazio Leach Farr Fattah Lewis (CA) Filner Lewis (KY) Forbes Linder LoBiondo Ford Lucas (KY) Frank (MA) Luther Frost Gejdenson Manzullo Gephardt McCrery McHugh McInnis McKeon Metcalf Buyer Mica Miller (FL) Miller, Gary

- Moran (KS) Rogers Sununu Murtha Rohrabacher Talent Nethercutt Ros-Lehtinen Tancredo Ney Roukema Tauzin Northup Royce Taylor (MS) Norwood Ryan (WI) Taylor (NC) Nussle Ryun (KS) Terry Ose Salmon Thomas Oxley Sandlin Thornberry Packard Sanford Thune Paul Saxton Tiahrt Pease Scarborough Toomey Peterson (PA) Sensenbrenner Traficant Petri Sessions Turner Pickering Shadegg Upton Pickett Shaw Vitter Pitts Shays Walden Pombo Sherwood Walsh Porter Shimkus Wamp Portman Shuster Watkins Quinn Simpson Watts (OK) Radanovich Skeen Weldon (FL) Rahall Smith (MI) Weldon (PA) Ramstad Smith (NJ) Weller Regula Smith (TX) Whitfield Reynolds Spence Wicker Riley Stabenow Wolf Rivers Stearns Young (AK) Rogan Stump Young (FL)

NAYS—180

- Abercrombie Gonzalez Nadler Ackerman Gordon Napolitano Allen Green (TX) Neal Baca Gutierrez Oberstar Baird Hall (OH) Obey Baldwin Hastings (FL) Olver Barcia Hill (IN) Ortiz Barrett (WI) Hilliard Pallone Becerra Hinchey Pascrell Bentsen Hinojosa Pastor Berkley Hoeffel Payne Berman Holden Pelosi Berry Holt Peterson (MN) Bishop Hooley Phelps Blagojevich Hoyer Pomeroy Blumenauer Inslee Price (NC) Bonior Jackson (IL) Rangel Borski Jackson-Lee Reyes Boswell (TX) Rodriguez Boucher Jefferson Roemer Boyd John Rothman Brady (PA) Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard Brown (FL) Jones (OH) Rush Brown (OH) Kaptur Sabo Capps Kennedy Sanchez Capuano Kildee Sanders Cardin Kilpatrick Sawyer Carson Klink Schakowsky Clayton Kucinich Scott Clyburn LaFalce Sherman Condit Lampson Shows Conyers Lantos Skelton Costello Larson Slaughter Coyne Lee Smith (WA) Cramer Levin Snyder Crowley Lewis (GA) Spratt Cummings Lofgren Stenholm Danner Lowey Strickland Davis (FL) Maloney (CT) Stupak Davis (IL) Maloney (NY) Tanner DeFazio Markey Tauscher Delahunt Mascara Thompson (CA) DeLauro Matsui Thompson (MS) Deutsch McCarthy (MO) Thurman Dicks McCarthy (NY) Tierney Dixon McDermott Towns Doggett McGovern Udall (CO) Doyle McIntyre Udall (NM) Edwards McKinney Velazquez Eshoo McNulty Vento Etheridge Meehan Vislosky Evans Meek (FL) Waters Farr Meeks (NY) Watt (NC) Fattah Menendez Waxman Filner Millender Weiner Forbes McDonald Wexler Ford Miller, George Weygand Frank (MA) Minge Woolsey Frost Mink Wu Gejdenson Moore Wynn Gephardt Moran (VA)

NOT VOTING—38

- Andrews Clement Dooley Buyer Coburn Doolittle Campbell Cooksey Ehrlich Chambliss Cubin Everett Clay DeGette Franks (NJ)

Hansen
Herger
Kasich
Kuykendall
Lipinski
Lucas (OK)
Martinez
McCollum

McIntosh
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Myrick
Owens
Pryce (OH)
Schaffer

Serrano
Sisisky
Souder
Stark
Sweeney
Wilson
Wise

Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
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
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourrette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeke (FL)
Meeke (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
Hall (OH)
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett

Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner

Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand

Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey

Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—6

Coble
Paul

Royce
Sanford

Sensenbrenner
Smith (MI)

NOT VOTING—43

Andrews
Buyer
Campbell
Chambliss
Clay
Clement
Coburn
Cooksey
Cubin
Davis (VA)
DeGette
Dooley
Doolittle
Ehrlich
Everett

Franks (NJ)
Hansen
Herger
Hill (IN)
Kasich
Kuykendall
Lipinski
Lucas (OK)
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Myrick

Owens
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Schaffer
Serrano
Sisisky
Souder
Stark
Sweeney
Udall (NM)
Wexler
Wilson
Wise

1935

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.

RECOGNIZING THE HERMANN MONUMENT AND HERMANN HEIGHTS PARK IN NEW ULM, MINNESOTA, AS A NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICANS OF GERMAN HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 89.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 89, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]
YEAS—389

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Baca
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
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert

Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham

1926

Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. THURMAN, and Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, DIXON, RODRIGUEZ, GEJDENSON, ORTIZ, STUPAK, HINOJOSA, DOGGETT, BERMAN, BECERRA and BOSWELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TURNER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof), the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION OF MINIDOKA RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO, AUTHORIZATION INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3577.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3577, 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 385, nays 6, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]
YEAS—385

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Baca
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 (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan

Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham

Danner Johnson, Sam
 Davis (FL) Jones (NC)
 Davis (IL) Jones (OH)
 Deal Kanjorski
 DeFazio Kaptur
 Delahunt Kelly
 DeLauro Kennedy
 DeLay Kildee
 DeMint Kilpatrick
 Deutsch Kind (WI)
 Diaz-Balart King (NY)
 Dickey Kingston
 Dicks Kleczka
 Dingell Klink
 Dixon Knollenberg
 Doggett Kolbe
 Doyle Kucinich
 Dreier LaFalce
 Duncan LaHood
 Dunn Lampson
 Edwards Lantos
 Ehlers Largent
 Emerson Larson
 Engel Latham
 English LaTourette
 Eshoo Lazio
 Etheridge Leach
 Evans Lee
 Ewing Levin
 Farr Lewis (CA)
 Fattah Lewis (GA)
 Filner Lewis (KY)
 Fletcher Linder
 Foley LoBiondo
 Forbes Lofgren
 Ford Lowey
 Fossella Lucas (KY)
 Fowler Luther
 Frank (MA) Maloney (CT)
 Frelinghuysen Maloney (NY)
 Frost Manzullo
 Gallegly Markey
 Ganske Mascara
 Gejdenson Matsui
 Gekas McCarthy (MO)
 Gephardt McCarthy (NY)
 Gibbons McCreery
 Gilchrest McDermott
 Gillmor McGovern
 Gilman McHugh
 Gonzalez McInnis
 Goode McIntyre
 Goodlatte McKeon
 Goodling McKinney
 Gordon McNulty
 Goss Meehan
 Graham Meek (FL)
 Granger Meeks (NY)
 Green (TX) Menendez
 Green (WI) Metcalf
 Greenwood Mica
 Gutierrez Millender
 Gutknecht McDonald
 Hall (OH) Miller (FL)
 Hall (TX) Miller, Gary
 Hastings (FL) Miller, George
 Hastings (WA) Minge
 Hayes Mink
 Hayworth Moore
 Hefley Moran (KS)
 Hill (MT) Moran (VA)
 Hilleary Murtha
 Hilliard Nadler
 Hinchey Napolitano
 Hinojosa Neal
 Hobson Nethercutt
 Hoeffel Ney
 Hoekstra Northup
 Holden Norwood
 Holt Nussle
 Hooley Oberstar
 Hostettler Obey
 Houghton Olver
 Hoyer Ortiz
 Hulshof Ose
 Hunter Oxley
 Hutchinson Packard
 Hyde Pallone
 Inslee Pascrell
 Isakson Pastor
 Istook Paul
 Jackson (IL) Pease
 Jackson-Lee Pelosi
 (TX) Peterson (MN)
 Jefferson Peterson (PA)
 Jenkins Petri
 John Phelps
 Johnson (CT) Pickett
 Johnson, E. B. Pitts

Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Portman
 Price (NC)
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Rahall

Ramstad
 Rangel
 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
 Schakowsky
 Scott
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Spence
 Spratt
 Stabenow
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stump
 Stupak
 Sununu
 Talent
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Thurman
 Tiahrt
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Towns
 Traficant
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Vitter
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watkins

Watt (NC)
 Watts (OK)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)

Weller
 Weygand
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Everett
 Franks (NJ)
 Hansen
 Herger
 Hill (IN)
 Horn
 Kasich
 Kuykendall
 Lipinski
 Lucas (OK)
 Martinez
 McCollum
 McIntosh
 Moakley
 Mollohan

Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—45

Morella
 Myrick
 Owens
 Payne
 Pickering
 Pryce (OH)
 Schaffer
 Serrano
 Siskisky
 Souder
 Stark
 Sweeney
 Wexler
 Wilson
 Wise

1945

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1945

DONALD YOUMANS' INTERNATIONAL CUSTODY BATTLE

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of Donald Youmans, a father whose son was abducted to Germany in 1993. Donald filed a missing persons report with police, and a United States court granted him temporary sole custody and ordered immediate return of his son.

A German court issued an ex parte order granting the mother sole custody of the son, stating that the child would suffer severe psychological damage to be taken away from his new environment of 3 months. In 1994, a German lower court denied return of the child, and 4 months later granted sole custody to the mother. In 1996, a court confirmed sole final custody and gave Donald restrictive access rights to be exercised only in Germany.

Despite the court order for these restrictive access rights, Donald's ex-wife continues to deny him access to his son. He has not seen his son since 1994. His son was abducted when he was two, and he is now eight.

Madam Speaker, these daily 1 minutes are about families and reuniting children with their parents. We must show respect and concern for the most sacred of bonds, the bond between a parent and a child. The House must do all that it can to bring our children home.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). 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 Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI 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 Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CORPORATE INVESTMENT IN AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War opened up a 10-year flood of new trade investment and economic growth in the world. But underneath this trend lies an unsettling pattern.

When it comes to competing for U.S. trade and private investment dollars, democratic countries in the developing world, countries like India and Taiwan and Bangladesh and South Korea, are losing ground to more authoritarian countries, like Indonesia, and especially the People's Republic of China.

In the post-Cold War decade, the share of developing country exports to the U.S. for democratic nations fell from 53 percent in 1989 to 34 percent in 1998, a decrease of 18 percentage points. Nondemocratic nations increased their share commensurately.

In manufacturing goods, developing democracies' share of developing country exports fell 21 percentage points, from 56 percent to 35 percent.

Regarding U.S. foreign investment in manufacturing, developing democratic countries gained 1 percent over the last 10 years. Nations that do not support democracy gained 5 percent of U.S. foreign investment over the last 10 years. China was responsible for 5 percent of foreign investment gained for non-democratic countries.

Not only have the U.S. export market shares decreased for developing countries that have always been democracies, countries that have recently become democracies have also lost market share.

Understanding that basis for the vote that is coming in the next couple of weeks about giving permanent trade, Most Favored Nations status trading privileges to China should make the difference in this vote.

Western corporations want to invest in countries, like China, that have below-poverty wages, that have unenforced environmental laws or non-existent environmental standards, and

have no opportunities to unionize. As a result, they are turning to the authoritarian countries that can suppress labor rights and guarantee high profits for American companies.

China, for instance, is much more attractive to an American investigator than is India; China, a country which has a docile hierarchal workforce where workers cannot join unions, where workers cannot talk back, where workers often cannot switch jobs and go to a competing factory.

United States pretends to promote democratic ideals worldwide through foreign aid and through the rhetoric in this chamber. But as developing countries make progress towards democracy, the American business community rewards them by pulling its trade and investment and depositing their investments in money in other totalitarian countries.

Understand, where corporate CEOs walk the halls of Congress asking Members of Congress to support permanent trade advantages for China, understand where they say that we need to engage with China so China improves its human rights record, where China will quit persecuting Christians and China will quit allowing forced abortions in their country, understand that the three major economic players in China are the Communist party of China, the People's Liberation Army of China, which runs many of the factories there, and Western investors.

Those Western investors, the Communist party, the People's Liberation Army, none of them want to change the rules. The rules work just fine for them. They like an authoritarian government structure that does not reward an ability to organize and bargain collectively, that does not tolerate any kind of dissent, that does not allow for any kind of worker rights.

That is why American investment is more and more likely to go to China instead of India, instead of Taiwan, instead of South Korea, instead of a country that really is a democracy. That is why China's permanent Most Favored Nations status trading privileges are such a bad idea.

Shame on this country, shame on this Congress if we give permanent Most Favored Nations status trading privileges to a country that violates every human rights standard, every value that we in this country hold dear.

SUPPORT \$500 TAX CREDIT FOR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN ON FOOD STAMPS

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. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues know, for several weeks, I have been coming down to the floor talking about our men and women in uniform that are on food stamps. Quite frankly, it has been a couple of weeks.

I brought tonight, as I have each and every night, the Marine who is getting ready to deploy for Bosnia. On his feet is his little girl named Magan. In his arms, he has a baby named Bridgette.

It so happens, on April 14, as my colleagues know, the Congress had closed for Easter. I was asked, along with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), to attend a memorial service at New River Marine Air Station, as four Marines were among 19 Marines that were killed in the V-22 helicopter accident in Arizona a few weeks ago.

Sitting in the sanctuary during the memorial, I started thinking, I was looking around at Marines in attendance and just how many times those of us in this Nation take for granted the men and women in uniform that are willing to be called upon at any time to go defend this country and to give their life for this Nation.

So I am back on the floor tonight because I have introduced H.R. 1055, which is a bill that would give each and every member in the military that qualifies for food stamps, it would give them a \$500 tax credit. Quite frankly, it is not enough. At least it shows that we care, and it is a start.

I am pleased to tell my colleagues tonight, Madam Speaker, that we have 95 Members, both Democrats and Republicans, that are on this bill almost equally divided. Many on the Democratic side as well as the Republican side are in the leadership, and I am pleased they would join me in this effort to say to those who qualify for food stamps in uniform that we do care about them, we are trying to do something about it.

I have figures that are really kind of interesting, that the Defense Department says we have 6,500 men and women in uniform on food stamps, and the GAO says we have 13,000. Well, my point is, Madam Speaker, that one is one too many.

I think about the fact that we have already spent probably \$9 billion or \$10 billion in Bosnia, we have spent probably \$11 billion in Yugoslavia, and yet we cannot find the money to take our men and women in uniform off food stamps. That is unacceptable.

I speak about this quite frequently in my district. I see a lot of people in civic clubs and sometimes at churches, like any Member here that serves the United States House of Representatives. People come up to me afterwards and say, "I cannot believe that. I did not know that."

So I am hoping, by coming to the floor once a week, that I can encourage the leadership both, again, Republican and Democrat, to move this bill. There are other ideas that Members have, and they are good ideas. But I tell my colleagues that we have researched this thing for months going back a year ago, and what we found out, that if one really wants to make sure that those who qualify for food stamps are the ones that receive the assistance and no one drops through the cracks, then it

has to be this bill that we have introduced that would give a \$500 tax credit.

If there should be some movement on this bill, I hope, quite frankly, that, in a bipartisan way, we would raise that figure from \$500 to \$1,000.

So, Madam Speaker, I am going to close now. But, again, I want to remind the Members of the House that not only this Marine, this Marine represents everybody that is in uniform. We are sending our troops around this Nation just like a police force. I think between 1991 and 1999, they have been on 149 operations or deployments. I think about 60 percent of those in uniform are married.

So, again, I hope that we, in a bipartisan way, before we leave in October, will pass legislation that those that are on food stamps will know that we care about them. Because I know truthfully, Madam Speaker, that the American people are just outraged that anyone in uniform is on food stamps.

THIRTEEN JEWS HELD IN SHIRAZ, IRAN ON CHARGES OF ESPIONAGE

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to address this House on the issue of the 13 Jews being held in the city of Shiraz in Iran and on trial on charges of espionage. Let me first provide a bit of background. The Jewish community of Iran has been there since the Babylonian captivity over 2,500 years ago. It is the oldest Jewish community anywhere in the world except for Israel itself. For 2,500 years, Jews have lived in peace and in loyalty to whichever regime has governed Persia, now Iran.

2000

In 1979, the Iranian revolution created the Islamic Republic. Since then, that Islamic Republic has found it necessary or appropriate for some reason to oppress its religious minorities. Its treatment of those of the Bahai faith is known to many of us and is deplorable. And as to those who practice the Jewish faith, some 17 have been killed in the last 21 years, roughly one a year, always after some sort of show trial, always absurd charges followed by execution.

In February of 1979, the government of Iran, perhaps dissatisfied with the idea of only one trumped-up execution a year of the Jewish community, instead decided to arrest some 13 Jews on absurd charges. They were charged with spying for the United States and spying for Israel.

Now, why can I brand these charges so absurd? Well, Madam Speaker, here in the United States we live in a multi-ethnic, multicultural society. People of all races, religions, and ethnicities are found in the National Security Administration, the CIA, the FBI, and other positions of importance to our national security. And so no matter what a person's ethnic background, every boy and

girl in America could find themselves in a position where they could be tempted to become a spy. And in fact we have Anglo American spies in our history and Chinese American spies. Perhaps there have even been Jewish American spies.

But Iran is a very different country. No one of the Jewish faith is allowed anywhere near anything of national security significance in Iran. And so to think that the CIA would reach out to this one small community and from there hire its spies is absolutely absurd. We could not be the world's only superpower if we hired as our spies those very few individuals in Iran absolutely precluded from getting the information that a spy might want.

These charges are not only absurd, but at the beginning of this month the trials began. The trials are modeled after those of Joseph Stalin; show trials in which there is no evidence except confession, and the confessions so devoid of information that they are evidence not of guilt but of the fear of the defendant. No information is given as to what the espionage sought to discover, what information was passed, to whom it was passed, or how it was passed. No information at all comes out in this trial except the fear of the defendants. Their confessions are evidence perhaps of torture, but not of guilt. Not since the days of Joseph Stalin have we seen such trials.

The question is what will the world do about it? The key is to have not only the American representative at the World Bank but the representatives of Germany and Japan stand up and say human rights does matter and to vote to delay any World Bank loan to this Islamic regime, the Islamic Republic of Iran. Until these 13 innocents are released, the World Bank should not hide behind professions that somehow its loans are only being used for a particular purpose, because loans are money that is fungible and that money will go to construction companies in Iran selected by and authorized by the Iranian government.

We must stand up for human rights. The World Bank is where this trial will be on trial.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I want to talk tonight about prescription drugs and, most importantly, about prescription drug prices.

We have had some discussion. The good news is, I think here in Washington, that there is a growing bipartisan feeling that we need to do something particularly for senior citizens about prescription drugs this year. The bad news is, it appears to me that we are going to continue just to throw good money after bad.

I have a chart here that describes, I think, what is a big part of the problem we have with prescription drugs. These are some comparison prices for one of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States. It is a drug called Prilosec. They are currently running a pretty aggressive advertising campaign. It is the purple pill. If someone buys those purple pills in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and again these are not my numbers, these are from an HMO in my State called Health Partners, but they did some research and found if an individual buys a 30-day supply of Prilosec in Minneapolis, Minnesota, they pay \$99.95. But if someone happens to be vacationing in Winnipeg, Manitoba, and they take the same prescription into a pharmaceutical drugstore, they will pay \$50.88. And, if someone happened to be vacationing in Guadalajara, Mexico, for exactly the same drug, made in exactly the same plant, under the exact same FDA approval, they would pay only \$17.50.

As a matter of fact, Health Partners claims that if they could recover just half of the savings between the United States and Canada, they could save their subscribers \$30 million a year.

When we start applying numbers like that to how much the Federal Government spends on prescription drugs every year, last year, according to the Congressional Budget Office we, the Federal Government, spent over \$15 billion on prescription drugs. Now, if we are paying 40 percent more than the folks on the north side and the south side of our borders, just imagine how much the Federal Government could save through Medicare and Medicaid, the VA, and other benefits.

Let me just run through some of the differences between what we pay in the United States for commonly prescribed brand name drugs and what they pay in Europe for exactly the same drugs. Premarin, \$14.98 here, they pay \$4.25 in Europe; Synthroid, \$13.84 versus \$2.95; Coumadin, and this is a drug my dad takes, and a lot of senior citizens take this, it is a blood thinner, we pay, the average price is \$30.25, they pay \$2.85; Prozac, \$36.12, \$18.50 over in Europe. Here we get a pretty good price, in Minneapolis. They say the average price for Prilosec, for a 30-day supply, is \$109, in Europe it is \$39.25.

Madam Speaker, the answer to our prescription drug problem in some respects does not require a whole new Federal agency. A big part of the problem, and I would like to share with Members and anyone who would like a copy, we can get a copy of a newsletter that was done by the Life Extension Foundation. It is available by calling my office at the Capitol or just sending an e-mail. We are easy to get ahold of. But this is an interesting little brochure and it talks about the differentiation and it really gets down to what the real problem is.

The real problem is our own FDA. Our own Food and Drug Administration is keeping American citizens from

bringing prescription drugs across the border. I think the best comparison that I can give, let us say, for example, that there are three drugstores, one downtown, one on the north side of town and one on the south side of town, but our own FDA says you can only shop at the one downtown. Even though they are charging, according to the Federal Government in the United States, the drug companies are charging 56 percent more than the prices in Canada, but our own FDA says we cannot shop at a store in Canada.

Now, the reason this is important is because we have what is called the North American Free Trade Agreement. That means the goods and services are supposed to go across the border freely. And just about all goods and services do, except prescription drugs. Madam Speaker, we need to make it easier for seniors and all Americans to get the prescriptions that they need and we need to get competitive prices. One way we can do that is open up our borders.

The FDA has overstepped its actual authority. In fact, if Members would like a copy, this is the actual language, which basically says it is the FDA's responsibility to prove that the drugs that are being brought into the United States are not safe. Unfortunately, the way they have interpreted this law is they have said, no, it is the responsibility of the consumer. We want to put that responsibility back on the FDA, where it belongs.

We should not allow our own FDA to stand between our consumers and lower drug prices.

WORKING FOR RESUMPTION OF INDIA-PAKISTAN DIALOGUE ON KASHMIR

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, recently we have seen some reason for hope about the resumption of a dialogue between Pakistan and India on resolving the Kashmir conflict. But we have also received a reminder of how difficult the path toward dying dialogue can be.

On the hopeful side, the United States has asked Pakistan to take concrete steps for the resumption of a productive dialogue with India and a return to what is known as the "Spirit of Lahore" so that there will be no more Kargils.

I should explain, Madam Speaker, that Lahore is a city in Pakistan near the border with India. It was the scene not much more than a year ago of a very amicable meeting between India's Prime Minister Vajpayee and the former Pakistani Prime Minister Sharif. Given the longstanding animosity between the two South Asian neighbors, the image of the two prime ministers embracing and pledging to

work in a spirit of partnership and respect was heart-warming, promising a new era in bilateral relations.

But a short time later there was Kargil. Kargil is the name of a town in Kashmir under India's jurisdiction near the line of control that separates the areas controlled by India and Pakistan. In May of 1999, Pakistani-backed forces crossed that line and attacked India's defensive positions near Kargil. This bold gambit by Pakistan was not successful militarily. Ultimately, it proved to be even more of a disaster militarily for Pakistan, and the United States urged Pakistan to withdraw its forces back to its side of the line of control. Our government refused to go along with Pakistan's bid to strengthen its position by internationalizing the crisis by trying to get the United States to step in as a mediator in the bilateral dispute.

What little was left of the "Spirit of Lahore," Madam Speaker, was further eroded last October when a military coup in Pakistan removed the civilian government from power and threw Prime Minister Sharif in jail.

In a recent interview with an international news service, our Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs, Karl Inderfurth, said that a solution to the Kashmir project must be homegrown and not exploited from the outside. Mr. Inderfurth expressed that the State Department was trying to move away from the old days when there was typically a pro-Pakistan tilt in U.S. policy in the region, to a more even-handed approach for working with both of the major South Asian nations. But he stated, and I quote, "Right now we have more opportunities to pursue with India, and, frankly, right now we have many more concerns about the direction Pakistan is heading." He also expressed hope that Pakistan would take concrete steps that would allow a productive and serious dialogue to be resumed with India.

Madam Speaker, I would stress that the most helpful concrete step that Pakistan could take would be to do all in its power to end the cross-border terrorism that has caused so much suffering to the people of Kashmir, Hindu and Muslim alike. While India has made clear its willingness to negotiate in good faith with Pakistan, India also has to maintain a vigilant defensive posture for as long as the Pakistani-supported cross-border terrorism continues.

Madam Speaker, I believe that President Clinton's recent trip to South Asia, which I had the opportunity to take part in, has played a significant role in helping to reduce tensions and hostility between Pakistan and India. As Secretary Inderfurth said, "The President's visit has changed the terms of the relationship between the United States and India, the world's two largest democracies." The President made it clear to both India and Pakistani leaders that the U.S. would be happy to work with both countries as friends to

try to encourage dialogue, but it is not our place to dictate the terms of the peace process in Kashmir much less the outcome.

The great thing about the Lahore process is that it rose as a bilateral initiative between India and Pakistan. The key for breathing life into the bilateral Lahore declarations is for Pakistan to accept India's outstretched hand. And so far, unfortunately, Pakistan has been sending somewhat mixed signals.

Meanwhile, Madam Speaker, we have seen how dangerous the Kashmiri militant movement, which is supported by Pakistan, has become. Over the weekend we heard from one of the militant leaders, Mushtaq Ahmed Zargar, who was one of the three militants freed last December by the Indian government in exchange for freeing the innocent hostages being held in the hijacked Indian Airlines plane. According to a news account from the AP, Mr. Zargar dismissed the idea of negotiations with India, promising to stay on the path of jihad, or holy war. He threatened punishment for any Kashmiri who opened talks with India. And this, unfortunately, is the true face of the so-called freedom movement in Kashmir.

2015

Mr. Speaker, by taking steps towards negotiation, Pakistan could help to isolate and undercut these terrorist groups operating in Kashmir. So far, Pakistan has done just the opposite, actively supporting the terrorists. But at some point, I hope that the Pakistani leadership will recognize that that strategy is increasingly turning Pakistan into a pariah state.

If and when Pakistan changes its course, and I hope it will soon, they will find a willing negotiating party in India and a supportive friend in the United States. I just hope that we can resume the India-Pakistan dialogue in the "spirit of Lahore" as soon as possible.

COMMEMORATING MEN AND WOMEN WHO FOUGHT IN VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 7, a celebration of sort, a commemoration of sort, took place in all 50 States in this country as we commemorated the 25th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War.

Between 1958 and 1975, over 8 million Americans, 228,000 of whom were Georgians, fought in Southeast Asia on behalf of freedom against communism and totalitarianism. That was the war of my generation. It was the legacy that I remember.

America was divided throughout that war and remains, in some cases, di-

vided today over whether we should have been there and our resolve was never what it should have been. But tonight, I rise not to debate that, but to commemorate the men and women who fought and died on behalf of the United States of America, 58,000 of them, 2,042 who remaining missing in action today.

While we debate the positive nature of issues we believe in and condemn others today in contemporary times, we must continue to pause and reflect on the sacrifice made on behalf of all of us.

To that end, I want to commend five individuals from Georgia, Susie Ragan, who founded the MIA/POW force in Georgia and now has moved to Maryland and is doing the same thing so we do not forget those 2,042; Tommy Clack, a triple amputee who returned to a divided America and has committed the rest of his life to see to it that Vietnam veterans get the attention and services that they deserve and their Government promised; Ron Miller, who served as the former executive director of the Georgian Veterans Leadership Program; and Colonel Ben Purcell of Georgia, a member of the Georgia legislature, but 25 years ago a man who ended more than 8 years as a prisoner of war, over 5 in solitary confinement.

We must never forget the sacrifice made by those men and women for our Nation and for our country and the duty and honor and commitment they made to this country and to their God.

And that fifth person to me is a person by the name of Jack Elliott Cox. Jack died in Vietnam in 1968. But Jack was a volunteer. He volunteered when we graduated from college to go to OSC. And like 70 percent of those who died in Vietnam, he was not drafted, he was a volunteer.

In fact, what is so often not talked about is that 25 percent of those who fought were drafted, 75 percent were people who volunteered for the service in a divided war and a divided time. But they were committed to their country.

Let us not forget the Jack Coxes, the Susie Ragans, the Tommy Clacks, the Ron Millers, and the Ben Purcells, those who fought and live today to fight on for the veterans of that war, and those who died for you and I.

As Members of this Congress, when we go to the 26th anniversary next year, may it be a time that we continue our commitment to the veterans of the United States of America and the men and women who, regardless of conflicts at home, fought and served and, in some cases, died for their country, for our Nation, and for those of us here tonight.

STATES SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO PROTECT THEIR OWN WATERS

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, the United States Supreme Court invalidated Washington State's standards for oil tankers entering their waters. That is, it invalidated Washington State's effort to control the tankers in their waters and, in doing so, potentially invalidated laws in 11 other States.

Even while admitting that Federal and international laws may be insufficient protection, the court refused to allow States to protect their own waters. That is hard to believe, but that is what the United States Supreme Court did.

We all remember the *Exxon Valdez* disaster in Alaska in 1989. The huge oil tanker ran aground in Prince William Sound, Alaska, dumping 11 million gallons of crude oil into the Pacific Ocean and damaging more than 1,000 miles of coastline in south-central Alaska.

The massive spill resulted in billions of dollars in damage claims by over 40,000 people, including some 6,500 Washington State fishermen who have yet to be compensated for their loss.

In response to the Valdez spill, my home State of Washington and many other coastline States issued tougher laws to prevent another catastrophe. Washington's laws created the Office of Marine Safety and added a number of requirements to Federal law. I was in the legislature when we did that.

For example, the State regulation required tanker crews to be proficient in English in order to prevent miscommunication between American navigators and foreign crews. Does it not seem logical that the people who are running the tankers in American waters should be proficient in English?

Among other rules adopted by Washington are prescriptions regarding training, location plotting, pre-arrival tests, and drug testing for tanker crews.

Ultimately, the Supreme Court invalidated these common-sense regulations. And, again, I cannot imagine how the Supreme Court could come to that decision.

Of course, Federal law must supersede State law in Coast Guard and national security matters, but States should have the right to enact safety standards within their own State waters.

Last week I introduced H.R. 4385, which reinstates the rights of States to adopt additional standards regarding maintenance, operation, equipping, personnel qualifications, or manning of oil tankers. I hope that all of my colleagues who care about States' rights and environmental protection will join me to support this important legislation. We must allow our districts and our home States to protect themselves from another Valdez disaster.

NEW ECONOMY OF THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address this House today on issues I believe are extremely important to our economy and to working families not only from my State in Illinois, but across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a very diverse district. I represent the south suburbs of Chicago, as well as the southern part of the city of Chicago. I represent bedroom communities and farm communities, a very, very diverse district of city and suburbs and communities.

I often find as I travel throughout the district that I have the privilege of representing, whether I am at the Steelworkers Hall in Hegewisch, a neighborhood in Chicago, or at the Legion Post in Joliet, or a grain elevator in Tonica, Illinois, or a coffee shop in my hometown of Morris, I find that there is a pretty common message whether I am in the city, the suburbs, or country; and that is that the folks back home in Illinois and the land of Lincoln, they tell me that they want us to work to find solutions to the challenges that we face.

Those solutions sometimes require a bipartisan effort. In many cases they do. I am proud that our efforts over the last few years of working together to come up with solutions produced the first balanced budget in 28 years, the first middle class tax cut in 16 years, the first real welfare reform in a generation. We stopped the raid on Social Security, and we began paying down the national debt.

Those are real accomplishments, and they are producing results. We have seen unprecedented economic growth for 9 years, economic growth that started in 1991 and continues to this day; and clearly, the balanced budget contributes to its continued growth.

I am proud to say the balanced budget now is producing almost \$3 trillion of extra money. And rather than arguing over how to eliminate the deficit, today we are arguing over what to do with that extra money.

Our welfare reform has resulted in an almost 50 percent reduction in our Nation welfare roles. Seven million former welfare recipients are now working and have joined employment roles, having economic opportunity and a chance to move up the economic ladder.

I am also proud to say that when we stopped the raid on Social Security and began the process of paying down the national debt that, in the last 3 years, we paid down \$350 billion of the national debt. And we are on track with the budget we are going to pass this year to eliminate the national debt by the year 2013. That is progress. That is real results.

Tonight I wanted to take the opportunity to talk about an area of our

economy, an area of American society and, frankly, a part of our global economy, an area that there is greater interest in, for a lot of reasons. And tonight I wanted to talk about the new economy and some of the challenges, as well as some of the solutions, to the new economy of the 21st century.

Let me start, in talking about the new economy, to talk about some facts, some statistics about the Internet and the new economy.

Over 100 million United States adults today are using the Internet, and seven new people are on the Internet for the first time every second. Seventy-eight percent of Internet users almost always vote in national, State and local elections, compared with only 64 percent of non-Internet users.

From a historical standpoint, the Internet began as the Advanced Research Project's Agency Network during the Cold War back in 1969 as a way of trying to determine how our military could communicate in time of nuclear war. Clearly, here is a peacetime conversion of military technology.

What is hard to believe is that it only took 5 years for the Internet to reach 50 million users, a much faster one compared to the traditional electronic media. It took television 13 years and it took radio 38 years to reach that same audience. In just 5 years, 50 million users were on the Internet.

The Internet economy today generates an estimated 301 billion U.S. dollars in revenue, and it is responsible for over 1.2 million jobs. And preliminary employment data shows that the technology industry in America employed 4.8 million workers in 1998, making it one of our Nation's largest industries.

The average high-tech average wage was 77 percent higher than the average U.S. private sector wage. It is also interesting to note that 63 percent of Americans believe that the Internet will be equally or more important than traditional sources of information in the future.

When it comes to all of our pocketbooks, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, points out and says that in the last few years, one third of all the economic growth, one third of all the new jobs that have been created in our economy, result from technology, much of it generated from the Internet.

I am proud to come from a great State, the great State of Illinois. Illinois, of course, is nicknamed in many cases, we think of it as an industrial State, we think of Illinois as an agricultural State. But Illinois is also a technology State. People often think of Silicon Valley, they think of the Silicon Corridor in Boston, they think of Seattle and Redmond, home to Microsoft and some of our bigger technology corporations; and they often overlook the fact that the Chicago land region ranks fourth today in technology employment, with well over 210,000 technology workers currently working in technology in Illinois.

I pointed out that the wages of technology jobs are 77 percent more than other jobs in today's economy. I would also point out that technology trade is extremely important to Illinois, my home State. Illinois exported over \$16 billion just a couple years ago, making Illinois the third highest ranking State in our Union when it comes to technology exports. I am pretty proud of that.

And we think of the map here, which shows the top cyber States, the States which generate the most jobs from technology. As I pointed out earlier, Illinois ranks fourth today in technology employment.

Of course, Texas and California have grown the most in technology employment. In fact, just in the last few years, technology employment in Texas, home to Governor Bush, has seen the greatest growth in technology.

2030

As I mentioned earlier, technology employment not only in my State of Illinois but throughout this country is a major contributor to our economy, in jobs in millions, in technology. According to these statistics here, there were 4.8 million jobs in technology in 1998. That is more than the combined jobs in steel, chemicals, auto manufacturing and services.

Think about that. The traditional industries of steel and chemicals, which of course that is petroleum and, of course, auto, traditional basic jobs of our old economy of the 20th century, those jobs today are outnumbered by the jobs in technology. Clearly our economy is changing.

We often have to ask, how can we harness that change to benefit the average working American? How can we harness that growth in the new economy so that every American has the opportunity to participate in that economic growth as well as to contribute with their ideas and entrepreneurship? I have listened to many of those who work in technology, many of those who have created; that is, the companies that have done so well, those who have created that new technology, created those jobs and opportunity. It is all about creativity. That is something I have learned when it comes to technology. But the message is clear. If we want to harness the new economy to continue to provide growth and opportunity for the American people, if we want to ensure that, there are some three basic rules that we want to, I think, adopt.

Some say, what can Congress, what can government do to get involved in the new economy? Of course the government likes to regulate and tax as well as to stick its nose into a lot of things. But clearly this success of the new economy, the fact that high tech job wages are 77 percent higher than other sectors of the economy, the fact that one-third of all these new jobs have been created by the technology

economy, the fact that our economy is growing so rapidly because of technology resulted basically because government was not in the way.

Clearly as we work to build our new economy, the best approach for government basically is to stay out of the way and let the private sector innovate and create with a goal of a tax-free, trade-barrier-free and regulation-free new economy. I am proud to say that House Republicans continue to lead in the effort to build and promote opportunity in the new economy.

We of course are working to honor what we call the e-contract 2000, a contract that we are committed to, to grow the new economy and to provide digital opportunity for all Americans. Of course, the central tenets, the central goals of our e-contract are to grow the new economy by reducing taxes, limiting regulation, reducing unnecessary lawsuits, promoting free trade and e-commerce and building a high tech future. Those are lofty goals. But if we all work together in Congress and we all work together in the same way that we succeeded in balancing the budget for the first time in 28 years, the way that we cut taxes for the middle class for the first time in 16 years, take the same approach that we succeeded in cutting our welfare rolls in half with the implementation of welfare reform and it all resulted in a growing economy that has seen unprecedented economic growth and the lowest unemployment in 30 years.

I am proud to say our approach to lowering taxation, minimizing regulation and promoting trade-barrier-free commerce has produced some real accomplishments in this Congress. I am proud that thanks to Republican leadership, we put in place a moratorium on new taxes on Internet sales so that we do not double-tax and increase taxation of the new economy. My hope is that will be extended and we can have a vote on that fairly soon.

I am proud to say as a Republican Congress that rewarded investment and the creation of new technology and research with what is the longest ever extension of the research and development tax credit, to make it easier to attract new investment in research and development technology, the R&D tax credit, that was one of those that every year was extended maybe for 9 months or 12 months. When you are a private employer considering investing your resources, your dollars in R&D, you always think about the tax consequences. By extending it for 5 years, we made sure that when they invest, they can be confident that that investment will be recognized and treated fairly under our tax code.

I am also proud to say that this Republican Congress recognizes the importance of protecting intellectual property rights, ensuring those who innovate and create and come up with new ideas get the credit as well as benefit from their hard work and their labors when we passed the Intellectual

Property Rights Protection Act in 1998. Soon we are going to be passing the e-sign legislation, legislation that establishes a uniform and legally binding standard for electronic signatures in e-commerce. You often think of legal documents being a piece of paper. Today, so much of the business, so many transactions today are done over the Internet. We have to ensure that we can come up with a way to ensure that those business transactions are legally binding even though it is a virtual transaction and that e-sign legislation which has passed the House and Senate, we are now in conference working out differences in our legislation between the House and Senate, moves quickly so that we can continue to grow the new economy.

I am proud of those accomplishments. We have also passed out of the House more legislation protecting intellectual property rights; the American Inventors Protection Act addressed the issue of cyber-squatting, those folks who would steal names. I am also proud to say that under the leadership of those who want to promote research, which is the Republican majority, that we passed out of the House the Network and Information Technology Research and Development Act, legislation that boosts Federal investment in new technology, in new ideas helping grow the new economy. Those are accomplishments. We have moved that out of the House.

I have said that one of our other goals of the Republican majority is also to promote barrier-free trade. Coming up in less than 2 weeks is probably going to be the most important technology vote of the year, a vote that will determine what kind of access Americans would like to give themselves into what is the world's largest market. It will be a decision over whether Americans want to sell products to over 1.3 billion customers. That is the issue of whether or not we grant permanent normal trade relations with China.

China, of course, is the world's most populous nation. China has made a commitment to join the World Trade Organization and live by the rules, to honor intellectual property agreements, to honor trade agreements. As we know right now, they have access to our markets. All we have to do is go to the discount store and shop for some T-shirts to see that China has access to our markets. The question really is, do we want access to China's market? That is why the vote on permanent normal trade relations, the same trade status we give to almost everyone else, if we are going to give ourselves access to that market. To me it is the normal thing to do, to want to be able to sell our products that we make in Illinois in China.

Now, China is pretty important in technology. I would point out of the top five U.S. exports to China, the top five are electrical machinery as well as office machines, particularly computers. Of course it is expected that by

the end of this year, within the next couple of years, by the end of 2001, that China will become the world's second largest personal computer market. I would note that over the last 10 years, U.S. technology exports to China have increased by 500 percent. Think about that. If technology is the fastest growing sector of our economy, if technology is the part of our economy that is creating the biggest chunk of new jobs, one-third of all new jobs being created by technology, would we not want to sell those products in the world's largest market? And, of course, that is China.

Illinois, of course, is a major exporting State. As I pointed out earlier, Illinois ranks fourth in technology jobs. But Illinois ranks third in export and trade of our technology. It is important to us. We exported over a billion dollars from Illinois to China last year. I think we need more opportunity in that market. That is why I support normal trade relations with China, because it is good for American workers and it is going to create more jobs for American workers. Clearly if we want to grow our technology economy, which I certainly want to do for the State I am proud to represent, Illinois, we need to increase our market.

I also wanted to talk a little bit as we talk about technology not only about trade but about another challenge that we face. That is something that some people call the digital divide, what I call the challenge to provide digital opportunity. What really hit home about the issue of the need to provide digital opportunity is when I talk to educators, teachers, school board members, school administrators, and they tell me that they are beginning to notice a difference in the classroom between the children who have a computer at home and those who do not. That the school kids who have a computer at home to work on their schoolwork, their homework seem to be doing a little better in school than those who do not. That is an issue of concern to our educators.

Clearly education has been a priority in this Congress. In fact in our budget this year, we increased funding for elementary and secondary education by 10 percent while balancing the budget. So at the same time we are making education a priority, maybe we need to think about what we can do to help those kids who do not have a computer at home so that they can compete in the classroom. That is a big issue here, creating digital opportunity for our kids and for the future. Because those young people, those children that do not have a computer at home, if they are behind in school because they do not have a computer and trying to compete with their classmates, think about what that means for them long-term in competing for jobs and, of course, competing in the new economy of the 21st century.

There are some interesting statistics out there. People say the digital divide.

What really is the digital divide? We hear about it. If the digital divide is out there, is there something that we can do to make that digital divide really something called digital opportunity? If we think about it here, it is interesting that when we look at the digital divide, it is interesting that many cases it is the income level of the family that creates the digital divide. It says here, some statistics I have with me today, that urban households earning more than \$75,000 annually are more than 20 times likely to have home Internet access compared to urban families at the lowest income levels. Think about that. In many communities in this State of Illinois as well as in this country, \$75,000 is middle class or upper middle class. But they are 20 times as likely to have computers and Internet access as low-income families. I would also point out that those families with persons making less than \$25,000 annually generally cite cost as the primary reason for not using the Internet at home, while those making more cite do not want it as the reason.

Let me repeat that again. Low-income families say the reason they do not have computer at home, the reason they do not have access to the Internet is because of the cost, whereas higher income families just because they do not want to have it. So clearly there is a recognition by those families in many cases who do not have computers and Internet access that if they had a little more money or somehow Internet access could be more affordable that they would want their children to have computers at home, too.

How can we create digital opportunity recognizing that income disparity on the so-called digital divide? I have also learned that if you look at statistics, that education level creates a digital divide. Those with the higher level of education, higher level of education degrees tend to have computers and Internet access. In fact, those with college degrees are 10 times more likely to have Internet access at work than persons with only some high school education. And that 62 percent of those with college degrees now use the Internet, while those with only a grade school education, only about 7 percent of them use the Internet. And also in rural areas it is interesting that those with college degrees are more likely to have access to the Internet than those without. So how can we ensure that those who are from families where there is not a college degree have computers and Internet access?

Some say we should be just talking about that digital divide. I believe that we should be looking for ways to create digital opportunity, because if we create digital opportunity, we can harness the new economy to ensure that every child has access to computers and the Internet, not only at school but at home. We are of course working in the Republican majority to find ways to provide digital opportunity, to eliminate the so-called digital divide. We

want to pass tax incentives to encourage computers at home as well as in the school.

2045

We want to encourage donation of computers to schools by the private sector. We want to bring down the costs of Internet access, and we pointed out earlier lower-income families identify the costs of Internet access and the costs of having that computer as their chief barrier to having a home computer for their child to be able to do their school work on.

Clearly, we have to work on an agenda, which will provide digital opportunity, digital opportunity for families, digital opportunities for e-commerce, both at home as well as at work. There are several ways we can do that.

Clearly, the ways we can do that is to give educational priority so that as we raise the education level, people tend to have a computer and Internet access, but also when it comes to education, should we not also ensure that families know how to use a computer; that teachers understand how to train students on how to use that computer for homework and classes, as well as research on school papers and preparing for a test?

I am proud to say that this House continues to lead the way in boosting education. As I mentioned earlier, we increased funding in this year's balanced budget by 10 percent for public education, a 10 percent increase while even balancing the budget, but we also worked to make sure those dollars reach the classroom, and that those dollars have distributed back to our local schools in a way that those schools can take advantage of those programs to train teachers, as well as to ensure that there is technology in the wire, in the fiber and the hardwares installed in the classroom.

We are ready soon to vote on here in the House the Education Options Act, legislation which will provide training for teachers, to integrate technology into the classroom, that has passed committee, and it is waiting for a vote here in the House.

I am also proud to say that the House Committee on Ways and Means which I serve on has improved the Education Savings in School Excellence Act, a program that would increase the amount of money you can set aside in Education Savings Account from \$500 to \$2,000 allowing families to save more for their child's education, but I would also point out that those dollars we would allow families to use to buy computer equipment and also the software they need to run those computers, and they would also be able to use those dollars to hire a tutor, if necessary, to help their child catch up in the classroom.

That legislation has passed committee. It is waiting a vote here in the full House of Representatives. The House of Representatives just this past

year passed the Teacher Empowerment Act which allows local schools to spend Federal dollars to teach educators how to integrate technology into the classroom, to ensure that technology is in the classroom, but also to ensure that teachers understand how to use that technology and better educate the children.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that there is a number of initiatives in the Committee on Ways and Means that I serve on which would also help provide computers in the school. I am proud to say that the House Committee on Ways and Means is now considering the New Millennium Classrooms Act, legislation that would increase the amount of the charitable deduction that a business would receive if they donate their surplus computers to schools.

Those are good ideas, good ideas to help in the classroom, good ideas to ensure that our children have an opportunity at school in how to use a computer, that teachers know how to use those computers, that teachers also know how to train them, but the other solution I believe to helping eliminate so-called digital divide, providing greater digital opportunity, is to find ways so that families could have computers and Internet access at home, so that when school children bring their homework home, they have got a computer at home to work on it, a computer they can use to solve their problems and to access the Internet for research, so that they can contact the Library of Congress, the greatest library in the world, via the Internet, and, of course, have that literally at home as a research tool to prepare their schools paper. And that is a challenge.

As I mentioned earlier in the statistics, many of these low-income families that do not have computers identify the costs of Internet access as being the barrier that prevents them from having computer and Internet access. So how can we solve that challenge?

I am proud to say a major employer in our country, but also a major in the District that I represent, and I have two Ford auto plants in Hegewisch and Chicago Heights, that I represent would point out that companies have stepped forward, major corporations have stepped forward in our country, Ford Motor Company, Intel, American Airlines, Delta Airlines and have stepped forward in that effort to help ensure that their workers have computers at home so their workers children have those computers for their school work. Think about that.

American Airlines has 100,000 employees, between Ford Motor Company, American Airlines, Intel and Delta Airlines, 600,000 workers, every one from the guy who sweeps the assembly line floor, to the CEO, every one of those families, universal access to Ford Motor Company's families, to the Internet in computers, as a result of a

program they are now offering, which will provide as an employee benefit computers and Internet access.

It would be an employee benefit the same as a pension or as your health care coverage, having a computer at home and subsidize reduced rate Internet access. Think about that. American Airlines, 100,000 employees, Intel, American Ford Motor Company and Delta Airlines, a total of 600,000 families that will benefit from this type of program.

I believe we should find more companies willing to step forward to provide digital opportunity on a universal basis for their employees. There is a consequence. We discovered that when Ford and Intel and American and Delta stepped forward to provide this benefit for their employees, computers and Internet access to help their children learn at home that there is a tax consequence.

The consequence was that this new benefit for employees having a computer and Internet access was taxable, which meant the worker would have to pay higher taxes in order to have that computer and that Internet access, and that is a question; is that right? I don't believe so.

To me, it is just good government policy to encourage private employees to help eliminate the digital divide, to provide greater digital opportunity. That is why I am proud that just prior to the Passover on Easter break, before Congress took a 2-week break to be back home in our districts, that I was joined by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) in introducing what we call the DDATA Act, the Digital Divide Access Technology Act, legislation that treats this computer and Internet access benefit that is provided by private employer to employees as a tax-free benefit.

It treats it the same as an employee contribution to a worker's pension, as an employer's contribution to a worker's health care benefits. It just make sense.

My hope is this legislation will receive bipartisan support and move quickly through the House. Ladies and gentlemen, we want to eliminate the digital divide. We want to eliminate the digital divide by creating digital opportunity at school, as well as in the home. I am proud of that. It is important initiative. Both initiatives deserve bipartisan support.

We also want to provide greater digital opportunity in the workplace. One of the ways we need to do a better job here in the Congress, where we can stay out of the way, but also bring fairness to the Tax Code, is to recognize the need, the need to modernize and update the tax treatment of technology in the workplace. Technology changes pretty rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, today, private employers are replacing the computers in their office every 14 to 16 months, but under our current Tax Code, our employers and private businesses, whether

it is the realtor or the insurance agent, as well as the big corporation, they have to carry those computers on their books for 5 years. They are depreciated over a 5-year period, even though that computer is replaced every 14 months.

Essentially, our Tax Code is discouraging private employers and business from taking advantage of the latest technology, because the Tax Code says if we are going to depreciate that you have got to keep it on the books for 5 years; that really delays the decision to upgrade the technology.

Now that we are in the global economy, do we not want the business community and our employers and those who use computers in the workplace to have the latest technology to compete? I think we do, and that is why I introduced legislation called the Computer Depreciation Reform Act of 2000, legislation which will eliminate that 5-year depreciation schedule and recognize reality here in the 21st century, and, that is, the need to reform depreciation and essentially what we call expensing in government jargon which means you can fully deduct the cost of that computer in the first year; 1 year, rather than 5, that recognizes the 14 to 16 months that you replace your computer.

Before I close, I am going to mention the last tax initiative that I believe deserves support that is now before the Committee on Ways and Means. Many poor families, as I noted earlier in the statistics that I share, have stated that the costs of Internet access in computers at home is a chief barrier to having those computers and having Internet access for children and their families in order to help them to do their schoolwork and do their research for school papers at home.

I have talked about solutions that Republicans are offering to ensure that computers are available at school and Republicans solutions to ensuring that computers are available at home, but I am also proud to say that there is legislation which I hope we bring before this House also early this summer, which will again help reduce the costs of those computers.

Frankly, what we are doing under this proposal is to eliminate what was once a temporary tax on your telephone, that was put in place during the Spanish-American war to pay off the Spanish-American war debt, probably the best example of one of those taxes that never ends, because when that tax was enacted 100 years ago, it was a luxury tax, because not many people had telephone. They figured they stick it to rich people and, of course, over time we now have telephones. And we are all paying this tax, and it was conveniently forgotten to end it. Three cents on every dollar of your telephone service is now collected and goes to Uncle Sam.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to reduce access costs to the Internet, we have to recognize that the majority of people who access the Internet obtain their

of course, if you charge 3 cents on the dollar in taxes for every dollar of telephone use, that means every time you access your computer, access the Internet, it is costly.

Let us end that Spanish-American war tax. Let us repeal the telephone excise tax, and think about it if it is 3 percent, that means that your grandmother, who is on a limited income, who uses the telephone to call her grandchildren across this country is paying that 3 percent the same as the millionaire who may live across the street.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a regressive tax as well, so we can reduce the costs for lower-income families, the Internet access by repealing the telephone excise tax.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have some big challenges before us and the new economy is contributing so much to the America's future, an economy that is driven by technology and an economy that has grown because government stayed out of the way. If we continue to want to see the new economy grow and technology provide greater opportunity for the American people, then I believe we need to continue that approach of a tax-free, regulation-free, trade barrier-free new economy.

We have some solutions. Solutions that promote education. Solutions that promote education as a way of contributing to the new economy. We also have solutions to address the so-called digital divide. I believe we need to provide digital opportunity in school, at home, and in the workplace, and that means we need to pursue a tax-free, trade barrier-free and regulation-free new economy, because that is what it is all about, digital opportunity for our kids and for our future.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address this House this evening.

2100

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will take 60 minutes this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for a very interesting and thoughtful presentation preceding mine.

Mr. Speaker, I intend tonight to address the issue of social security. I am pleased to see that the candidates for president are each speaking to this vital issue, and I want in the next several minutes to present some background in terms of what is encompassed within the social security program, what are the strains on the program that need to be addressed in the

future, and how the parties differ on the early proposals for change they are advancing, things that we need to look at very closely to make certain that we have a strong social security program going forward.

Let me begin by talking about social security. First of all, the program passed in 1935. Someone suggested that of the many initiatives of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, social security remains in place as perhaps his most significant contribution to this country.

I like to think of social security as a program designed to respond to the unavoidable, completely inescapable risks each of us have as Americans: dying at a time when we have dependents; becoming disabled and unable to make a living; or outliving one's assets in retirement years, each a very serious right-to-the-core financial threat to us and our families.

Social security was built as a system whereby all of us as Americans insure each of us against these perils.

I think it is vitally important that we remember social security is more than a retirement program. There is going to be a lot of discussion, I guarantee Members, over the next many months, a lot of discussion about whether a person is making enough return on their social security payments, the taxes withheld from our paycheck for social security; is the return on that what we might make if we just had that money and could go and invest it in the market?

Most of that discussion does not acknowledge at all that in addition to the retirement benefit there is an insurance policy, essentially, that covers workers in the workplace if they die prematurely leaving dependents at home.

More than one in seven Americans today will die before their 67th birthday. It is very foreseeable that they would have dependents at home depending on them, depending upon the income that no longer comes in.

I know something about this particular coverage. When my father died with a sudden and unanticipated heart attack, just struck down, a complete shock to all of us, he had dependents. I was one of them, a teenager; my younger brother was another; my mother, a displaced homemaker without employment skills; all of us absolutely not just in an emotional state of shock, but without the resources to make it.

The social security checks came. I have been a social security beneficiary. This vital support from social security helped us stabilize and allowed my brother and myself to get an education, to go out and get careers; allowed my mother that period of time she needed to get a job skill, get into the work force so she could make it on her own.

That was what that social security survivors' benefit meant to my family, and that is a very, very common story. I would challenge anyone who really does not know about this survivors'

benefit in the social security program to ask around. They will not have to ask far to find out someone who has benefited when a loved one has died leaving them with dependents, and depending upon, therefore, social security.

Ninety-eight percent of the children in this country are covered under the survivors' benefit under social security, 98 percent.

As we look at issues like uninsured children for health and other issues, we design programs anymore that if they get half of that, we think it would be a smashing success. We literally have all but universal coverage of our children in this country if their dad or mom die while they are still in dependent years. That is something we do not talk about. Remember that survivors' benefit. It is a vital part of the protection social security provides.

Of course, we also have the disability coverage. Someone is working, becomes disabled, and can no longer make a living. What are they going to do? This is one of those core risks that social security responds to with its disability payment.

This was designed in the thirties. I had a grandpa who was smashed against a barn driving a team of horses. Members can well imagine the kind of disability threats that accompanied the hard physical labor in the thirties. But believe me, it is still very much part of the work force, very much with men and women going to work today.

In fact, if we just take 20-year-olds at a time in their lives where they are the strongest, healthiest, and have their career years right in front of them, it is pretty sobering to think that three out of 10 will at sometime in their lives become disabled and unable to work before retirement, three out of ten 20-year-olds today. That is the kind of risk that is associated with disability.

If you are in the work force, working for a living, getting by on your own, you become disabled and unable to pull down that paycheck, that is a very important coverage of social security.

There is private disability coverage available. It is expensive. It is medically underwritten. Most do not have it. In fact, three of four workers in the work force today, 75 percent of men and women going to work today, only have social security if they become disabled. But that is another thing we really do not talk about as being wrapped into social security.

Next time we hear somebody at the work force talking about, well, I am just not making on that social security money what I could make in the stock market, just ask them what they think the value of having coverage for their kids is if they get killed on the way home from work in an auto accident; or if tomorrow they have a stroke and they cannot work anymore, what the values of those coverages are like. Let me tell the Members, it improves the

return on that social security investment very, very significantly immediately.

Of course, the hallmark, the feature that social security is best known for, is its survivors' benefit. On average, social security pays \$800 a month for individuals in retirement, \$800 a month. It is not enough to live comfortably on at the margin one can get by on if that is all they have, so there is a tremendous pressure to do more, with social security as the foundation for retirement income and more, retirement savings; even earnings, and we have lifted the earnings cap so people can earn whatever they can earn once they get 65 and their social security starts, because we want to help people get a comfortable income in retirement.

The reality is that \$800 a month, that is more than 50 percent of the income for more than two-thirds, more than 66 percent, two-thirds of Americans receiving social security retirement payments. For one-third, the millions that represent one-third of social security retirement retirees, that social security check is all they have got. More than half of the income for two-thirds, that is all they got, for one-third.

Let us face it, that \$800 a month average payment, it may not seem like a lot to some, but to some it is everything. That is why, when it comes to social security, we have to be very, very serious and careful because it is the retirement foundation. I do not believe it is one place where we should add risk, more risk, to Americans than we already have about our retirement savings earnings.

Social security at its formation was never intended to be a retirement plan, a stand-alone, this is all you need, live happy, plan. That is not what it was supposed to be. It was supposed to be the foundation. It continues to be just the foundation. No one aspiring to living on \$800 a month in retirement years is looking at a standard of living that they might more fully aspire to. We need retirement savings in addition to achieve that. Let us just talk about how that one is coming along.

We know that Americans' savings rate, their household savings rate as measured by the Department of Commerce is at its lowest point since the Depression. The February statistic of .8 percent was the lowest retirement savings rate since the Depression. Between World War II and 1980, it averaged 8 percent. Now it is .8 percent.

We are on a spending binge. I worry a lot about it. I think we need to try and encourage more savings in this country so people can live comfortably in retirement.

If personal savings is not getting the job done, let us take a look at, are people saving in the work force, do they have their 401(k)s or whatever they have at the workplace that will help them save for retirement?

Here the news is also very, very disturbing. One-half of the workers in the work force have no retirement savings

plan at work, even a 401(k) where the boss does not kick in anything. They do not even have that. They have nothing, nothing at work, so no personal savings and no savings plan at work for 75 million. Fifty million Americans have no retirement savings whatsoever, another statistic that we know.

We know that more than half of all Americans have never calculated whether the savings that they have is going to match their expected need in retirement years. That can be pretty sobering. Maybe they stick a couple of hundred in now and then, maybe they get \$1,000 in the tax return that people manage not to spend and put that in and they figure, well, we are working away at it.

For the average man reaching the age of 65 today, he has 15 more years that he has to figure out how he is going to finance. For the average woman, it is even more telling, 19 additional years. They can expect 19 additional years once they have reached the age of 65. Yet, more than half of all Americans have not calculated whether they are saving enough with their workplace retirement plan and other savings to meet those needs in retirement.

There is another evolution going on. Even within those places where there are retirement plans at work, we are going to a new design of plans. We are going away from the old pension plan where, no matter how long you live, you had that guaranteed pension payment. We are going more to what is called a defined contribution model, where what you will have to sustain you in retirement is dependent upon what you have saved and how well you invested.

Unlike the old days when you did not have an investment responsibility, you now do have an investment responsibility under those 401(k) plans. We know some use it well and some do not use it well.

We also know that for the millions that are depending upon their 401(k) plans to sustain them in retirement years, those amounts may not be up to the test. Remember, there are literally lots and lots of years to account for once a person reaches the age of 65. Yet, a February year 2000 study by the Employment Benefits Research Institute shows that 47 percent, 47 percent of the 401(k) plans have less than \$10,000 in them. The average account balance on average is \$47,000. Now try to sustain a comfortable living for 19 years if your balance is somewhere between \$10,000 and \$47,000. It is one mean trick, let me say.

That is why we keep circling back to social security. It is the foundation. It must remain. We cannot have additional risk jeopardizing even that payment because we know we have all kinds of trouble on the private retirement savings side.

I think the conclusion we can draw from all of this is that Congress has to pay attention to private retirement

savings. We have to make it easier for people to save individually for retirement savings. We have to help modest income households even under tight discretionary income circumstances save for retirement.

We also have to do more to help employers across this country offer retirement savings plans for their work force. Sometimes Congress has been guilty of putting in place way too much rigmarole and regulation. We have actually discouraged the very retirement savings that we want to encourage. We need to address that. That has to happen on the private retirement savings side.

2115

But now we get to Social Security. Where are we standing on this one? Well, I am pleased to say that over the years I have been in Congress working on Social Security, the solvency outlook for Social Security has improved significantly. I do not claim full credit for that. It is a feature of our robust economy. It is a feature of more people in the workforce paying payroll taxes. And as a result, the solvency of this program has improved almost 10 years from only 2 or 3 years ago.

The strain, of course, on Social Security is that we do not have an evenly allocated age range across the population of the United States. We have got this bulge, the much-discussed baby boomers. And while we are in the workforce today, and I am one of them, we are going to move into retirement in disproportionate numbers. The number of active workers today is three to one. And by the time all the baby boomers retire, it is going to be two workers per retiree. That is what causes the strain on this Social Security program.

The earlier projections were that the surplus that has been generated will be completely exhausted by the year 2029, just when the baby boomers really are fully into retirement. Again, because of the increased participation in the workforce, low unemployment, a sustained record-setting economy in the history of this country, we have generated significant contribution to Social Security beyond what was anticipated by the actuaries even 3 years ago, and the most recent projection is that the Social Security Trust Fund will not be exhausted until the year 2037, and that is if nothing whatsoever is done with it.

At the time, 2037, benefits fall 30 percent. It is not as if Social Security payments stop, but they are funded only by the payroll tax coming in. That is not enough to fully make those payments, so benefits collapse 30 percent. Therefore, we need to take action. And anyone that knows something about this is going to say: The earlier we take action, the less painful it needs to be to make the fixes to sustain Social Security for the long haul.

So that is the backdrop to the presidential debate on Social Security that

we will have in this upcoming election year. It is an absolutely vital program for Americans. It pays not just retirement, but survivors benefits and disability benefits. Its solvency has improved, and improved quite significantly, in recent years in light of the very healthy economy that we have had. But we have a shortfall and we have to address it.

Let us take a look at the competing proposals to address Social Security. Vice President Al Gore has advanced a proposal that basically captures the strengths of our existing economy. He holds absolutely secure all of the surplus being generated by Social Security. And, again, that surplus is because we have got a three-to-one ratio, three workers per retiree. So as we generate the Social Security withholding taxes, we are generating a lot more surplus than required to pay the benefit.

The Vice President would first of all hold that surplus secure for Social Security. He would use the surplus dollars to retire and eliminate completely the Federal debt owed by this country. He would save the money that the Federal Government now pays in interest on the debt, and commit it to the Social Security program.

Let me go through this again. Here is the Vice President's plan: Hold Social Security surplus secure; eliminate the Federal debt; calculate the amount of money that the Federal Government has been paying in interest and, because there is no debt and that money is not owed in interest anymore, take that amount and pay it into the Social Security program to sustain it well through the middle of the 21st century.

Some might say, wait a minute, we have Social Security taxes for Social Security and now we are going to take general fund revenues for Social Security? Absolutely appropriate. It is the Social Security surplus that is retiring the national debt, and this debt payment out of taxpayer dollars is staggering. To think that nearly 15 cents out of every dollar, just 15 cents of every dollar, take the first \$15 in taxes out of \$100, goes to pay interest on the debt. We are going to eliminate the debt. Eliminate it and then take that surplus, commit it to Social Security, take that savings, commit it into Social Security so that while preserving the full benefit structure, Social Security is with us through the life span of the baby boomers.

Mr. Speaker, I was born in 1952. A Social Security solvency program that gets us through the year 2050 takes care of me, believe me, and most of my peers in the baby boomer age group.

In the event there continued to be solvency issues past the middle of this century, we can address them. But I think making this strong commitment, given the sound economy of this country, to paying down the debt, capture the interest savings, invest in Social Security so it is there through the middle of the century and beyond, these

are the hallmark of the Vice President's plan. I think they are solid principles for Social Security. They absolutely preserve it as the income bedrock for Americans and that is what we have to do.

Against that backdrop, the Bush plan, quite frankly, has caused me a great deal of concern. Although it is very sketchy and we hear that there may or may not be greater detail provided about the Bush plan, we know that he would basically carve up the program and create for each Social Security recipient an amount they could voluntarily elect as a private account.

Now, who would not like additional private account on top of our individual retirement assets? If someone would say to me, "You want an additional 2 percent in retirement savings to play around with invest and make some return?" Sure, what do I have to give up? And this is the critical thing.

To the extent that we invest our resources in an individual account, we subtract from the guarantee to the program. Now, there are those that advocate this private account business that say: No problem. We are going to make it a heads-you-win-tails-I-lose situation. If the individual account does not perform spectacularly, giving you more money that you know would otherwise have, the Federal Government is going to pony up the difference. So we have literally a no-lose situation. That sounds great.

But, Mr. Speaker, sometimes things that sound so great need a little closer inspection. I used to be an insurance commissioner. My colleagues would not believe some of the sales pitches that I have seen behind complex financial instruments. The fact is I disallowed a lot of them because they were not fundamentally honest. I do not think that promises of that nature that are not based on sound economics, I do not think those promises are fundamentally honest either.

Let us talk about the totality of the Bush economic plan and see whether this could possibly work. First of all, we know that instead of tackling that debt and eliminating it, the foundation of the Bush economic plan is a massive tax cut, even larger than the House passed and the President vetoed last fall. A tax cut that would basically take all of the non-Social Security surplus and eliminate it from the Federal budget.

Then he would create these individual accounts. And if we are doing our math, at this point we are thinking, let us see. The general fund revenue is gone. And then there is the individual account, and that has got to carve into the Social Security guarantee, but they say it will not. So how do we fund that part?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it really has not been made clear. Some of the options, frankly, if we do not have the revenue, would have to include benefit reduction, expanding the retirement age, not actually funding that backstop, that

guarantee that we cannot do worse under this program. All of those are really core questions I think that have to come into the proposals advanced by George W. Bush.

I give him credit for talking about these issues. These are complicated, controversial issues and I think it is good that he has advanced them as part of his campaign for President. But then it is our responsibility to look at it and ask the questions.

Quite frankly, we do not have the dollars. We do not have the dollars with the tax cut he proposes to take the general fund revenue and the additional 2 percent commitment that he makes out of the Social Security revenue. We do not have the dollars to continue that base guarantee.

The bottom line is at a time when we have inadequate savings for retirement on the private side, we have individual workers in the workforce taking more and more risk for their retirement by whatever employer program they are covering, at a time when Social Security checks average \$800 a month, and we know that Americans have more and more life expectancy to try and make on that kind of income, we know that the Bush plan adds uncertainty into the Social Security picture.

The investment counselors would say investors should allocate risk. There is a spectrum of risk in investment strategies, from the high-tech on the risky side down to the bonds on the low end side and that way we kind of protect ourselves. We protect our investment picture. I think we need to look at retirement income similarly.

Mr. Speaker, with retirement, we are going to have the high-risk stuff, and that is going to be including the private savings that we might have on a tech stock. It will include the kind of risky stuff that might be an aggressive portfolio of our 401(k). And then it has to include the bedrock, absolutely safe stuff, and that has to be the Social Security program.

So this is not a place and we do not add risk on top of risk. We backstop more risk by maintaining the foundation, and that means keeping Social Security, keeping the commitment, keeping the retirement age, keeping the defined benefit guarantee that there is a payment there every month that we cannot outlive. And it is up to us not just to see this program, I think, for retirement needs of those now in retirement or those of us in the baby boom generation about to come on to retirement, but for our children and grandchildren as well.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason this Social Security issue teed up in the presidential debate will be generating a great deal more discussion, and I thank you for giving me this time to advance these ideas tonight.

TRIBUTE TO D.C. FIRE CHIEF TOM TIPPETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, a terrible tragedy occurred on Friday of last week. The District of Columbia fire chief resigned his position. I have known Tom Tippett for a number of years. I have come to respect him and admire him, as do all of those firefighters, men and women, who serve in local 36 of the D.C. Fire Department Union.

Tom Tippett is a true firefighter. I first met him about 12 years ago, shortly after I first came to Congress and decided to try to work the issues involving fire and life safety in this country. To create a better awareness among our colleagues about the role of the firefighter in our inner-city areas, I started a tradition that each year would take our colleagues on a volunteer basis and have them run with one of the busiest D.C. fire stations.

Mr. Speaker, one of those nights we assigned a group of Members to run with Tom Tippett's station, a truck company and a rescue company that was at that time the busiest station in D.C. As Members of Congress in their jeans and shirts, with their running gear assigned by the Department, sat in the station talking to firefighters and responded throughout the evening to drug dealings, shootings, emergency trauma situations, fires, accidents, HAZMAT disasters, every kind of incident we could think of, all of us were in awe, Democrats and Republicans, of the job these people do every day.

Since that time, I have worked with Tom in a number of capacities. He became the President of the local here in the District of Columbia. And then when an opening occurred last year, he was offered the temporary assignment of serving as the District of Columbia Fire Chief.

He did an outstanding job, Mr. Speaker. When he took over the role of the chief, he said he would do it, but would have as his ultimate goal the objective of improving the life safety for the firefighters who he now had responsibility for.

2130

The safety and well-being of fire fighters and EMS personnel across America is a major issue, Mr. Speaker. In fact, each year, we lose over 100 fire and EMS personnel, most of them volunteers, because the bulk of our Nation's fire fighters are volunteers, in the course of their doing their job. Over 100.

In fact, the D.C. Fire Department has lost three fire fighters within the last 3 years. In fact, Mr. Speaker, following a fire several years ago that took the life of one of D.C.'s finest, a fire where that life probably should have been able to be saved, a series of recommendations

were made, recommendations following the death of fire fighter and Sergeant John Carter.

John Carter's widow was at the press conference today where we called for action to restore these cuts that were made to the D.C. fire department. John Carter was a dedicated professional. He left behind a widow and a 10-year-old son. He died in an unfortunate circumstance that probably could have been avoided, as did two of his colleagues who died almost 1 year ago in May of last year.

Following the death of John Carter, the Committee on Appropriations of this body in its legislative language in last year's bill put in the following item, and I will quote from this bill which is actually District of Columbia Appropriations bill for the year 2000 passed in this body on July 22, 1999. This is what it says, "The Committee encourages the District to provide funding for two critically important safety measures that were developed by the fire department internal committee following the death of Fire Fighter John Carter 2 years ago. These safety measures include restoring the aide to the battalion chief within the fire fighting division and increasing staffing levels to at least five fire fighters on ladder companies.

"The mission of the fire and emergency medical services department is to improve the quality of life to those who choose to live, work, visit, and do business in the District of Columbia by preventing fires before they occur, extinguish those fires that do occur, and providing emergency medical and ambulance service."

This was in the law that we passed last year in response to the death of Fire Fighter Carter.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, last year we saw two additional deaths of D.C. fire fighters. In fact, in a fire that occurred on May 30, 1999 at 3146 Cherry Road in Northeast, two fire fighters paid the ultimate price, and they left their families behind.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I came down to Washington at the request of the local fire department along with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and we joined the thousands of fire fighters, both locally and nationally, who came to pay their respects to these two brave individuals.

There was a second study done, Mr. Speaker, following this fire. I will enter into the RECORD the report of that fire from the Reconstruction Committee, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT—REPORT FROM THE RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE REGARDING FIRE AT 3146 CHERRY ROAD, NE, WASHINGTON, DC, ON MAY 30, 1999

Incident Commanders need to follow the Incident Command System and sector every incident immediately upon arrival. This will reduce fireground confusion and allow the Incident Commander to quickly contact sector leaders to determine the locations of companies in their sectors.

The Safety Officer should not conduct roll calls. Instead, a member of the Incident

Command Staff (e.g., a battalion chief aide) should conduct roll calls.

The Training Academy must conduct ongoing training and evaluation of fire fighters and fire officers to ensure that all Department personnel respond properly to roll calls. Roll call training must be part of recruit training, company level drills and training academy refresher courses.

FIREGROUND COMMAND

Problem—Command Post Location.—Battalion Fire Chief 1's vehicle was not in a position to allow him an adequate view of the incident. Battalion Fire Chief 1 unsuccessfully attempted to relocate the vehicle to obtain a better view, then left his vehicle and proceeded to the front of the building. Battalion Fire Chief 1 never established a fixed command post.

By leaving his vehicle, BFC-1 abandoned the stronger car-mounted mobile radio and was forced to communicate using a weaker portable radio. The use of a single portable radio also caused missed messages, due to switching back and forth between fireground and dispatch channels. In addition, it was impossible to maintain the command chart from a roving position.

Recommendation.—Incident Commanders must establish fixed command posts. A fixed position allows for better communication, tracking of companies and a better environment for decision making. The Incident Commander should use either his/her vehicle or another emergency vehicle that is more suitably located for this task. The command post should allow a view of the building that includes at least one, and preferably two, sides. The use of a fixed command post allows the Incidence Commander to simultaneously monitor multiple radio channels at greater signal strength as well as access to both mobile and portable radios.

Problem—Changing Tactics.—Extinguishing this fire involved a change in tactics from a front to a rear oriented attack. This change in tactics required close coordination and communication between BFC-1 and the front and rear fire suppression teams. Battalion Fire Chief 1 was unable to coordinate front and rear teams because he lacked information, particularly the location of engine company crews.

Recommendation.—Proper management of the fireground requires the assistance of a battalion chief's aide. This position was restored on December 19, 1999. Department should continue the position of battalion chief's aide and their role includes the following: Assist in the coordination of fireground activities; gather critical information for the Incident Commander; allow the Incident Commander to sector the incident sooner; handle specific tasks, such as accountability, as directed by the Incident Commander; improving fireground communications.

The position of battalion chief's aide is important to fireground safety. All personnel should understand the function of this and other command staff positions through training in the Department's Incident Command System.

Problem—Sectoring.—Battalion Fire Chief 1 never sectored the fire or properly used a tactical worksheet. He was quickly overwhelmed trying to manage this escalating incident. BFC-2 was assigned to the rear, however, he was never assigned any companies nor were specific companies directed to report to him.

Recommendation.—Incident Commanders must follow the Department's Incident Command System procedures on sectoring an incident and use command charts at all incidents. Sectors must be established in the early stages of all emergency incidents. Sector leaders must be assigned companies for

which they are responsible. Sector leaders must give progress reports to the Incident Commander every five minutes or more frequently, as necessary. The Department must ensure that all officers are trained to serve as sector leaders.

Mandatory use of sector assignments will reduce the risk of exceeding the span-of-control and increase the Incident Commander's effectiveness. Command Staff should also be increased to facilitate the sectoring process. Restoration of the battalion chief's aide will also help alleviate this problem.

Problem—EMS Command.—The EMS Supervisor established a separate EMS command structure at this incident.

Recommendation—EMS operations must be incorporated into the overall fireground operational plan as a sector that reports to the Incident Commander.

Problem—Mobile Command Unit.—It was too long into the incident before the Mobile Command Unit arrived on the scene. Consequently, the command process was hindered because the additional resources afforded by the Mobile Command Unit were not available.

Recommendation—The Mobile Command Unit should respond automatically to any incident that the DFC responds or if requested by the Incident Commander.

COMMUNICATIONS

Problem—Relaying Important Information.—After the Box Alarm was dispatched, Communications Division received an additional phone call, correcting the incident address and reporting that the fire was in the basement. This information was announced on the Fire Channel 1 at the end of a long transmission. Few companies heard this message and the information was not properly acknowledged. Acknowledgment was only received from E-26 on the address change information.

Recommendation—Communications must follow the established SOPs for relaying pertinent information. Communications Division must require that all responding units acknowledge all pertinent information.

The Department should also conduct a thorough evaluation of the Communications Division to ensure that its operations meet the Department's needs. Such an evaluation must also include recommendations to improve the Communications Division's performance during emergency incidents.

Problem—Size-up Reports.—There was no size-up report from the rear. As a result, personnel did not have a description of the building and the conditions found. Also, BFC-1 and company officers did not request important information, which caused them to act without sufficient information.

Recommendation—Company officers must be trained to give immediate and accurate size-up reports at every incident. Company officers must receive ongoing training in effective fireground communication and SOPs. In addition, Incident Commanders and company officers must be trained to request information, such as size-up progress reports, in the absence of this information. The use of Battalion Chief's Aides greatly improves size-up information.

Problem—Progress Reports.—The officers from E-26 and E-10 made no radio transmissions during their initial attack, nor did they give progress reports. These companies did not respond to repeated attempts by BFC-1 to contact them by radio. As a result, BFC-1 was not fully aware of the interior conditions or the location of these companies in the building. Accordingly, Battalion Fire Chief 1 delayed a rear fire attack out of concern for the safety of these interior crews.

Company officers were unable to hear all radio transmissions at all times. It is likely

that the inability of some officers to hear radio transmissions was due in part to the position of the portable radios of the officers. This contributed to the poor communications at this incident.

Recommendation—The Incident Commander must be aware of the location, activities and conditions encountered by the companies at an incident. Department SOPs for the Incident Command System requires that companies provide regular progress reports to the Incident Commander. The Department must train personnel through in-service drills and annual training and enforce the existing SOPs for communications at all emergency incidents.

Speaker microphones should be used or radio pockets should be added to the Department's turnout clothing specification to improve effectiveness of radio transmissions.

Problem—Deteriorating Conditions.—During rescue operations, personnel noticed that the living room floor was deteriorating, becoming spongy and sloping. This critical information was not relayed to BFC-1.

Recommendation—Personnel must be trained to immediately relay any information about deteriorating structural integrity of fire buildings to the Incident Commander.

Problem—Radio Interference.—Fire Channel 1 (154.190MHz) and Fire Channel 4 (154.205MHz) are too close in frequency, creating interference when either channel is operated simultaneously. The Channel 4 radio transcript shows many unintelligible transmissions and microphone clicks that could not be identified. Fireground personnel may have missed important Channel 4 transmissions when Channel 1 was active. Identical problems were documented during the Kennedy Street reconstruction.

Recommendation—As a short term solution, the Department should replace Fire Channel 4 with Fire Channel 2 as the fireground channel. There should be a minimum bandwidth separation of at least 25 MHz between fire channels. There is an insufficient bandwidth separation between Fire Channels 1 and 4 to ensure clear communications capability. Fire Channel 2 is a significantly stronger frequency compared to Fire Channel 4 due to greater bandwidth separation. Fire Channel 2 is currently used by fire units responding on medical calls.

Replacing Fire Channel 4 with Fire Channel 2 will not eliminate the problem of insufficient bandwidth separation. Rather, it will shift the communication problems from fire units responding on fire calls to fire units responding on medical calls. EMS units will not be affected by this change because they use a different communications system.

Problem—Truck Company Staffing.—Current staffing of the Department's truck companies is inadequate. Working fires require truck company members to perform more work tasks then can be accomplished by four fire fighters in a timely manner. At this incident, improper and insufficient ventilation by truck companies was a critical factor contributing to the deaths and injuries. Other operational deficiencies include the following: Aerial ladders were not raised to the roof of the townhouses, even though it was possible to do so. An insufficient number of ground ladders were placed on both the front and rear of the structure. Truck companies did not turn off the gas or electric utilities at the fire building. Although not a factor in this incident, this certainly could have been catastrophic.

In part, the failure of truck companies in completing assigned operations resulted from truck company officers performing fire fighter tasks as well as the role of officer. Management of their companies was, necessarily, a secondary consideration to the primary task of carrying out vital fire fight-

er operations, such as placing ladders, ventilation, and forcible entry.

Recommendation—The Department must properly staff and train truck companies to ensure that vital fireground operations are accomplished in a timely manner. Truck companies must be staffed with a minimum of 5 or 6 fire fighters. Such a staffing level is nationally recognized by NFPA 1710, Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression, Emergency Medical Operations, and Special Operations to the Public by Career Fire Departments (scheduled for adoption May 2001), for all jurisdictions with tactical hazards, high-hazard occupancies, high incident frequencies, or geographical restrictions. This applies to all fire responses in the District of Columbia. Restoration of such staffing levels on truck companies will allow truck company officers to properly manage the overall operation of their company and ensure that critical tasks are accomplished. Note: December 1999, the Department restored truck company staffing to 4 fire fighters and an officer.

SAFETY

Problem—Integrated PASS Devices.—Fire Fighter Phillips wore an SCBA with an integrated PASS device that was automatically activated. Fire Fighter Matthews wore a manually activated PASS device, which he did not activate. Department personnel who entered the building in search of a missing fire fighter reported that they were able to rapidly locate F/F Phillips because they heard his PASS alarm. They were not able to locate F/F Matthews as quickly because his PASS device was not activated. In later interviews, the majority of fire fighters with manually activated PASS devices reported that they had not activated their devices before entering the building.

Recommendation—The Department must maintain SCBA units with integrated PASS devices for all fire fighters. Note: In December 1999, the Department provided every on duty fire fighter and officer with an SCBA with integrated PASS device.

Mr. Speaker, I will again quote from this report, although the text of it as I provided will be entered into the RECORD. But these are the recommendations that were made following two additional deaths of D.C. fire fighters. "Proper management of the fireground requires the assistance of a battalion chief's aid. This position was restored on December 19, 1999" at Chief Tippett's request. The "Department should continue the position of battalion chief's aid and their role includes the following: Assist in the coordination of fireground activities, gather critical information for the incident commander, allow the incident commander to sector the incident sooner, handle specific tasks, such as accountability, as directed by the incident commander, improving fireground communications.

"The position of battalion chief's aid is important to fireground safety."

Now, that was an internal recommendation of the D.C. Fire Department over the past year following the investigation of the cause of the death of these two fire fighters.

The report goes on to say, "The use of battalion chief's aides greatly improves size-up information."

On the staffing issue, this same report says the following, "Current staffing of the Department's truck companies is inadequate. Working fires require truck company members to perform more work tasks than can be accomplished by four fire fighters in a timely manner." It goes on to say, "Recommendation", "Truck companies must be staffed with a minimum of 5 or 6 fire fighters. Such a staffing level is nationally recognized by" the National Fire Protection Association 1710. It goes on to say, "This applies to all fire responses in the District of Columbia."

Now, Mr. Speaker, here we have the Congress and the internal investigative arm of the District of Columbia on the record within the last year saying that we should increase the number of fire fighters on truck companies to five and that we should reinstate these aides to the battalion chief incident commander on the scene of a disaster in the District of Columbia.

The new fire chief put into a temporary position last year, Chief Tom Tippett, when he was sworn in said that he would protect the lives of those who he was charged to lead. The mayor supported Chief Tippett in that declaration, as did this Congress. That is exactly what Chief Tippett did.

Because there was not enough funding in the District of Columbia budget, he used money from the reserve account for overtime and excess dollars that he could find within the D.C. Fire Department budget to increase the staffing level and bring in these aides. So over the past several months, the District of Columbia has had better protection.

Unfortunately, it came to a show-down that ended in a very unfortunate decision last Friday. See, Mr. Speaker, the oversight authority for the District of Columbia, the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, headed by former Clinton OMB director Alice Rivlin, told the mayor that they could not continue to fund these positions. Even though Chief Tippett found the money within his own budget allocation when he went back in for a reprogramming to complete this fiscal year, which amounted to over a million dollars, the oversight commission said no.

The mayor supported the chief; and to his credit, Mayor Williams said the chief is correct. D.C. fire fighters do not deserve to be treated as second-class citizens. They protect the Congress. They protect the American people. They protect the White House. They will be out there on the streets this coming Sunday when hundreds of thousands of moms march on Washington. They were there a few short weeks ago when thousands demonstrated in support of gay rights. They are here every week when thousands and tens of thousands of citizens from all over this country come to our city.

The fire department responds to medical emergencies, fires, disasters, and

other problems that confront this city every day.

Chief Tippett did what he said he would do. He increased the funding to allow that support to take place for the D.C. Fire Department. Alice Rivlin and her oversight board laid down an ultimatum and told the mayor and the chief, "We will not support your increased funding." Even though the proposed budget for the District of Columbia for the next fiscal year contained an additional \$6 million to fund these initiatives, the oversight board said it would not provide the emergency funding to complete the rest of this fiscal year, which would have totaled somewhere less than \$4 million.

When Chief Tippett was backed into a corner after having given his word, which unfortunately many in politics do not abide by, but that members of the fire service do abide by their word, Chief Tippett did what he felt was the honorable thing. On Friday afternoon of last week, he resigned. He stepped down from his office because he felt that he could not justify nor guarantee the safety of the D.C. fire fighters.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that there are at least three other next in line officers who were approached about taking the interim position of D.C. fire chief, and they refused. They refused because of this common bond of honor between all the fire fighters in this city and nationwide.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the irony of this whole incident is that last Wednesday evening in Washington, for the 12th time, we had over 2,000 leaders of the American fire and EMS community come to Washington for a celebration of our domestic defenders, our American heroes, our fire and emergency service providers, volunteers and paid.

Yet 2 days later, Chief Tippett has to resign because of a short-sighted decision made by a pencil-pushing budget cutter overseeing a budget in excess of \$2 billion that could not find \$4 million to help this city to be properly protected.

Mr. Speaker, within the last 3 years, three D.C. Fire fighters have given their lives. These fire fighters were burned. In fact, there were a couple at the fire station today on New Jersey Avenue when we had a press conference who did live who were burned. These are not pencil pushers. These are men and women who every day in this city, as their brothers and sisters do across America, respond to every type of disaster that one can think of: bomb threats, explosions, stabbings, drug dealings, because the emergency response community in this city is the D.C. Fire and Emergency Services Department. Yet tonight, Mr. Speaker, those in D.C. are less protected. Those who protect the people of D.C., the brave fire fighters and EMS personnel, are more at risk.

Mr. Speaker, today, at a press conference in front of the fire station on New Jersey Avenue and in this room tonight, I call for the resignation of

Alice Rivlin. Anyone who is as short-sighted as she must be, to deny a \$4 million request, which I, as a Republican, will aggressively support in this body, out of a budget in excess of \$2 billion to help guarantee the safety of fire fighters and EMS personnel in this city, in my opinion, is not fit to be the director of the oversight management authority for this the District of Columbia.

Either she restores the funding or she herself should resign. As I said today, Mr. Speaker, let her take the money that she makes and the staff that supports her and give that to the D.C. Fire Department. The people of D.C. would be safer if that money were being used to protect them and the people who visit this city.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to go one step further, because Alice Rivlin is the hand-picked choice of this administration. Now, President Clinton and Vice President AL GORE talk a good game when it comes to supporting the Nation's fire fighters. In fact, AL GORE should talk a good game because it was the International Association of Fire Fighters who endorsed the candidacy of the Vice President before any other union in America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask myself where is the voice of the Vice President calling for the safety of these fire fighters? Where is his outrage that a former hand-picked senior manager of this administration would make such a disastrous decision? Yet, no word would come out of this administration about the impending problems for the safety and well-being of both the fire fighters, the emergency medical personnel, and the people who work and live in D.C.

Besides calling for the resignation of Alice Rivlin, I have today and I am again asking and requesting and demanding that the Vice President of the United States say something about the absolutely outrageous action that was taken by the oversight board to deny Chief Tippett's recommendations. If he does not respond, then I hope every union IAFF member in D.C. and around the country understands that that silence speaks louder than any words. We are talking about the safety of the men and women who protect this city.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, under a different administration, the New Jersey Avenue fire station was closed down, the station that protects this Capitol. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and I fought that decision and got on this floor and tried to pass legislation to restore the funding to keep that station operational. We were unsuccessful.

Five years later, a few short months ago, that New Jersey Avenue station was reopened. I could not make the reopening, but the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) did, and he deserves much credit for his support in helping that station be reopened.

Within the first 30 days of their operation, they responded to 325 calls on Capitol Hill, 325 calls in 1 month, 30

days. Prior to that, those calls had to be answered by distance stations traveling much further to reach this Hill to take care of the citizens of America who visit and work here.

2145

Today we have to respond to a different call. Chief Tippett, a brave and honorable man, gave up his profession on Friday based on principle. Now it is time for this Congress, Members from both sides of the aisle, to stand with Chief Tippett on principle.

Now, there are many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, who are railing about support for the fire service, about whether or not one is for this bill or for that bill; whether or not one is for this amendment or that amendment. Well, here is the chance for all our colleagues to join together this week and demand that the D.C. Oversight Board do the right thing and provide the additional \$4 million for these brave men and women to protect this city and the people who live and work here, but more importantly to protect the lives of the fire and EMS personnel themselves.

It would be absolutely tragic, Mr. Speaker, if another incident like 3146 Cherry Road, Northeast, took place and additional D.C. firefighters were put at risk or, heaven forbid, lost their lives. All of us, Democrats and Republicans, must speak out and speak out loud and in a very clear and coherent voice.

Mr. Speaker, just a few short weeks ago tens of thousands of firefighters were joined by the President of the United States and the Vice President as they traveled to Worcester, Massachusetts, to join with all of us as we mourned the loss of six firefighters who were killed during the course of their assignment. They made the supreme sacrifice, just as the three D.C. firefighters did in the last 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, words are critical to console the families of those when a loved one is lost, as we all did when those six Worcester firefighters were killed. Where is the voice of those people today, before an additional D.C. firefighter is killed? Where is the voice of the President today? Where is the voice of the Vice President today? And where is the support for Alice Rivlin and the Oversight Board for the additional risks that are being put on those firefighters because they are not being adequately staffed and not being sup-

ported to respond to the incidences they have to face in this city?

Mr. Speaker, I hold those officials accountable. And I encourage all of our colleagues to join with me and to join with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who went to the New Jersey fire station today, before I did, to state unequivocally that we will support the funding, but we want a decision made now. Not next week, not next month, not next year, but now, to restore the full support that Chief Tippett asked for. And we also want Chief Tippett back in that job.

Because, as I told the mayor 3 months ago when he began his search for his chief, when I called him on the telephone, I said, "Mayor, you know you have a good man there. Your interim chief." He said, "Congressman, I agree with you." I said, "He deserves to be the chief." And he said, "I agree with you." As I sat next to the mayor last June, as we had this memorial ceremony for those two firefighters that were killed here in D.C., he said, "You know, Congressman, my top priority as the mayor is to guarantee the safety of our emergency service workers."

The mayor is then on our side. The chief is on our side. The director of public safety for the city is on our side. Where is Alice Rivlin? Where is the oversight board? Where is the White House? And where is Mr. GORE with his IAFF endorsement? What is he doing to help protect the lives of these D.C. firefighters?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness of the family.

Mrs. WILSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes each day, on today, May 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ISAKSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTON of Texas, for 5 minutes each day, on May 9 and 10.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2370. An act to designate the Federal building located at 500 Pearl Street in New York City, New York, as the "Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the on-going persecution of 13 members of Iran's Jewish community; to the Committee on International Relations.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1744. An act to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that certain species conservation reports shall continue to be required to be submitted.

S. 2323. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the treatment of stock options under the Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the fourth quarter of 1999 and the first quarter of 2000 by Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives, and for miscellaneous groups in connection with official foreign travel during the calendar year 1999 are as follows:

AMENDMENT TO REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter King	12/1	12/3	Ireland		539.83		1,627.55				2,167.38
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	12/8	12/9	Italy		247.36						247.36
	12/9	12/10	Macedonia		207.00						207.00
	12/10	12/13	Kosovo		117.00						117.00
	12/13	12/14	Macedonia		189.00						189.00
Commercial airfare							5,169.87				5,169.87
Committee total					1,300.19		6,797.42				8,097.61

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, Chairman, May 1, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Charles O. Flicker	1/4	1/6	Honduras		713.00						713.00
	1/6	1/9	Nicaragua		727.50						727.50
	1/9	1/10	El Salvador		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							1,713.45				1,713.45
Christopher J. Walker	1/4	1/6	Honduras		713.00						713.00
	1/6	1/9	Nicaragua		727.00						727.00
	1/9	1/11	Colombia		632.00						632.00
Commercial airfare							1,558.45				1,558.45
Hon. Joe Knollenberg	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. James Moran	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Jerry Lewis	1/9	1/10	Italy		75.00						75.00
	1/10	1/11	Macedonia/Kosovo		222.00						222.00
	1/11	1/13	Turkey		420.00						420.00
	1/13	1/14	Germany		242.00						242.00
Kevin Roper	1/9	1/10	Italy		75.00						75.00
	1/10	1/11	Macedonia/Kosovo		222.00						222.00
	1/11	1/13	Turkey		420.00						420.00
	1/13	1/14	Germany		242.00						242.00
Douglas Gregory	1/9	1/10	Italy		75.00						75.00
	1/10	1/11	Macedonia/Kosovo		222.00						222.00
	1/11	1/13	Turkey		420.00						420.00
	1/13	1/14	Germany		242.00						242.00
Frank Cushing	1/9	1/10	Italy		75.00						75.00
	1/10	1/11	Macedonia/Kosovo		222.00						222.00
	1/11	1/13	Turkey		420.00						420.00
	1/13	1/14	Germany		242.00						242.00
Hon. Bud Cramer	1/7	1/10	Colombia		785.00						785.00
	1/10	1/12	Peru		526.00						526.00
	1/12	1/14	Chile		540.00						540.00
	1/14	1/17	Argentina		1,466.00						1,466.00
	1/17	1/19	Paraguay		185.00						185.00
	1/19	1/21	Brazil		643.00						643.00
Commercial airfare							220.60				220.60
Hon. Sam Farr	1/16	1/18	Venezuela		525.40						525.40
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	1/19	1/20	Guatemala		140.00						140.00
	1/20	1/22	Mexico		442.00						442.00
Scott Lilly	1/12	1/14	New Zealand		400.00						400.00
	1/14	1/18	Antarctica		0.00						0.00
	1/18	1/19	New Zealand		200.00						200.00
	1/19	1/25	Australia		1,365.00						1,365.00
Commercial airfare							8,631.00				8,631.00
Sally Chadbourne	1/12	1/14	New Zealand		400.00						400.00
	1/14	1/18	Antarctica		0.00						0.00
	1/18	1/19	New Zealand		200.00						200.00
	1/19	1/25	Australia		1,296.00						1,296.00
Commercial airfare							8,166.00				8,166.00
Hon. Sonny Callahan	2/18	2/19	Venezuela		384.00						384.00
	2/19	2/20	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	2/20	2/21	Ecuador		287.50						287.50
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	2/18	2/19	Venezuela		384.00						384.00
	2/19	2/21	Colombia		514.00						514.00
Commercial airfare							1,327.78				1,327.78
Charles O. Flickner	2/18	2/19	Venezuela		384.00						384.00
	2/19	2/20	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	2/20	2/21	Ecuador		287.50						287.50
Christopher J. Walker	2/18	2/19	Venezuela		384.00						384.00
	2/19	2/20	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	2/20	2/21	Ecuador		287.50						287.50
Mark Murray	2/18	2/19	Venezuela		384.00						384.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	2/19	2/22	Colombia		1,000.00						1,000.00
Commercial airfare							(³)				
Elizabeth Dawson	2/18	2/24	Italy		1,650.00		824.70				824.70
	2/21	2/21	Kosovo		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							(³)				
							5,538.72				5,538.72
John Blazey	2/19	2/23	Italy		1,650.00				53.00		53.00
	2/21	2/21	Kosovo		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							(³)				
							5,508.00				5,508.00
Douglas Gregory	2/22	2/24	Colombia		486.00				54.00		54.00
Commercial airfare											
							2,055.80				2,055.80
Hon. John P. Murtha	3/17	3/18	Colombia		243.00						243.00
							(³)				
Gregory R. Dahlberg	3/17	3/18	Colombia		243.00						243.00
							(³)				
Committee total					31,436.40		35,544.50		107.00		67,087.90
Frederick A. Brugger	3/26	4/1	Mexico		1,276.50		2,474.49		45.40		3,796.39
Bertram F. Dunn	2/18	2/22	India		949.50		7,326.51		124.62		8,400.63
	2/22	2/25	Pakistan		429.00						429.00
	2/25	2/26	India		260.00						260.00
James W. Dyer	2/18	2/22	India		949.50		7,326.51		35.44		8,311.45
	2/22	2/25	Pakistan		429.00						429.00
	2/25	2/26	India		260.00						260.00
Norman H. Gardner	2/18	2/22	India		949.50		7,326.51		45.83		8,321.84
	2/22	2/25	Pakistan		429.00						429.00
	2/25	2/26	India		260.00						260.00
Carroll L. Hauer	3/26	4/1	Mexico		1,304.75		2,474.49		185.23		3,964.47
James A. Higham	2/18	2/22	India		949.50		7,326.51		49.23		8,325.24
	2/22	2/25	Pakistan		429.00						429.00
	2/25	2/26	India		260.00						260.00
Dennis K. Lutz	3/26	4/1	Mexico		1,304.75		2,495.00		88.49		3,888.24
John R. Mikel	2/18	2/22	India		949.00		7,326.51		70.74		8,346.75
	2/22	2/25	Pakistan		429.00						429.00
	2/25	2/26	India		260.00						260.00
Margaret R. Owens	3/26	4/1	Mexico		1,276.50		2,474.49		24.00		3,774.99
R.J. Reitwiesner	2/18	2/22	India		949.50		7,326.51		239.14		8,515.15
	2/22	2/25	Pakistan		429.00						429.00
	2/25	2/26	India		260.00						260.00
R.W. Vandergrift, Jr.	2/18	2/22	India		949.50		7,326.51		754.46		9,030.47
	2/22	2/25	Pakistan		429.00						429.00
	2/25	2/26	India		325.00						325.00
T. Peter Wyman	2/18	2/22	India		949.50		7,326.51		66.23		8,342.24
	2/22	2/25	Pakistan		429.00						429.00
	2/25	2/26	India		260.00						260.00
	3/26	4/1	Mexico		1,276.50		2,474.49		104.17		3,855.16
Committee total					19,612.00		71,005.04		1,832.98		92,450.02

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

C.W. BILL YOUNG, Chairman, Apr. 17, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Rick Hill	1/9	1/13	China		1,120.00		(³)				
	1/13	1/15	Hong Kong		694.00						
	1/15	1/18	Taiwan		530.00						
Patrick Toomey	1/9	1/11	Beijing		207.00		(³)				
	1/11	1/13	Shanghai		253.00						
	1/13	1/15	Hong Kong		297.00						
Bruce Vento	1/15	1/17	Taiwan		215.00						
	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						
Committee total					6,016.00						6,016.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

JAMES A. LEACH, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND MAR. 31, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Shadegg	1/9	1/13	China		1,120.00						1,120.00
	1/13	1/15	Hong Kong		694.00						694.00
	1/15	1/18	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
Hon. Nathan Deal	2/19	2/22	New Zealand		400.00						400.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND MAR. 31, 2000—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Chip Pickering	2/22	2/27	Australia		1,162.00						1,162.00
Alison Taylor	2/19	2/22	England		1,143.00		2,420.00				3,563.00
Joseph Stanko	2/15	2/16	Canada		184.00		584.69				768.69
Hon. Tom Sawyer	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00		2,235.25				3,025.15
Amit Sachdev	3/22	3/25	Germany		654.50		3,109.43				3,763.93
Richard Frandsen	3/20	3/23	Germany		654.50		1,963.93				2,618.43
Hon. Cliff Stearns	2/19	2/22	England		1,143.00						1,143.00
	2/22	2/22	Belgium								
	2/22	2/24	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	2/24	2/27	Germany		779.00						779.00
Hon. Bart Gordon	2/19	2/22	England		1,143.00						1,143.00
	2/22	2/22	Belgium								
	2/22	2/24	Switzerland		616.00						661.00
	2/24	2/27	Germany		779.00						779.00
Committee total					13,566.00		10,897.89				24,463.89

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Apr. 20, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Adams	1/5	1/7	Ecuador		301.00						301.00
	1/16	1/18	Venezuela		525.40						525.40
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	1/19	1/20	Guatemala		140.00						140.00
	1/20	1/22	Mexico		442.00						442.00
Hon. Cass Ballenger	1/16	1/18	Venezuela		60.00						60.00
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	1/19	1/20	Guatemala		93.35						93.35
	1/20	1/22	Mexico		100.00						100.00
Paul Berkowitz	1/3	1/7	India		1,263.00		173.00				1,436.00
	1/8	1/10	Philippines		732.00						732.00
	1/11	1/14	New Zealand		644.00						644.00
Commercial airfare							8,914.03				8,914.03
Nancy S. Bloomer	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Kevin Brady	1/12	1/15	Belgium		909.00						909.00
Commercial airfare							6,597.26				6,597.26
Sean Carroll	1/15	1/18	Venezuela		765.85						765.85
	1/18	1/20	Colombia		386.00						386.00
	2/11	2/13	Haiti		369.00						369.00
Commercial airfare							1,166.80				1,166.80
Hon. William Delahunt	1/15	1/18	Venezuela		311.50						311.50
	1/18	1/20	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare							1,347.80				1,347.80
Nisha Desai	1/6	1/7	Holland		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							2,238.00				2,238.00
Mike Ennis	1/8	1/13	Korea		772.00						772.00
	1/13	1/17	Vietnam		636.00						636.00
	1/17	1/20	Hong Kong		929.00						929.00
Commercial airfare							5,797.40				5,797.40
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	2/11	2/13	Haiti		369.00						369.00
David Fite	1/8	1/13	Korea		934.00						934.00
Commercial airfare							3,814.80				3,814.80
Richard J. Garon	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Sam Gejdenson	1/6	1/7	Holland		0.00						0.00
	1/7	1/14	India		2,137.00						2,137.00
Commercial airfare							6,730.63				6,730.63
Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Charisse Glassman	1/5	1/7	Papua New Guine		360.00						360.00
	1/7	1/8	Australia		387.00						387.00
	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		462.00						462.00
	1/9	1/13	Australia		796.00						796.00
Commercial airfare							10,938.42				10,938.42
Jason Gross	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		690.00						690.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	1/12	1/15	Austria		504.00						504.00
Commercial airfare							5,207.16				5,207.16
John Herzberg	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Earl F. Hilliard	2/11	2/13	Haiti		369.00						369.00
Amos Hochstein	1/6	1/7	Holland		0.00						0.00
	1/7	1/15	India		2,118.00						2,118.00
Commercial airfare							6,705.73				6,705.73

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Amo Houghton	1/5	1/12	Australia		0.00						0.00
Charmaine Houseman	1/9	1/13	Korea		851.00						851.00
	1/13	1/17	Vietnam		715.00						715.00
	1/17	1/20	Hong Kong		1,007.00						1,007.00
Commercial airfare							4,603.24				4,603.24
Hon. Peter King	1/15	1/17	Portugal		118.00						118.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Commercial airfare							523.21				523.21
Robert R. King	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/19	1/20	Australia		436.00						436.00
	1/23	1/20	East/West Timor		640.00						640.00
	1/23	1/26	Indonesia		741.00						741.00
Commercial airfare							7,336.57				7,336.57
	2/19	2/21	Marshall Islands		450.00						450.00
	2/22	2/28	Micronesia		992.00						992.00
Commercial airfare							6,659.94				6,659.94
Hon. Tom Lantos	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/13	Belgium		303.00						303.00
	1/17	1/20	London		306.00						306.00
Commercial airfare							207.99				207.99
John Mackey	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Marc Mealy	1/6	1/7	Holland		0.00						0.00
	1/7	1/15	India		2,325.47						2,325.47
Commercial airfare							6,659.63				6,659.63
Kathleen Moazed	1/13	1/16	Vietnam		576.00						576.00
	1/16	1/20	Laos		600.00						600.00
	1/20	1/20	Thailand		199.00						199.00
Commercial airfare							7,786.41				7,786.41
Vincent L. Morelli	1/16	1/18	Venezuela		525.40						525.40
	1/18	1/19	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	1/19	1/20	Guatemala		140.00						140.00
	1/20	1/22	Mexico		442.00						442.00
Joan O'Donnell	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Donald Payne	1/5	1/7	Papua New Guinea		360.00						360.00
	1/7	1/8	Australia		387.00						387.00
	1/8	1/9	New Zealand		462.00						462.00
	1/9	1/13	Australia		796.00				389.43		885.43
Commercial airfare							9,858.67				9,858.67
Stephen Rademaker	1/23	1/25	Austria		336.00				341.93		377.93
Commercial airfare							4,026.15				4,026.15
Frank Record	1/9	1/10	Denmark		258.00						258.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		416.00						416.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		690.00						690.00
Commercial airfare							2,205.15				2,205.15
Grover Joseph Rees	1/17	1/18	Singapore		149.25						149.25
	1/19	1/21	Australia		280.00						280.00
	1/21	1/24	East/West Timor		340.00						340.00
	1/24	1/27	Indonesia		840.00				342.15		882.15
	1/27	1/28	Singapore		149.25						149.25
Commercial airfare							5,155.80				5,155.80
Matt Reynolds	2/19	2/21	Marshall Islands		450.00						450.00
	2/22	2/28	Micronesia		937.00				39.43		937.00
Commercial airfare							6,659.94				6,659.94
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	1/7	1/11	Philippines		776.00				3356.37		1,132.37
	1/11	1/18	Thailand		1,393.00						1,393.00
	1/14	1/14	Cambodia		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							1,871.11				1,871.11
Laura Rush	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00				39.43		616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	1/9	1/13	China		1,120.00				37,564		8,684.48
	1/13	1/15	Hong Kong		694.00				35,874.26		6,568.26
	1/15	1/18	Taiwan		530.00				34,614.30		5,144.30
	1/9	1/13	Korea		851.00						851.00
	1/13	1/17	Vietnam		715.00						715.00
	1/17	1/20	Hong Kong		1,007.00						1,007.00
Linda Solomon	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Hillel Weinberg	1/9	1/10	Denmark		277.00						277.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		516.00						516.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		690.00						690.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		318.00						318.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		418.00						418.00
Committee total					75,955.47		127,999.47		41,211.81		245,166.75

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Delegation costs.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Janice Helwig	12/29	12/29	USA				4,220.66				4,220.66
	12/30	3/4	Austria		13,705.11						13,705.11
Marlene Kaufmann		1/12	USA				5,215.22				5,215.22
	1/13	1/12	Austria		336.00						336.00
Hon. Steny Hoyer		1/12	USA				5,215.22				5,215.22
	1/13	1/15	Austria		336.00						336.00
Michael Ochs		2/15	USA				8,210.87				8,210.87
	2/17	2/23	Kyrgyzstan		1,164.00						1,164.00
	2/23	2/24	Turkey		267.00						267.00
Karen Lord		2/20	USA				4,200.66				4,200.66
	2/23	3/6	Thailand		576.22						576.22
Ronald McNamara		2/29	USA				4,025.78				4,025.78
	3/1	3/4	Austria		504.00						504.00
John Finerty		3/21	USA				4,653.47				4,653.47
	3/22	3/27	Russia		1,308.00						1,308.00
Orest Deychakiwsky		3/21	USA				4,653.47				4,653.47
	3/22	3/27	Russia		1,373.26						1,373.26
Erika Schlager		3/25	USA				5,096.11				5,096.11
	3/26	3/27	Austria		335.82						335.82
	3/27	3/30	Czech Republic		808.20						808.20
Committee total					20,733.61		45,491.46				66,225.07

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, BRITISH-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUG BEREUTER, Chairman, Mar. 21, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Amo Houghton, Chairman	5/20	5/24	Canada		588.17		(3)		1,421.14		2,009.31
Hon. Pat Danner	5/20	5/24	Canada		567.65		(3)				567.65
Hon. Phil English	5/20	5/24	Canada		573.63		(3)				573.63
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	5/20	5/24	Canada		550.15		(3)				550.15
Hon. Bill Lipinski	5/20	5/24	Canada		550.15		(3)				550.15
Hon. Don Manzullo	5/20	5/24	Canada		550.15		(3)				550.15
Hon. Jim Oberstar	5/20	5/24	Canada		617.09		(3)				617.09
Hon. Collin Peterson	5/20	5/24	Canada		557.65		(3)				557.65
Hon. Clay Shaw	5/20	5/24	Canada		552.65		(3)				552.65
Hon. Louise Slaughter	5/20	5/24	Canada		565.15		(3)				565.15
Hon. Cliff Stearns	5/20	5/24	Canada		581.92		(3)				581.92
Hon. Fred Upton	5/20	5/24	Canada		577.17		(3)				577.17
Carl Ek	5/20	5/24	Canada		558.96		(3)				558.96
Denis McDonough	5/20	5/24	Canada		414.28		574.44				988.72
Frank Record	5/20	5/24	Canada		699.75		(3)				699.75
Kim Roberts	5/20	5/24	Canada		559.50		(3)				559.50
Bob Van Wicklin	5/20	5/24	Canada		553.48		(3)				553.48
Jill Quinn	8/30	9/2	USVI		671.36		1,032.90		157.00		1,861.26
Delegation expenses:											
Representational									44,724.21		44,724.21
Committee total					10,288.86		1,607.34		46,302.35		58,198.55

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

AMO HOUGHTON, Chairman, Mar. 23, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation expenses:											
Representational									2,319.35		2,319.35
Miscellaneous									78.00		78.00
Committee total									2,397.35		2,397.35

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 21, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe, Chairman	6/25	6/27	United States		318.00		(³)		140.00		458.00
Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman, Vice Chairman	6/25	6/27	United States		318.00		(³)				318.00
Hon. Cass Ballenger	6/25	6/27	United States		329.00		(³)				329.00
Hon. Joe Barton	6/25	6/27	United States		333.00		(³)				333.00
Hon. David Dreier	6/25	6/27	United States		318.00		(³)				318.00
Hon. Bob Filner	6/25	6/27	United States		334.73		(³)				334.73
Hon. Grace F. Napolitano	6/25	6/27	United States		318.00		(³)				318.00
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	6/25	6/27	United States		327.08		(³)				327.08
Hon. Charles Stenholm	6/25	6/27	United States		339.84		(³)				339.84
Sean Carroll	6/25	6/27	United States		346.59		(³)				346.59
Everett Eissenstat	6/25	6/27	United States		318.00		(³)				318.00
Shelly Livingston	1/11	1/15	United States		575.64		372.00				947.64
	3/23	3/26	United States		516.14		626.00				1,142.14
John Mackey	6/25	6/27	United States		378.66		(³)				378.66
Caleb McCarr	6/25	6/27	United States		327.89		(³)				327.89
Jill Quinn	6/25	6/27	United States		348.27		(³)				348.27
	6/25	6/27	United States		318.00		(³)				318.00
Delegation expenses:											
Representational functions									58,571.70		58,571.70
Translation/interpreting									3,839.88		3,839.88
Miscellaneous									457.86		457.86
Committee total					6,064.84				63,009.44		70,075.28

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

JIM KOLBE, Chairman, Mar. 21, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ralph Regula	2/13	2/17	France				2,713.64				2,713.64
Hon. Roy Blunt	2/13	2/17	France				2,608.64				2,608.64
Susan Olson	3/26	3/29	Germany		800.00		5,877.49		111.00		6,788.49
	5/27	6/1	Poland				2,202.51				2,202.51
Josephine Weber	11/11	11/17	Netherlands				2,590.20				2,590.20
	5/27	6/1	Poland				2,202.51				2,202.51
	11/11	11/17	Netherlands				2,590.20				2,590.20
Delegation expenses:											
Representational Functions									18,861.10		18,861.10
Miscellaneous									4,098.52		4,098.52
Committee total					800.00		20,785.19		23,070.62		44,655.81

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUG BEREUTER, Chairman, Mar. 22, 2000.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7472. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance; Statutory Merger of Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs; Housing Choice Voucher Program; Correction [Docket No. FR-4428-C-06] (RIN: 2577-AB91) received March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7473. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Multifamily Housing Assistance Restructuring, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Multifamily Housing Mortgage and Housing Assistance Restructuring Program (Mark-to-Market) [Docket No. FR-4298-F-07] (RIN: 2502-AH09) received March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7474. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes to Admission and Occupancy Requirements in the Public Housing and Section 8 Housing Assistance Programs [Docket No. FR-4485-F-03] (RIN: 2501-AC59) received March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7475. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Allocation of Funds Under the Capital Fund; Capital Fund Formula; Final Rule [Docket No. FR-4423-F-07] (RIN: 2577-AB87) received March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7476. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ophthalmic and Topical Dosage Form New Animal Drugs; Tricrinolone Acetonide Cream—received March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7477. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Trustees and Custodians of Pension Plans; Share Insurance and Appendix—received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7478. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA,

Department of Health and Human Service, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Paper and Paperboard Components [Docket No. 93F-0132] received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7479. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 94F-0246] received April 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7480. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 97F-0157] received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7481. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 98F-0567] received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7482. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted

in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 99F-5523] received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7483. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulation of Exchanges and Alternative Trading Systems; Technical Amendments [Release No. 34-40760B; File No. S7-12-98] (RIN: 3235-AH41) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7484. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Light Truck Average Fuel Economy Standard, Model Year 2002 [Docket No. NHTSA-00-7033] (RIN: 2127-AH95) received March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7485. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 72.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Newell, South Dakota) [MM Docket No. 99-96 RM-9534] (Merville, Iowa) [MM Docket No. 99-193 RM-9561] (Rockford, Iowa) [MM Docket No. 99-194 RM-9562] (Watseka, Illinois) [MM Docket 99-308 RM-9693] (Keosauqua, Iowa) [MM Docket No. 99-309 RM-9694] (Box Elder, South Dakota) [MM Docket No. 99-310 RM-9742] received March 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7486. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Littlefield, Wolforth and Tahoka, Texas) [MM Docket No. 95-83 RM-8634] received March 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7487. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Easton, Merced and North Fork, California) [MM Docket No. 99-181 RM-9584 RM-9700] received March 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7488. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting Annual report of progress in implementing requirements of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9620; to the Committee on Commerce.

7489. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7490. A letter from the Chief Counsel (Foreign Assets Control), Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blocked Persons, Specially Designated Nationals, Specially Designated Terrorists, Foreign Terrorist Organizations, and Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers; Additional Designations and Removal and Supplementary Information on Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers—received March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7491. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the Accountability Report for fiscal year 1999, pursuant to Public Law 94-59, title III (89 Stat. 283); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7492. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the 1999 Integrity Act Report to the President and Congress, pursuant to P.L. 97-255; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7493. 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; Opens Directed Fishing for Several Groundfish Species in the Central Regulatory Area in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 991228352-0012; I.D. 032700E] received April 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7494. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Fort Stockton, TX [Airspace Docket No. 2000-ASW-09] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7495. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Bonham, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-34] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7496. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Waco, TX [Airspace Docket No. 2000-ASW-08] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7497. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, DHHS, Administration for Children and Families, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Individual Development Accounts (RIN: 0970-AC02) received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. GEKAS: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 3709. A bill to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet; with amendments (Rept. 106-609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 4040. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program under which long-term care insurance is made available to Federal employees, members of the uniformed services, and civilian and military retirees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-610 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X Committee on Armed Services discharged. H.R. 4040 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3244. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 9, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of May 4, 2000]

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to establish nexus requirements for State and local taxation of mobile telecommunication services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

[Submitted May 8, 2000]

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 4392. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SABO, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 4393. A bill to provide that amounts allotted to a State under section 2104 of the Social Security Act for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999 shall remain available through fiscal year 2002; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 4394. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain ceramic knives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSTAD (for himself and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 4395. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the manner in which new medical technologies are made available to Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska introduced a bill (H.R. 4396) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *M/V Wells Gray*; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 205: Mr. CANNON.

- H.R. 453: Mr. METCALF, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 640: Ms. CARSON.
 H.R. 894: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 979: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
 H.R. 1055: Mr. LINDER.
 H.R. 1093: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1217: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 1248: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. BASS.
 H.R. 1465: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1485: Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 1560: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. NUSSLE.
 H.R. 1997: Mr. LARSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2233: Mr. PAUL, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 2446: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 2573: Ms. RIVERS.
 H.R. 2594: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 2720: Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2722: Ms. SANCHEZ and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD.
 H.R. 3010: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 3044: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 3174: Mr. SKEEN.
 H.R. 3193: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 3244: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 3482: Mr. MINGE, Mr. Owens, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 3558: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 3573: Mr. POMEROY.
 H.R. 3694: Mr. FLETCHER.
 H.R. 3826: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3831: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 3850: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 3915: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SPENCE, Ms. CARSON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. COOKSEY.
 H.R. 3916: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FORD, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3981: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 4033: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 4040: Mr. MCINTOSH.
 H.R. 4108: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 4140: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. LEE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 4207: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SAWYER, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 4214: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 4218: Mr. CONDIT.
 H.R. 4245: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 4249: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PETERSEN of Minnesota, Mr. PETRI, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 4271: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FROST, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 4272: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FROST, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 4273: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FROST, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 4282: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
 H.R. 4292: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 4313: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 4329: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 4337: Mr. KUYKENDALL.
 H.R. 4374: Mr. BONILLA.
 H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. WU.
 H. Con. Res. 251: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. MASCARA.
 H. Con. Res. 293: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. MATSUI.
 H. Con. Res. 297: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mr. HOLT.
 H. Res. 398: Mr. HOEFFEL.
 H. Res. 491: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. REGULA, Mr. EWING, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WATKINS, and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H. Res. 492: Mr. METCALF, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MOORE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. WU, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HORN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. ISAKSON.